



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: WEDNESDAY 18 JUNE 2008

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: Jacobs Well Village Hall, Jacobs Well Road, Guildford GU4 7PD

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 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 Wendy May (Stoughton)
Mr John Garrett (Lovelace)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Terence Patrick (Send)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)
Ms Mary Laker (Worplesdon)
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

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

- Progress on the Normandy Village Safety Scheme (Peta Malthouse, Chairman Normandy Parish Council)
- Realtime Bus timetables (Peter Hattersley, West Horsley)
- Consultation on any future Park & Ride site in Worplesdon (Daniel Shaw, Worplesdon)

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

IN PUBLIC

23/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Nigel Manning.

24/08 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (23 APRIL 2008) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

25/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

The following declarations were made:

Item	Councillor	Type	Reason
13	Goodwin	Personal	CPZ permit holder
7	White	Personal	Member of Safer Guildford Partnership Executive
11	Wicks	Personal	GBC Cllr - GBC is owner of Pirbright Common which the BOAT runs across
11	Phillips	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Reeves	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Laker	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Goodwin	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	White	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Di Caprio	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	May	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Searle	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
The Local Committee and Partnerships Officer read out advice received by SCC legal officers, after which the following interests were declared:			
11	Moseley	Prejudicial	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Lockyer-Nibbs	Personal	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Nevins	Personal	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
11	Rooth	Personal	GBC Cllr - GBC is landowner
12	Laker	Personal	Normandy Parish Councillor

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

26/08 PETITIONS [Item 4]

Four petitions were received and written responses provided (attached to these minutes).

- In relation to the petition about parking in Byrefield Road, Stoughton, Cllr Searle agreed that the authorities cannot sanction parking on pavements but asked that the issue be considered alongside other traffic issues in any future traffic study.
- Stacey Gannon (Guildford College Student) addressed the Committee in relation to the petition for a safe crossing on Holly Lane, explaining that the College needs to be safely accessed by young (16 year-old) and disabled students and many students who travel by bus. The Chairman said that the matter would be given consideration.

27/08 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

One question had been received, from Peta Malthouse (Normandy Parish Council), which was discussed briefly in the earlier informal question session. The written question and answer are attached to these minutes

28/08 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

One question had been received, from Cllr Di Caprio, which is attached with the written answer to these minutes. Cllr Di Caprio asked how this issue related to County Council policy and indicated that several stones had been replaced with tarmac. The Local Highways Manager explained that tarmac would only be used by SCC's (or utility companies') contractors as a temporary 'make-safe' measure.

29/08 SAFER GUILDFORD PARTNERSHIP COMMUNITY SAFETY STRATEGY [Item 7]

The Area Director spoke to this item and along with colleagues from partner agencies in attendance (Surrey Police Borough Inspector Julie Murray, Community Safety Sergeant Tina Griffiths, GBC Community Safety Officer John Stimpson and GBC Neighbourhood Manager John Badcock) responded to questions from Members.

Members commented on:

- The commitment of officers from partner agencies working together
- The need for services to prevent Domestic Abuse (especially the effects on children)
- Youth engagement sessions (The Surrey Police Borough Inspector for Guildford, Inspector Julie Murray explained how the sessions work and the outcomes in terms of reductions on incidents of anti-social behaviour.)
- A common-sense approach to Policing, as recently announced by the acting Chief Constable
- Joint (borough council licensing and Police) visits to licensed premises.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

The Committee

- (i) Noted the contents of the report and the activities of the Partnership in the years 2005-2008.
- (ii) Offered comments on the work of the Partnership and on priorities for the future.
- (iii) nominated SCC Cllr Fiona White as its member representative at Safer Guildford Partnership Executive meetings. (Cllr Goodwin nominating and Cllr Barker seconding.)
- (iv) Delegated SCC's financial contribution to community safety in Guildford (£24,000) to the Area Director (as SCC's officer representative on the Partnership).

Reason for decision:

In order that SCC is able to appropriately participate and influence partnership working to address Community Safety in Guildford borough.

**30/08 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE AND CAPITAL
ALLOCATIONS [Item 8]**

Cllr Goodwin argued that the FISH scheme should not be funded from SCC sources as it is a Guildford Borough Council scheme. The Area Director agreed to have further discussions with GBC officers.

Cllr Davis declared a personal interest (relating to paragraph 5(e) in the report) as his wife is the chair of Guildford Opera Company. Cllr White declared a personal interest (relating to paragraph 5(r)) as she is a GBC nominee to the Members Board of Guildford Action (correcting 'GAVS' to 'Guildford Action' in the report).

The Committee

- a. agreed to use the Local Committee Capital allocation of £100,000 as described in paragraph 3 for Highways purposes.
- b. agreed **that officers have further discussions with GBC concerning funding for the FISH project**, and that a theme of older and vulnerable people, and carers be applied to the Capital allocation (paragraph 4).
- c. approved the return of funding to the relevant member/committee for projects where funding is no longer required (paragraphs 4 & 7).
- d. noted the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2007/8 budget and from the 2008/09 budget since the Local Committee meeting held on 12 February 2008 (paragraph 5).
- e. approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 6 (and detailed in Appendix B) **and a further proposal for £3,000 for Guildford Institute (£1500 each from Cllrs Goodwin and Di Caprio.**

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

31/08 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 9]

The Committee agreed the Forward Programme 2008/9, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report, and made suggestions for other items:

- Review of effectiveness of the SCC Contact Centre
- Report on Minerals extraction affecting Guildford borough
- Review of Community Highways Officers and Community Gangs
- Park and Ride
- Usage of BOATs and the condition of amenities in the Guildford area

Reason for decision:

To enable officers to plan and publicise the meetings and prepare reports.

**32/08 TRANSPORTATION TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP & TERMS OF REFERENCE
[Item 10]**

The Committee agreed

- (i) that the current membership of the Transportation Task Group is confirmed.
- (ii) that the Terms of Reference for the Transportation Task Group as set out in ANNEXE A be approved.
- (iii) that the criteria for prioritisation of Minor Improvement Schemes as set out in ANNEXE B be approved.

Reason for decision:

To assist the Committee in reaching decisions on Highways and Transportation matters for Guildford borough.

**33/08 BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC (BOAT) No. 529, PIRBRIGHT- REQUEST FOR
TRAFFIC ORDER [Item 11]**

The following Members left the room:

Cllrs, White, Goodwin, Searle, Di Caprio, May, Phillips, Laker, Reeves, Moseley, Garrett. 9 Members remained in the room.

The Countryside Legal Team Manager advised the Committee that a TRO on this route does not meet County Council policy and that the site was due to be repaired during the summer.

Cllr Nevins thanked the officer, but proposed a different recommendation to the Committee on the grounds of safety and damage. Cllr Nevins argued that the permanent TRO would be consistent with SCC policy.

Cllr Davis agreed that there is a general problem with damage to a number of BOATs across Surrey, but asked that this item be deferred to the Autumn so that the issue of all BOATs could be considered. Cllr Lockyer-Nibbs felt all BOATs should have TROs applied. Cllr Wicks felt it was not cost-effective to spend money on repairing the route, only to leave it open to future misuse. Cllr Rooth cited examples of TROs being applied in Ash (BOATs 519, 520) and urged the Committee to take the same approach here.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

The Countryside Legal Team Manager responded to these points.

The Chairman moved the amendment (proposed by Cllr Nevins, seconded by Cllr Rooth) and the Committee agreed (6 out of 9 Members voting in favour):

That a permanent TRO be approved on BOAT No. 529, Pirbright following repairs to the surface. The closure would relate to motorised vehicles, including motorbikes and horse drawn carriages.

Reason for decision:

To make the BOAT more passable and safe for walkers, wheelchair users, cyclists and horse-riders, and to prevent damage to the surrounding land.

[10 Members returned to the room.]

**34/08 COBBETT HILL ROAD, NORMANDY – PROPOSED 7.5 TONNE HEAVY
GOODS VEHICLE WEIGHT BAN [Item 12]**

Tim Kaner, representing the petitioners, addressed the Committee arguing that that matters relating to the Wireless Station site were separate to the urgent need for an HGV ban to protect road users and residents including children. Signage and changes to satellite navigation systems would have the effect of deterring drivers from using the road.

The Committee agreed (with 12 Members in favour, 2 against, and 1 formally abstaining)

- (i) that the intention of the County Council to make the necessary Weight Restriction Order under Sections 1 and 2 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as set out in the report be advertised and, if no objections are received, the orders be made.
- (ii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections or representations, the Order be made.
- (iii) that the proposal be referred to the Transportation Task Group for consideration as to its timing.
- (vi) that the petitioners be informed accordingly

(Recommendations (iv) and (v) were not agreed.)

Reason for decision:

To restrict HGV movements along the road, for the amenity of local residents and road users.

**35/08 ON STREET PARKING REVIEW, EAST GUILDFORD & SMALL CHANGES TO
THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE [Item 13]**

John Twining (Chair of Downsedge Residents Association) asked that officers' solutions to the traffic problems at the Tangier Rd/Epsom Rd and Warren Rd/Tangier Rd junctions, should be trialed, with consideration given to extending the double yellow lines at these junctions if there was firm evidence that the officers' solutions were not improving road safety.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

Sam Parker (Downsedge Residents Association, Roads Representative) felt that views from residents in Upper Tangier Road had not been reflected in the officer's report. Residents understand the arguments concerning parking displacement but are likely to object to the scheme as described in the report.

GBC Parking Services Manager responded to the points made.

Cllr Di Caprio proposed (and Cllr Reeves seconded) an amendment to exclude the upper part of Tangier Road from the proposals, arguing that many residents in that area would object, which would slow the implementation of the scheme elsewhere. Officers advised that this would constitute a major change to the original proposal, and residents would have to be consulted afresh. Officers advised that amendments to the scheme could be considered, in the light of any objections received, in October 2008. Cllr Di Caprio withdrew her amendment.

The Committee agreed

- (i) that the proposal to extend the CPZ eastward be agreed with the amendments highlighted on the plan in ANNEXE 5 and described in paragraph 23 of the report.
- (ii) 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 proposal in the above recommendation and that if no objections are maintained the Order be made.
- (iii) that approval be given to formally advertise the changes proposed in ANNEXE 4, as outlined in paragraph 18 of the report.

Reason for decision:

To enable officers to progress the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone with the intention of improving safety, and controlling use of the kerb space so there is parking available for residents, visitors and long stay parkers.

36/08 WODELAND AVENUE SPEED ASSESSMENT [Item 14]

Robert Good (Chair of Wodeland Avenue Action Group) described the characteristics of Wodeland Avenue and the surrounding area that residents feel qualify it for a 20mph speed limit.

Cllr Goodwin cited SCC Speed Management Policy, and a motion to full council on 2 May 2006 concerning the implementation of 20mph zones across Surrey, to support the case for a 20mph limit across the area bounded by Farnham and Portsmouth Roads. He proposed an amendment **that a 20mph speed limit on Wodeland Avenue and side-streets off Wodeland Avenue, with terminal and repeater signs, be put into operation as soon as is practicably possible.**

Some Members felt unable to support a speed limit for the whole area as the report provided information only in relation to Wodeland Avenue. Cllr Moseley felt she could not prioritise a speed limit reduction here when other areas had worse accident records.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING
ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

The Local Highways Manager informed the Committee that he felt a 20 mph limit on Wodeland Avenue would be against County Council Policy and he would need to take advice before implementing it. He suggested that the Transportation Task Group be asked to consider how any costs would be funded; Cllr Goodwin agreed to using his allocation to help fund the signs.

Cllr Goodwin altered his amendment and the Committee agreed, **that a 20mph speed limit on Wodeland Avenue, with terminal and repeater signs, be put into operation as soon as is practicably possible.**

Reason for decision:

To improve safety on the road and in the area.

[Cllrs Carpenter and Garrett left the meeting.]

37/08 ALEXANDRA TERRACE [Item15]

The Committee agreed

- (i) that the proposed highway improvements to Alexandra Terrace including repositioned on-street parking and minor amendments to parking restrictions as shown on the plans attached as ANNEXE B of the report be approved.
- (ii) that the proposals be advertised as an intention to make an Order under appropriate sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections received, the Order be made.
- (iv) that any objections which cannot be resolved be reported back to the Committee.

Reason for decision:

To enable the development to proceed, with improved pedestrian facilities and interests of SCC and highway users protected.

[Meeting ended 10.15 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 Committee will be on WEDNESDAY 8 OCTOBER 2008 at 7pm.
The venue is Kings College, Southway, Guildford, GU2 8DN.



SUMMARY OF PETITIONS

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

18th JUNE 2008

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, WORPLESDON,
STOUGHTON

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

WORPLESDON
GUILDFORD NORTH

LEAD OFFICER

DEREK LAKE, LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER

TELEPHONE NUMBER

01483 517501

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petitions referred to in the report

DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 8 OCTOBER 2008

ITEM 4: PETITIONS

Principal petitioner/organisation	Date received	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Cllr. Mike Nevins on behalf of 359 residents of local roads (Chapel Lane, Malthouse Lane, Heath Mill Lane, Rowe Lane), Pirbright area and from other parts of the Borough (Worplesdon, Normandy and Guildford town).	23.04.08	WORPLESDON / Pirbright	The petition calls for the BOAT between Malthouse Lane and Chapel Lane, Pirbright to be closed to vehicular traffic by means of a TRO until the surface is repaired, and then a permanent TRO to exclude vehicles from byway 529 that runs through 'protected heath land' and SSSI. (Cllr. Nevins' covering letter includes a request that if permanent closure is not possible, then a seasonal closure be implemented (Oct to March)	18.06.08	<p>A report on this matter is included on the agenda for this meeting. (Item 11). However the Committee has been advised by SCC Solicitors to remit the item to SCC Planning and Regulatory as GBC Members (17 out of the 20 Members of the Committee) would have a prejudicial interest (due to GBC being the landowner). If Members accept this advice, the Committee could be inquorate (a minimum of 5 Members is required) for that item.</p> <p>The Planning and Regulatory Committee's next three meetings are on 9 July 2008, 17 September 2008 and 15 October 2008.</p>
Cllr. Mike Nevins on behalf of 693 residents of Fairland Estate, Gravetts Lane area and beyond	23.04.08	WORPLESDON / Worplesdon	The petition calls for a pedestrian crossing near Hunts Farm and a reduction in speed limit to 30 mph.	18.06.08	This matter was considered by the meeting of this Committee on 23 April 2008. It was agreed that further investigation be carried out into this proposal.

DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 8 OCTOBER 2008

ITEM 4: PETITIONS

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Date received	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Cllr. Pauline Searle on behalf of 46 residents of Byrefield Road, Stoughton, coordinated by Annelies Scott.	23.04.08	GUILDFORD NORTH / Stoughton	The petition asks people to 'agree that the old 'common sense' parking system served the residents much better and was safer than the new system of parking entirely on the road'. Many petition slips have comments attached.	23.04.08	Parking (even partially) on the footway causes damage to the footway and potentially to utilities' services underneath. It obstructs pedestrian movement, particularly elderly and disabled pedestrians and those with children in prams and buggies. For all of these reasons it is against County policy. In addition footway parking is classed as obstruction and therefore Surrey Police, reacting to complaints from local people, take action against offenders from time to time. If the proposal were to go ahead, the effect of a wider road space would be likely to increase vehicle speeds. Finally, by law footway parking can only be permitted in Greater London. Officers therefore recommend that no formal arrangements be agreed to permit footway parking in Byrefield Road.
Lesley Clayton on behalf of 1746 signatories from the Merrist Wood College Student Union and residents of local roads (Fairlands Estate, Rydes Hill Road) and from other parts of the Borough (e.g. Worplesdon and Guildford town).	2.06.08	WORPLESDON / Pirbright	"We the undersigned request a safe crossing to be installed at the Merrist Wood end of Holly Lane. It is currently a danger to both pedestrians and motorists and without a safe area to cross, we continue to face the alarming reality of a fatality occurring! This is wholly unacceptable!"	18.06.08	This matter has been considered on several previous occasions. The usage of such a crossing would be low, since most people travel to the college by car. The main users of a crossing would be those travelling to the college by bus; their numbers are not thought to be large. The crossing requested would be at the junction of Holly Lane with Farm Close, Combe Lane (the Merrist Wood access) and the access to Fairlands Farm; this would not be a safe location, at a point where drivers are distracted by other vehicle movements. The most suitable and safe location would be some 50 metres away, but this would not attract high usage. In the past 3 years there have been 2 personal injury collisions; both were concerned with vehicle movements at the junction, and neither involved a pedestrian. If this analysis is extended to the last 10 years, there are a total of 4 collisions, one of which involved a pedestrian. Officers cannot therefore recommend this scheme. It is understood that the college may have some funds to contribute to more modest measures, and officers would be happy to discuss possible measures with college representatives.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

PETA MALTHOUSE, CHAIRMAN NORMANDY PARISH COUNCIL (NPC)

Q1 In respect of Normandy Village Safety Scheme works:

1. Have the budgeted works been completed and if not when is it expected they will be completed?
2. If there are remaining works then please identify them and advise the location of and extent of works?
3. In the light of the fact that we understand it is SCC policy to use signs which have a yellow background can you explain why the new 30 mph speed limit signs recently erected in Normandy are:
 - (a) not 'yellow backed'
 - (b) placed in positions hidden by shrubs and trees
 - (c) inadequate so far as enforcement is concerned.

NB: Where not placed, the inadequacy of the street lighting is such as to make enforcement impossible (Glaziers Lane and Flexford Road).

4. Finally we note that a substantial sum was set aside by the County for signage which works we are told are complete. Can you please advise how that budget has been expended.
5. What is the process that needs to be started to put the balance of the scheme works for which a budget could not be obtained forward to be included in a future budget i.e. a Phase 2?
6. We have indicated that we would wish to increase the signage by way of village gateways /other options and that we would set aside a budget. That has been done. We are at a loss to know how to engage in a discussion with the County Council in order to get advice and ensure the works are done by the end of the financial year. How do we go about that?

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- A**
1. The Village Safety Scheme is complete. Following completion of all projects an independent Safety Audit was carried out to review the scheme. We are considering whether further items need attending to, but these are all very minor (e.g. vegetation clearance).
 2. There are no remaining works.
 3. (a) It is not SCC policy to use yellow backed signs. These are intended for use only in situations where conspicuity is a proven problem. If all signs were to have yellow backing boards as the norm their advantage would be lost.

(b) Signs are not deliberately placed in positions where they are obscured, but in rural areas it is difficult to find positions for signs which will never be obscured by vegetation. In many cases the vegetation is in private ownership and is the responsibility of frontagers. Limits on revenue maintenance budgets are such that clearance of highway vegetation is not always affordable.

(c) Surrey Police are consulted on all SCC highways projects. If they considered a scheme to be unenforceable, officers would not recommend it to this Committee.

‘Repeater’ 30 mph speed limit signs are not permitted where there is a system of street lighting. This is the case in Glaziers Lane and Flexford Road. Elsewhere in the village (where there is no street lighting), repeater signs have been installed.
 4. The original estimated cost of the entire scheme was £143,000. Orders have been issued to a total value of £160,000. Staff costs are in addition to this.
 5. If NPC wished to promote what is effectively a new scheme, they should write to us setting out what they wish to see done. Officers will assess this against Local Transport Plan criteria and advise accordingly. If the proposal has merit it would be referred to the Transportation Task Group. NPC should be aware, however, that there is very much less money available for such measures than in previous years.
 6. NPC should write or email, setting out the locations they would like to see these facilities installed, what sort of design they favour, and any other aspects they wish to draw to our attention. We will advise as to the likely cost, and whether the proposals are feasible (e.g. is there sufficient verge width to accommodate the gateways).

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 8 OCTOBER 2008**

ITEM 6: MEMBER QUESTIONS

CLLR. SARAH DI CAPRIO

Q1 Guildford Borough Council Executive recently (22nd May 2008) approved a Town Centre Usage Guide which states that "any fees that might currently be raised from filming on the High Street for commercial films and television productions would currently go straight to the Highways Authority which owns the land." In light of this comment, can officers confirm:

1. the amount of revenue raised in the last five years by commercial filming and television productions in the High Street
2. whether any money arising out of such films and TV productions has been earmarked for restorative work on the High Street setts
3. whether any future film/TV money can be earmarked for such restorative work on the High Street setts and if not, when we can expect to see the High Street setts receive any restorative work.

- A**
1. Surrey County Council (SCC) has no authority to make charges for this activity. As is usually the case under highway legislation, we can only charge what it costs us (which in this case would be the administrative costs only).
 2. In view of the above, there are no such monies available to fund work on the setts.
 3. No monies will be available from TV/filming work, barring a change in legislation.

However this is the SCC position. The recently-approved Town Centre Usage Guide is a Guildford Borough Council (GBC) document. A number of GBC officers have been consulted regarding this question and a range of comments have been received, as follows:

- No money has ever been charged for filming on the highway in Guildford and yet quite a lot of officer time is taken up arranging these filmings, usually by the communications service. Sometimes the Police are involved too.
- Currently there is no mechanism in place to charge for filming or any "pot" earmarked for the High Street repairs
- There are diverse arrangements in other areas of GBC's responsibility. Individual departments (parks and countryside and the parking office) have charged fees associated with filming but this has been more for land use and vehicle parking rather than the filming itself.
- The decision to charge is not always straightforward. Filming has considerable power to raise the profile of a town, e.g. the 'Trinny and Susannah' show last year really spotlighted Guildford as a great place to shop. We do not want to drive such opportunities away.
- GBC has plans to develop a filming policy for Guildford, but this is primarily in relation to use of the Borough's own land, facilitation and so on.

In summary, it is unlikely that SCC income for filming on the highway will ever be sufficient to meet or contribute significantly to the considerable costs of maintenance. Any income is more likely to accrue to the Borough Council. In view of GBC's responsibility for conservation areas and the like, SCC would welcome a joint approach to design and maintenance of the High Street with a view to improving its condition, conserving its historic infrastructure, providing a safe and convenient environment for users (especially elderly and disabled pedestrians) in a manner which is sustainable and affordable.