



# **SURREY**

COUNTY COUNCIL

## **Minutes of meeting**

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

**Date:** WEDNESDAY 8 OCTOBER 2008

**Time:** 7.00 pm

**Place:** Kings College for Arts & Technology, Southway,  
Guildford GU2 8DU

### **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 Edward Owen (Guildford East)  
Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)  
Ms Fiona White (Guildford West) (Vice Chairman)

#### **Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)**

Mr David Carpenter (Morrow)  
Ms Wendy May (Stoughton)  
Ms Mary Laker (Worplesdon)  
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)  
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)  
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)  
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)  
Mr Matt Furniss (Christchurch)\*

\* substitute

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING  
ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

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

- Grange Road roadworks, effect on local business (Mark West)
- Speeding traffic in Onslow (GBC Cllr Chris Ward, Chris Smaller, Hugh Rawson, Lyn Jennings, Mrs Berry, Jacqueline Brown)
- Need for a crossing on Epsom Road, Merrow (Lawrence Brown)
- Speeding in Palm Grove (Dennis Crowth)
- A county-wide survey of Byways Open to All Traffic; Rights Of Way statement for Surrey (Peter Hattersley)

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

**IN PUBLIC**

**38/08 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Moseley, Rooth, Nevins, Garrett, Manning and Patrick (substituted by Cllr Furniss).

**39/08 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (18 JUNE 2008) [Item 2]**

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

**40/08 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were made

**41/08 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

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

Cllr Phillips described recent accidents in Queen Eleanors Road and called for urgent resurfacing of the road and feasibility into a number of traffic calming measures.

Cllr Searle called for measures to calm traffic in Palm Grove and Oak Tree Drive.

Cllr Carpenter put the case for a new safe crossing of the Epsom Road in Merrow.

Members agreed that all three matters be referred to the Committee's Transportation Task Group (meeting next in November 2008).

**42/08 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

One question had been received from Maurice Barham on behalf of the Guildford Society Transport Group; a written response was provided (copy attached to these minutes).

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING  
ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

**43/08 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

One question had been received, from Cllr Di Caprio. Guildford Borough Council's Parking Manager explained that the decision on making the new order (to be taken by SCC's Executive on 4 November 2008) is separate from the decision on refunding parking charges or fines.

**44/08 FOOTPATH No. 582 - PROPOSAL TO RESCIND DIVERSION ORDER 1993 [Item 7]**

The Committee agreed that the Surrey County Council Footpath No. 582 (Guildford) Diversion Order 1993 be rescinded

Reason for decision:

The Order is no longer needed and can be rescinded

**45/08 PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE TO THE EAST [Item 8]**

John Twining (Downsedge Residents Association) addressed the Committee; he felt that there could be a reduction in the number of bays in the area. He advised that Residents would assist officers in monitoring the parking situation in the future.

Sam Parker (Tangier Road representative) addressed the Committee, proposing that a scheme be introduced in lower Tangier Road, and then extended in a second phase if appropriate to upper Tangier Road.

Cllr Di Caprio supported Mr Parker's suggestion and formally proposed (with Cllr Reeves seconding) that the whole issue of consultation and implementation of the CPZ be discussed at the Task Group. Officers responded that implementing the scheme in 2 phases would constitute a significant change to the advertised proposals, which if not readvertised, would leave the authorities open to criticism and challenge. Variations of controls within a zone would require extra signage, potentially leading to confusion and challenges from drivers. Cllr Furniss supported the scheme as proposed.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the objections received to the proposed extension to the Controlled Parking Zone as set out in the plan attached to the report as ANNEXE 3 be not supported.
- (ii) that the proposed restrictions be confirmed and that the Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised.
- (iii) That the issue of the Controlled Parking Zones in Guildford borough (the principle and process) be discussed at the Transportation Task Group**

Reason for decision:

To give effect to an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone to control parking in

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING  
ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

St Omer Road, Tangier Road and Warren Road. To enhance CPZ consultation and implementation in other areas of Guildford in the future.

**46/08 A246 YORK ROAD JUNCTION WITH LONDON ROAD, GUILDFORD  
PROPOSED JUNCTION IMPROVEMENT [Item 9]**

Cllr Di Caprio regretted the loss of the trees but supported the proposal.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the comments received be noted.
- (ii) that the proposed highway improvement shown on the plan attached to the report as ANNEXE A be approved for implementation, as set out in Option 1, paragraph 15.

Reason for decision:

To address a serious accident problem, and thereby contribute to the County Council's and government's accident reduction targets.

[Cllr Di Caprio left the meeting.]

**47/08 CONSULTATION ON IMPROVEMENTS TO LEARNING DISABILITY DAY  
SERVICES [Item 10]**

Officers described the key issues and the processes of the consultation. It is proposed that services be run in a different way, that has been developing already over a number of years i.e. that service users access a range of services in the community and if they have a higher level of needs, one of the 4 Centres of Excellence. While it is not proposed that Surrey County Council continue to operate a day centre at Lockwood, officers are actively working with partners to determine whether Lockwood might be retained as a community resource in the future. Person-centred planning would follow the consultation process so that individual needs can be met.

Cllr Searle, Owen and Barker reported on their visit to Lockwood during the previous week to speak to service users. Cllr Searle conveyed the anxiety of some service users about the changes to the structure of services and the means of accessing them (i.e. transport arrangements) that they are used to. Cllr Owen was concerned that social networks of groups at Lockwood might be broken up by the changes.

Cllr White asked how the proposals would meet the needs of people who have medium-level needs i.e. people who will not need to access the Centres of Excellence, but who may not be independent or active enough to access community services. She suggested that serious consideration be given to Lockwood Day Centre remaining open and available for day services for people with learning disabilities. Cllr Davis felt there needs to be a more stimulating environment to help with the longterm care needs of people with learning disabilities.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING  
ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

[Cllr Wicks left the meeting.]

The Committee agreed that comments be passed to the service for inclusion in the consultation.

Reason for decision:

To contribute the views of the Committee members as part of the formal consultation process.

**48/08 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT [Item 11]**

Officers from the Service presented the report emphasising the work in preventing both fires and road traffic accidents. Members (including those who have attended the 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive' show) made various comments and expressed their admiration for the work of the service. The Area Director undertook to seek further financial contributions to the projects in Annexes A and B, from Members.

The Local Committee

- 1 Recognised the achievements of the Borough Teams at Guildford and Gomshall.
- 2 Supported the achievement of the Retained duty personnel at Gomshall Fire Station and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed
- 3 Decided not to contribute more than amounts previously pledged (totalling £2400) for projects in Annexes A and B in the report.

Reason for decision:

To support the service in their work to prevent, and minimise the effects of, fires and road accidents in the borough.

**49/08 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE & CAPITAL ALLOCATIONS  
[Item 12]**

The Committee

- a. noted the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2008/09 budget since the Local Committee meeting held on 18 June 2008 (paragraph 5 of the report).
- b. approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 6 (and detailed in Appendix A).

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

[Cllrs Furniss and Lockyer-Nibbs left the meeting.]

**50/08 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 13]**

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING  
ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

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

A report on educational attainment of Children in Care in Guildford borough  
A report on Surrey County Council's policy with regard to Byways Open to All Traffic.

Reason for decision:

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

**[Meeting ended approximately 9.30 p.m.]**

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

**Contact:**

Dave Johnson  
(Area Director)

01483 517301  
[dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk)

Diccon Bright  
(Local Committee & Partnership Officer)

01483 517336  
[diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:diccon.bright@surreycc.gov.uk)

The next meeting of the Committee will be on WEDNESDAY 10 DECEMBER 2008 at 7pm. The venue is East Horsley Village Hall, Kingston Avenue, East Horsley KT24 6QT.



**SUMMARY OF PETITIONS  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**8<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 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)**

MERROW  
STOKE  
ONSLOW

**COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)**

GUILDFORD (EAST)  
GUILDFORD (NORTH)  
GUILDFORD (SOUTH WEST)

---

<b>LEAD OFFICER</b>	DEREK LAKE, LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER
<b>TELEPHONE NUMBER</b>	01483 517501
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	Petitions referred to in the report

---

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

**ITEM 4 PETITIONS**

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
<p>GBC Cllr. David Carpenter on behalf of 185 signatories, including:                      Levylsdene - 42                      Merrow Chase - 41                      Longmead - 30                      Merrow Court - 19</p>	<p>GUILDFORD EAST                       Merrow</p>	<p>We the undersigned request a safe crossing to be installed on the Epsom Road at the Levylsdene bus stop to the Merrow Village Hall. On the one side of the road there is the Girl Guide hut, Merrow Village Hall and Redwood Care Home, on the other the bus stop and the footpath to Merrow Downs. When there is a function at Merrow Village Hall, cars are parked in Levylsdene and the occupants have to cross the fast and busy road at this point because of restricted car parking at the Village Hall.</p>	<p>8.10.08</p>	<p>In the period since January 2004 there have been 2 personal injury collisions in this vicinity. One involved two vehicles, and the other (November 2004) involved a pedestrian.</p> <p>It would be difficult to site a pedestrian crossing safely at or near this location, due to the proximity of several side roads and private accesses. The island in the mouth of Levylsdene is also the location of a bus stop, which would need relocated. Epsom Road is not wide enough to accommodate a pedestrian island without widening the road.</p> <p>There are already several pedestrian crossing locations along this section of Epsom Road. In the immediate vicinity of Levylsdene there is the traffic signal junction at Bushey Hill Drive (220 metres to the east) which incorporates signal controlled pedestrian facilities and a pelican crossing by the junction with High Path Road (360 metres to the west).</p>



**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

**ITEM 4 PETITIONS**

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
<p>Mr D. Crawl on behalf of 61 signatories including: Palm Grove - 46 Oak Tree Drive - 10</p>	<p>GUILDFORD NORTH  Stoke</p>	<p>Petition to support the requirement for traffic calming</p>	<p>8.10.08</p>	<p>The existing Bellfields traffic calming was introduced by SCC around 2001 following extensive consultation. The objective of the scheme was to secure a reduction in personal injury accidents. This was highly successful - in the 3 years prior to the scheme, there were 76 pias; in the first year after the scheme there was only one. The accident level has remained low.</p> <p>The roads omitted from the scheme are not obvious rat runs which would attract through traffic off main roads seeking to avoid congestion. They were omitted from the scheme because of a lack of public support, because their alignment, width and the presence of parked cars make it difficult to speed, or because their accident record was low.</p> <p>It is suggested that traffic from Willow / Yew / Hazel / Lilac Way etc uses this route in order to avoid the traffic calming. This is not necessarily so - they may just be following the shortest route between their homes and their destinations.</p> <p>Officers would advise against traffic calming measures as, while these are often requested, they frequently prove unpopular when they are installed. They could not be justified on collision reduction grounds since in the period since January 2004 there have been no personal injury collisions.</p> <p>A cheaper alternative put forward by one resident is to close the road (either Oak Tree Drive or Palm Grove) to traffic. This would divert significant levels of traffic through the traffic calmed area, which is where the accident problem used to exist.</p>

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008**

**ITEM 4 PETITIONS**

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
<p>GBC Cllr. Tony Phillips on behalf of 193 signatories, including: Queen Eleanors Road - 60 Wilderness Road - 27</p>	<p>GUILDFORD SOUTHWEST  Onslow</p>	<p>In view of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The spate of accidents during the past 2 years in Queen Eleanors Road when drivers of vehicles have lost control and demolished walls</li> <li>• The potential danger of these events to cause harm to other road users, pedestrians and residents by the cars mounting the pavement</li> <li>• There being 2 schools in close proximity with parents and children using the road predominantly as pedestrians</li> </ul> <p>We call on County Highways to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring forward the resurfacing of the road as an urgent priority</li> <li>• Carry out a feasibility study into possible traffic calming solutions including looking at a 20 mph zone and associated measures to help slow the traffic.</li> </ul>	<p align="center">8.10.08</p>	<p>Surrey Police have provided a 'speed visor' sign which measures traffic speeds and warns drivers whose speeds are excessive. Depending on the results, further enforcement will be considered.</p> <p>The road surface has been checked, and is not considered to be in such poor condition that resurfacing can be justified in the near future, in comparison with other roads across the County.</p> <p>Officers have put the road forward to be considered for surface dressing during the next financial year. This would seal cracks and other defects, reducing further deterioration, and would improve the road's skid resistance.</p> <p>The road is used as a 'rat run' due to its direct connection to the A3. It is unlikely to meet the criteria for a 20 mph zone or limit, and the former would therefore require traffic calming. Officers would advise against traffic calming measures as, while these are often requested, they frequently prove unpopular when they are installed. They could not be justified on collision reduction grounds since, notwithstanding the recent accidents (which have not yet reached the SCC database) there have been no personal injury collisions in this road over the past 5 years.</p> <p>One option would be to close the connecting link to the A3, thereby eliminating that element of the traffic which is 'rat running'. Traffic levels (and hopefully speeds) would be reduced, as the only people using the road would be residents, their visitors and those attending the schools. This option may also contribute to safety on the A3. The views of the Highways Agency and Surrey Police would need to be sought, and consultation with those affected would be essential.</p>

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS  
MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008  
ITEM 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

<b>MAURICE BARHAM on behalf of the GUILDFORD SOCIETY TRANSPORT GROUP</b>
--

**Q1** Following Iain Reeve's presentation to the Guildford Environment & Housing Scrutiny Committee on 2 September entitled "Transport for Surrey", is it envisaged that this Local Committee will have a role to play in the development of projects proposed for Transport for Guildford?

**A** Yes. The precise details of the Transport for Guildford partnership are yet to be established, but the County Council would strongly suggest that the Local Committee should be closely involved in the management of the partnership and the development of projects.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS  
MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008  
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**CLLR. SARAH DI CAPRIO**

**Q1** [Questions in bold text; answers in normal text]

**A** In light of the "legal blunder" as the Surrey Advertiser calls it regarding on-street parking fines in Guildford, could officers:

**(a) confirm the full list of on-street parking locations in Guildford affected by this**

A full list of streets where there are parking places affected is given below. It is only the 495 (approx.) Pay and Display bays that are affected. There are some 4,000 on-street parking places in the Guildford Controlled Parking Zone which are not affected. These are variety of unrestricted, permit only dual use and disabled spaces. In addition there are some 5,000 off-street car parking spaces which again are not affected.

Roads where maximum stay in parking place is 30 minutes:

Castle Street	North Square	Ward Street
Chertsey Street	Quarry Street	Woodbridge Road
High Street	Tunsgate	

Roads where maximum stay in parking place is 2 hours:

Alexandra Terrace	Haydon Place	Millmead
Bedford Road	Hunter Road	Pewley Hill
College Road	Jenner Road	Pewley Way
Dene Road	Laundry Road	Sandfield Terrace
Denmark Road	Leapale Lane	South Hill
Eastgate Gardens	London Road	Sydenham Road
Epsom Road	Martyr Road	The Bars
Harvey Road	Mary Road	York Road

Roads where maximum stay in parking place is 3 hours

Castle Hill	Harvey Road	Pewley Hill
-------------	-------------	-------------

**(b) detail how it was discovered**

The issue was highlighted in a review of the Guildford Traffic Regulation Orders and legal advice was then taken on the effect of the omission.

**(c) confirm exactly what attempts have been made to inform the public about the situation**

There has been widespread coverage in the media, radio and television and articles in the Surrey Advertiser. There are details and information on the Guildford and Surrey websites. New instructions have been posted on all pay and display machines explaining the position.

**DRAFT MINUTES FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS  
MEETING ON 10 DECEMBER 2008  
ITEM 6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**(d) confirm what steps residents should take if they feel they have unjustly paid fines**

Anyone with proof of paying a fine in relation to on-street pay and display parking in Guildford who wishes to request a refund should write to Guildford Borough Council with this evidence and their request will be considered. The appropriate address is:

Parking Services  
Bedford Road multi-storey car park  
Level 2  
Laundry Road  
Guildford  
Surrey  
GU1 4PX

**(e) estimate how many people are likely to be affected by this**

There were approximately 17,000 fines paid in Pay and Display bays.

**(f) what the timescale is to remedy the situation.**

An amendment order has been advertised and this invites any objections or representations to be made to the parking office by 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008.

If no objections are received the order can be made. A made order will need to be advertised and if there are no objections 31<sup>st</sup> October is the earliest this could be done. The machines could then be restored on the 1<sup>st</sup> November.

If objections are received these will need to be considered by an appropriate Committee and SCC's Executive on 4<sup>th</sup> November has been targeted. If the Executive decides to overrule any objections then the made order could be advertised on 7<sup>th</sup> November and come into effect on the 8<sup>th</sup> November.

The publicity has stressed to motorists that the situation is temporary and that they should check the machines each time they park. However when charges are re-introduced measures will be taken to ensure motorists are not taken by surprise.