



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

Date: WEDNESDAY 11 MARCH 2009

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: Ash Manor School, Manor Road, Ash, GU12 6QH

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 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 John Garrett (Lovelace)
Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)
Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)
Ms Wendy May (Stoughton)
Mr Tony Phillips (Onslow)
Ms Caroline Reeves (Friary & St Nicolas)
Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)
Mr Matt Furniss (Christchurch)*
Mr Roy Hogben (Tillingbourne)*

* substitute

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

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

- Implementation of a pedestrian crossing on the Aldershot Road A323 (Sandra Morgan - Worplesdon Parish Council)
- Congestion on the B3000 between the A3 and A31 (Frank Morris - Puttenham Parish Council)
- Congestion on the A323 due to the railway crossing / Broken pavement at Lime Crescent (Richard Tolley)
- Request for footpath on Foreman Road (Ash Green Residents Association)
- Request for greater priority for pedestrians, including zebra crossings, in Guildford town centre (Bob Bromham - Holy Trinity Amenity Group)
- Request (including a petition to be formally received at the next meeting of the Committee) for traffic calming on Down Lane, Compton (John Prior).

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

IN PUBLIC

01/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Nevins, David Carpenter (substituted by Roy Hogben) and Terence Patrick (Substituted by Matt Furniss). The Chairman and Committee wished Mike Nevins well. [Mary Laker was absent due to illness.]

02/09 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (10 DECEMBER 2009) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

03/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

- Roy Hogben declared a personal interest in Item 11 as he is a member of Albury Parish Council.
- David Davis declared an interest in Item 19 as he is a Trustee of the Lifetrain Trust and the GASP Motor Project.

04/09 PETITIONS [Item 4]

A petition had been submitted calling for a feasibility study into traffic calming measures on Curling Vale to be carried out. The wording of the petition and the officer's response is attached to these minutes. Sean Beight (Resident of Curling Vale) addressed the Committee, citing a number of accidents in Curling Vale, the features of the road that give rise to greater risk of accidents, and the priority given to the issue at a recent Police Panel meeting. Cllr Tony Phillips supported the petition's request for a 20 mph speed limit (as in Wodeland Avenue). He recommended, and the Committee agreed, that the issue be considered by the Committee's Transportation Task Group.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

05/09 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Six questions had been received which are appended, with the written answer to these minutes.

In relation to question 2, John Glanfield compared the costs to Surrey and West Sussex County Councils of tarring and chipping a mile of carriageway.

In relation to question 3, Bob Bromham said that tarmac repairs in the town centre are making Guildford appear second rate compared to other towns.

In relation to question 4, Bob Bromham said that there is a widespread desire to extend the pedestrian hours in the town centre in line with other market towns.

In relation to question 5, Tieleke Williams urged that the Spectrum car park should be for Spectrum users.

In relation to question 6, Patrick Robson (on behalf of Keith Meldrum) expressed concern that the development would lead to increased traffic congestion and that comparisons of traffic flows at this site are inaccurate.

06/09 WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Two questions had been received which are appended, with the written answer to these minutes.

In relation to question 1, Pauline Searle urged that permanent road repairs on Moorfield road be prioritised.

In relation to question 2, Sarah Di Caprio asked that the issue of heavy commercial and military traffic on the A281 be considered by any future Transport for Guildford group.

**07/09 GRANGE ROAD, STOUGHTON OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION
[Item 7]**

Pauline Searle thanked the officer and residents who contributed to the consultation, and gave her reasons for favouring Option 1. She added that the waiting restrictions must be enforced properly, that Option 2 should still be considered if Option 1 was not effective, and that there should be a review after a year. Pauline Searle proposed, Wendy May seconded and the Committee agreed:

1. to proceed with Option 1, i.e. to implement waiting restrictions in Grange Road to prevent parking and thereby allow two-way traffic without the need to mount the footpath during the times of day when the problem occurs.
2. that officers develop a detailed plan for the extent and duration of these waiting restrictions and report this to a further meeting of this Committee, prior to consulting with local residents.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

3. that following implementation, the situation be kept under review to determine whether further action is necessary.

Reason for decision:

To provide room for two-way traffic, thereby avoiding the need for vehicles to drive on the footway. Option 1 puts forward the cheapest solution, the solution which is supported by the majority of respondents, and the solution which prejudices the interests of the smallest number of respondents.

**08/09 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE REVIEW PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES
[Item 8]**

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the objections detailed in ANNEXE 1 are not supported, that Pewley Way be moved from catchment area H to catchment area C and that additional parking in Pewley Way be introduced as detailed in the Plan in ANNEXE 3 but with the small variation in length described in paragraph 12.
- (ii) that the objections detailed in ANNEXE 2 are not supported and that the boundary of catchment area F be changed so that it includes the whole of Wodeland Avenue.
- (iii) that the amendment order is made to give effect to these changes.

Sarah Di Caprio further proposed, Fiona White seconded and the Committee further agreed :

- (iv) **that monitoring of the situation in Pewley Way is needed and overspill parking arrangements may need to be looked at.**

Reason for decision:

To ease the parking pressure in some roads on the boundary of catchment areas and help deter unsafe or inconsiderate parking.

**09/09 PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING
ZONE AND AD HOC CHANGES [Item 9]**

Sarah Di Caprio proposed an amendment to recommendation (iv) (in bold below), David Goodwin seconded and the Committee agreed :

- (i) that change 7, Bury Street and change 41, Yvonne Arnaud Access road described in ANNEXE 1 not be progressed,
- (ii) that the objections summarised in ANNEXE 2 to the changes detailed in ANNEXE 1 be not supported,
- (iii) that the changes described in ANNEXE 1 be confirmed, with the exception of those referred to in (i) above and that an amendment order be made to give them effect with the minor amendment to change 21 so that the restriction only extends to the northern edge of the pedestrian island
- (iv) that the objections received to the proposed extension and summarised in ANNEXE 3 to the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone shown on the plan in ANNEXE 4 be not supported, **but the situation be monitored closely and issues brought back before the committee if necessary.**
- (v) that the proposed restrictions shown on the plan in ANNEXE 4 be confirmed and that an amendment order be made to give them effect.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

Reason for decision:

To address the problems in St Omer Road and ensure that the displaced parking will be ordered, that there will be a balance of parking and that parking round junctions will be prohibited.

To allow access to properties, facilitate the introduction of disabled bays in residential areas, promote better use of space and correct anomalies between markings on the road and those in the Traffic Order.

10/09 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE REVIEW: CONSULTATION ON SUNDAY RESTRICTIONS [Item 10]

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the findings of the consultation on Sunday controls be noted.
- (ii) that the intention to make an amendment order to introduce the changes to restrictions shown in ANNEXE 4 and to advertise the intended change under the relevant section of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be approved.
- (iii) that if there are no unresolved objections to the proposal that it should be implemented and that if there are unresolved objections they will be referred to the Committee for determination at a future meeting.

Sarah Di Caprio asked, and officers agreed, that officers continue to informally discuss with stakeholders the reasons for their concerns.

Reason for decision:

To allow greater traffic flow on Sundays and on busy evenings. To help resolve the traffic flow issues in South Hill and Castle Street. To deter drivers from parking vehicles across or near driveways in South Hill.

11/09 ALLEGED PUBLIC RIGHTS OVER LAY-BY FRONTING THE OLD MILL, ALBURY [Item 11]

David Davis urged Members to support the view that the lay-by is part of the highway, and asked that the developer be advised of the Committee's decision. He argued that where the bus stop should be located was a separate matter. Roy Hogben also supported the recommendations.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that public highway rights have been established over the lay-by adjoining the carriageway of The Street along the frontage of The Old Mill, as shown hatched on the plan attached as ANNEXE 1.
- (ii) that in view of recommendation (i) officers be authorised to approach the developer with a view to securing the removal of the obstruction and the reinstatement of the lay-by.
- (iii) that in the event that this approach is unsuccessful, that officers be authorised to seek Counsel's advice on the matter, and to act on that advice.

Reason for decision:

Because there is substantial evidence that lay-by adjacent to the carriageway was used by the public for a period of 20 years or more prior to the construction of the wall.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

12/09 GUILDFORD PARK AND RIDE FARES REVIEW [Item 12]

Tony Rooth suggested and David Goodwin seconded the proposal that the Adult monthly charge at Spectrum should be £24.00. The Local Highway Manager asked for (and the Committee agreed) a degree of flexibility in case there was some operational reason why the charge could not be increased.

The Committee agreed that:

- (i) the revised fares and pricing strategy as set out in the report should take effect from 30 March 2009, **with an amendment that the Adult monthly charge at Spectrum should be £24.00 unless there are any overriding operational reasons which would make this change impracticable.**

Reason for decision:

To assist with reducing pressure on parking spaces at Spectrum. To increase farebox revenue thus reducing pressure on the CPZ account for the operational funding of the Guildford Park & Ride services.

13/09 MINOR IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME REVIEW [Item 13]

Members made various comments and asked questions about individual schemes; the Local Highways Manager responded to the questions and comments.

The Local Highways Manager clarified that Annexe A showed schemes where work had started on feasibility or construction; Annexe B showed schemes approved by the Committee where no work had started; and Annexe C showed schemes recommended to be added to the list, but with no commitment at this stage to fund the scheme or start work. He said that were the Committee to agree the recommendations, and with the expected level of annual funding, the list of agreed schemes would take 10 years to complete.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that the progress made in delivering the minor improvements programme since last year be noted, including the completed projects set out in ANNEXE A.
- (ii) that the list of schemes remaining in the forward programme as set out in ANNEXE B be noted.
- (iii) that the recommendations of the Transportation Task Group regarding new schemes put forward since last year be approved as set out in ANNEXE C, supported by the detail in ANNEXE D.
- (iv) 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 2009/10 budgets are known.

Reason for decision:

To prioritise a forward programme of minor improvements schemes.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

14/09 SPEED LIMIT PRIORITISATION [Item 14]

Tony Rooth asked (and the Committee agreed) that the Task Group reconsider lowering the speed limits in The Avenue and Priorsfield, Compton to 40mph. The Local Highways Manager stated that roads are not assessed for a particular speed limit but to determine the appropriate speed limit for the road; therefore the officer recommendation to the Task Group would be the same.

David Goodwin expressed disappointment that three speed limits in Annexe A had not been implemented. Sarah Di Caprio and David Goodwin claimed that the SCC Speed Management policy had been amended by a resolution of the County Council on 2nd May 2006. David Goodwin added that in any case, he felt Wodeland Avenue met the (previous) policy for a 20 mph limit. Other Members asked for 20 mph limits or zones to be applied in various locations (as in other areas such as Kingston) or Guildford town-wide (as in Portsmouth).

Fiona White proposed (and Tony Phillips seconded) that the Committee confirm its intention to have the three limits implemented and let SCC's Executive call in the decision if it wished. David Goodwin said that the Committee had made its decision on the three speed limits already and the decisions were not called in at the time.

Officers responded that the Committee could not compel officers to act against SCC policy, which they felt had not been changed by the Council resolution referred to on 2nd May 2006. Members could ask officers to review the policy. The Local Highways Manager said that he would secure clarification and bring a report to the Committee's next meeting on June 24th 2009.

Sarah Di Caprio suggested, and the Chairman agreed, that he write to the Executive to ask for a discussion in full Council explaining the position in relation to the decisions taken by the Committee on speed limits but not called in by the Executive. Tony Rooth asked that the policy be reviewed as soon as possible.

The Committee agreed:

(i) that the updated Speed Limit programme shown in ANNEXES A & B be approved and Officers be authorised to progress the assessment and implementation of these during the 2009/2010 financial year, subject to the level of funding available and to their meeting the requirements of the County Council's Speed Management Policy.

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

Reason for decision:

To prioritise a forward programme of speed limits.

15/09 TRANSPORT FOR GUILDFORD [Item 15]

The Head of Transport for Surrey (Surrey County Council's Transportation Service) introduced the report. Members made the following comments:

DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009

- The group could be seen as a ‘talking shop’ as it would have no budget and no decision-making powers of its own
- The proposal was welcome but would need to be reviewed
- The proposal lacks involvement of elected Members who have an important contribution to make
- The group should discuss how hauliers and the military should be encouraged to find alternative transportation (including rail and canals) for heavy goods
- Surrey Police should be members of the group
- Transport issues across the borough (not just in Guildford town) should be discussed

The Committee agreed:

- (i) that Transport for Guildford be established with the broad remit as shown in ANNEXE A.
- (ii) that the Transport for Guildford partnership should provide regular updates to the Local Committee, particularly to make proposals for a Guildford Hub major scheme and associated Highways Agency infrastructure.

Reason for decision:

To allow transport improvements to be coordinated more effectively at minimum cost.

16/09 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF CHILDREN IN CARE [Item 16]

The Development Manager for Looked After Children and Young People introduced the report and made the following points:

- Children in care are some of the most vulnerable people in the county
- Libertas Community home in Guildford for young people in Care was considered an excellent service
- There is an urgent need to recruit more foster carers
- A headteacher for a ‘virtual school’ for all Surrey County Council’s children and young people in care has been appointed to improve educational outcomes
- Recent government legislation has been passed to give young people the right to stay in or return to foster care after the age of 18.

Pauline Searle noted that several young people had left Libertas and were now independent and making a positive contribution. She informed Members that every school should have a school governor with responsibility for pupils at the school who are in care.

The Area Director and Jenny Wicks commented on the positive approach taken by Guildford Borough Council Housing services in planning and providing for the housing needs of young people who are due to leave or have recently left care.

Eddie Owen felt that the County had poor performance against key measures set as priorities in 2007. He also noted that many young people were placed in care outside Surrey county. Fiona White called for better communication between Children’s Services and schools. The Chairman reminded Members that as Corporate Parents they all had a role in promoting the interests of children and young people in care.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

The Committee:

- (i) noted the information provided on the position of children and young people in care in Guildford.
- (ii) considered ways in which it might further support children and young people in care in Guildford.

Reason for decision:

To narrow the gap in outcomes between Children and Young People in Care and other children.

[Diana Lockyer-Nibbs and Matt Furniss left the meeting.]

**17/09 SURREY'S LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT AND GUILDFORD'S LOCAL
STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP [Item 17]**

The Area Director informed the Committee that a more detailed report would be brought back to the meeting on 30 September 2009.

Members made various comments:

- Discussion and decisions about which indicators would be included in the LAA had passed Members by
- Elected Members should be included more in the Thematic Partnerships
- There needs to be more reporting of performance, debate and involvement of Members
- Partnership working is a slow process
- The Local Strategic Partnership was set up several years ago but without targets and measures its performance is difficult to judge.

The Committee:

1. noted the contents of the report,
2. agreed to seek further information and understanding of the partnership arrangements at borough and county level,
3. commented on how elected Members might contribute to the achievement of Local Area Agreement targets and meeting local LSP priorities.

Reason for decision:

To develop the role of elected Members in partnership working in Guildford borough.

18/09 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE BOROUGH PLAN [Item 18]

The following points were made:

- The contribution of the services is recognised
- Trend data would have been useful in the report
- The service has received good inspection assessments and has achieved Equalities Standard 3
- The service has achieved savings of £1.8m.

DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009

The Committee:

1. recognised the achievements of the borough teams within Guildford and supports their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Guildford safer through the delivery of the borough plan.
2. noted the targets and initiatives set within the Guildford borough plan for 2009/10 and supports the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.

Reason for decision:

To support the activities of the service in making Guildford borough safer.

19/09 PROPOSALS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S REVENUE & CAPITAL ALLOCATION [Item 19]

The Committee:

- a. **agreed proposals a. and b. for Capital expenditure** (paragraph 3 and detailed in Appendix A).
- b. approved the return of funding to the relevant member/committee for projects where funding is no longer required (paragraphs 3 & 6).
- c. noted the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2008/09 budget since the Local Committee meeting held on 10 December 2008 (paragraph 4).
- d. approved the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 5 (and detailed in Appendix B).

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

20/09 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 20]

The Committee agreed the Forward Programme 2009/10, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.

Reason for decision:

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

[The Chairman and Committee thanked the Local Committee and Partnership Officer for his service to the Committee.]

[Meeting ended approximately 10.20 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 24 JUNE 2008 at 7pm.
The venue is Wanborough Great Barn.



SUMMARY OF PETITIONS

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)

11th MARCH 2009

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)

ONSLOW

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

GUILDFORD (SOUTH WEST)

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

ITEM 4: PETITIONS

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
<p>Sean Beight of 23 Curling Vale, on behalf of 96 signatories from 66 households. Of these, 58 signatures (35 households) are from Curling Vale. The remainder are mainly from roads in Onslow Village, with 6 from further afield.</p>	<p>GUILDFORD SOUTHWEST Onslow</p>	<p>"In view of the spate of accidents in Curling Vale when drivers of vehicles have crashed into each other, and the potential danger of these events to cause harm to other road users, pedestrians and residents, we call on Surrey County Council Highways to carry out a feasibility study into possible traffic calming solutions including looking at a 20mph zone and associated measures to help slow traffic."</p>	<p>11.03.09</p>	<p>The objective of traffic calming is generally to secure a reduction in personal injury collisions. There has only been one such collision in Curling Vale since 1987.</p> <p>Physical traffic calming measures are often requested, but frequently prove unpopular when they are installed. They could not be justified on collision reduction grounds given the very low accident rate.</p> <p>For a 20 mph limit or zone speeds would have to be low already, or speed reduction measures would be required. Experience elsewhere suggests that such a zone or limit would be unlikely to meet County policy.</p>

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DR GRAHAM HIBBERT on behalf of EAST GUILDFORD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (EGRA)
--

Q1 EGRA is concerned about the impact of the opening of the Hindhead tunnel on traffic levels through and around Guildford. Can the Committee please respond to the following points?

1. What is the latest information the Committee has on the expected increases in traffic volumes along the A3 which, we understand, is already operating way above its planned capacity with some 30 million journeys a year passing by Guildford?
2. What will the impact of this be on air & noise pollution levels and what if any steps are planned to mitigate such pollution to comply with the European Noise Directive and other such legislation?
3. We understand from a presentation given some time back by the Highways Agency that Guildford will take over from Hindhead as the new pinch point on the A3 when the tunnel is open. To what extent will this mean traffic using other roads to bypass the Guildford stretch of the A3, resulting in increased traffic on other roads in and around Guildford, and what can be done to reduce the impact of such increases of through traffic?

- A**
1. The current assessment by the Highway Agency (HA) indicates Annual Average Daily Traffic on the A3 through Guildford between A31 and A322 junctions in 2012 is as follows:

Do nothing	86,000
With scheme	87,000
 2. The level of increase given above is unlikely to have a material impact on either air quality or noise. For information, the note overleaf provided by the Highways Agency gives further information on the EU Environmental Noise Directive.
 3. It is not possible to say at this stage what traffic would use other roads to bypass the Guildford stretch of the A3. However, both Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Highways Agency (HA) are aware of the current issues on the A3 through Guildford and how this impacts on the local road network. Both SCC and the HA have submitted to SEERA proposals for major schemes in Guildford. These schemes complement each other, and are being taken forward with key partners, including Guildford Borough Council. This work is a major focus of the new Transport for Guildford (TfG) board, and will help to address the potential impact and further issues likely to arise in the future, including the opening of the Hindhead tunnel and the impact of planned development at Guildford. A report on TfG is on the agenda for this meeting (Item 15).

[continued overleaf]

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

EU Environmental Noise Directive (END)

The EU Environmental Noise Directive (END) was transposed into UK Law on October 2006 by the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006. The Directive requires a noise mapping and action planning process to be taken forward on a five year rolling programme, with the aim of manage noise issues and effects, including noise reduction if necessary, as well as preserving environmental noise quality where it is good.

The first round of mapping and action planning applies to the busiest major roads (with more than 6 million vehicle passages per year), hence including most Agency roads, including the A3 around Guildford, agglomerations (with more than 250,000 people), railways (with more than 60,000 passages per year) and all major airports.

The noise maps for all sources required for the first round have now been completed and were published on 16 May 2008. These are available on DEFRA's website (www.defra.gov.uk/noisemapping). The Agency did not carry out any detailed mapping itself, but assisted DEFRA in producing the maps by providing information such as surfacing types. The base year for all mapped major road noise levels is 2006.

The Agency is currently working with DEFRA to develop a UK major road noise action plan. This plan is expected to identify practical and cost-effective measures to reduce road traffic noise at sites considered to be experiencing serious noise problems. As neither the Directive nor Regulations set out specific criteria for defining a serious noise problem, this has been left to DEFRA to develop its own criteria/thresholds, in common with other EU member states. DEFRA intend publishing draft action plans on their website later in March, which will include proposed criteria/thresholds for major road noise. However, formal consultation will not commence until July 2009, and hence the plans are unlikely to be adopted formally until late 2009. The Agency is unable to confirm at this stage whether any properties alongside the A3 in Guildford meet the proposed threshold, and hence whether they will be considered further for noise mitigation.

Highways Agency, Dorking, March 2009

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

JOHN GLANFIELD

Q2 I would appreciate receiving the following road maintenance information:

A. **Surrey county**. (all Surrey roads for which SCC is responsible).

1. Annual County budget provision for: 2009. 2008. 2007. 2006. 2005.

B. **Guildford borough**

2. Tarring and chipping only:

(a) Estimated total miles of road now in need of this treatment.

(b) cost per mile.

(c) miles treated 2008. Planned 2009.

3. Shaving, resurfacing and reprofiling, lifting drains etc:

(a) Estimated total miles of road now in need of this treatment.

(b) cost per mile.

(c) miles resurfaced 2008. Planned 2009.

4. Name of present road maintenance contractor for W. Surrey.

5. Annual value of contract.

6. Date of expiration of contract.

I realise this is fairly comprehensive, but many present at the meeting will be asking the same questions.

[Mr. Glanfield subsequently amplified his original question as follows:]

Too many of Surrey's Council-maintained roads are progressively wearing out and remaining neglected. Parts are becoming a danger to users and vehicles, especially at night.

Neighbouring counties maintain demonstrably superior roads, e.g. in West Sussex and Hampshire. What went wrong? What plans and priorities are being applied to catch up?

A Mr. Glanfield's central question is complex. Surrey's roads carry twice the national average traffic flows. The geography of Surrey, particularly the Surrey Hills area which extends across the rural, southern parts of the County, is such that there are few main roads and many smaller, rural roads. For the most part these roads have evolved over time, i.e. they were not designed and constructed to modern standards, and they often have inadequate foundations which are disproportionately affected by water and particularly by freezing. As traffic pressures increase, these roads carry traffic loads which were never intended, and their edges break away, permitting further water ingress. This contrasts with the position in northern parts of the County where highway condition is generally better, and raises Surrey's position in national league tables of highway condition.

Surrey is a wealthy County, and as such attracts much lower levels of government grant than some other authorities. For example Surrey receives some £200 per annum revenue support from central government grant per head of population. Manchester receives some £800. Some Counties with higher levels of deprivation in other parts of the UK receive funding from the European Union towards highway maintenance. Surrey does not benefit from this.

Government capital funding, which in the past was the principal source of highway maintenance funding has fluctuated over the years, and decreased markedly recently. This has meant that the County Council has had to increase its borrowing in order to provide a higher level of maintenance.

[continued overleaf]

DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Despite this, significant improvements have been made to the quality of Surrey's roads. In 2007/08, 42 major maintenance schemes, 120 surface dressing projects and 91 local structural repair sites were carried out. Surrey Highways also carried out 40% more repairs to road defects in 2007/08 compared to the previous year, and at the same time improved the percentage of defects repaired to timescale from 89% to 90%. Additional funding in 2008/09 has accelerated the pace of maintenance, and this continues into 2009/10. These funding levels in conjunction with an increasing emphasis on cost effective early intervention maintenance will help to slow down the rate of deterioration of Surrey's roads.

Surrey Highways has also revised its system of prioritization to ensure that the most deserving roads receive priority. Every road is 'scored' against a range of criteria including road condition, numbers of complaints and insurance claims, the importance of the road (e.g. A roads score higher than B or C roads, bus routes score higher than others etc), and elected Members are able to contribute their views as to which roads should receive priority. On this basis, we are halfway through a major published two-year programme of maintenance across the County, including many roads in Guildford.

1. Revenue maintenance & capital budgets

	2004/05 budget £m	2005/06 budget £m	2006/07 budget £m	2007/08 budget £m	2008/09 budget £m	2009/10 budget £m
Capital	36.6	36.1	35.2	28.3	29.2	30.3
Revenue maintenance	25.1	25.8	26.5	25.2	26.0	26.7
Total	61.7	61.9	61.7	53.5	55.1	56.3

These figures exclude one-off allocations made by the Executive in 2008/09: £440k on 08/04/08 & £5m on 24/06/08. These figures cover revenue maintenance and all capital across highways & transport, so includes roads, structures, lights, signals, etc. The higher level of investment in earlier years reflects additional "prudential" borrowing at that time. Since then central government funding has reduced, so that much of the LTP is now funded from SCC's own money. So although overall expenditure is not as high as it used to be, use of SCC's own funding is higher.

- 2(a) 93 miles
- 2(b) Approximately £65,000 per mile
- 2(c) 2008 20 miles
Planned 2009 8 miles

NB we are delivering a two year programme between April 2008 and March 2010 and as such the miles treated were programmed to fall into these two years as indicated.

- 3(a) 65 miles
- 3(b) Approximately £650,000 per mile.
- 3(c) 2008 5 miles
Planned 2009 4 miles

4. Ringway Infrastructure Services

5. £20 million approximately

6. Currently April 2011; may be extended later this year to 2013

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

**R.J. BROMHAM on behalf of
HOLY TRINITY AMENITY GROUP PLANNING GROUP**

Q3 What is the long term strategy for repair of the town centre pavements?

We have complained previously about the poor, and dangerous, state of the paving slabs, a large number of which were broken. Their unacceptable state, particularly in the upper High Street, was noted during a walk about with Councillor Barker over a year ago, which was arranged to consider the associated problem of illegal parking on pavements. We are pleased that some action is at last being taken, but are concerned that this seems to be limited to removal of broken slabs and the filling of the void with tarmac. We presume this is a temporary measure. It is an unsightly, second rate, repair, which is being carried out even on the York Stone paving bordering the cobbled part of the High Street. Because the tarmac consolidates with use it is impossible to avoid trip hazards when the edge of the remaining slabs stand proud of the tarmac.

Much of Guildford's shopping area pavements are now very second rate compared to other towns. Because the pavements have not been maintained as frequently as the roads the curb stones are no longer high enough to act as any sort of deterrent to vehicles driving onto the pavements; there is also little enforcement to prevent this happening. We note that other towns often use smaller and thicker concrete slabs that are not damaged if a vehicle does drive over them, but this would still need to be combined with measures to stop vehicles driving onto the pavement. It is suggested that additional pavement edge bollards be considered; these would not only reduce damage to pavements, but reassure pedestrians that they have some protection against vehicles mounting the pavement.

A Surrey Highways will continue to respond to reports of defects made by the public or our own Inspectors and Community Highways Officers. Maintenance Engineers maintain schedules of those roads where more comprehensive maintenance is required, and when funds are made available these lists are put forward. There is no policy to permanently replace slabs with tarmac, but temporary repairs have been carried out using tarmac in a number of places where the footway had been damaged, often by parked vehicles. Bollards are considered in some cases, but these, too, are frequently damaged and a therefore a further financial burden. Bollards need to be set back from the kerb, and therefore reduce the effective width of the footway. Where the footway is already narrow, this results in difficulties for users of double buggies or wheelchairs, so is not an acceptable solution.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

**R.J. BROMHAM on behalf of
HOLY TRINITY AMENITY GROUP PLANNING GROUP**

Q4 What are the plans for the introduction of speed limits and restricted vehicle access to the lower High Street?

We put a question about introduction of a speed limit to the GLC meeting on 11th March 2004; the answer was that “There are no current plans for reduced speed limits”. Since then there has been a growing acknowledgement that this is needed, notably in the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal (which was approved by GBC) and which recommended both a speed limit and increased pedestrianisation hours. Neither measure would cause significant problems for the businesses, and we believe they would increase footfall during the hours when traffic makes this an unpleasant area for shoppers. Planning policies at all levels, including the SCC LTP, seek improved facilities for pedestrians.

For all but the meagre five hours of pedestrianisation, the lower High Street is a hostile environment for pedestrians. Guildford lags far behind other towns in making the town shopping centre pedestrian friendly; shoppers are unlikely to continue to tolerate current conditions and will go to more welcoming shopping centres.

Frequent observation of the High Street sets shows that they start to loosen only a short time after repairs have been made. This is undoubtedly largely caused by too much traffic accelerating to excessive speeds up the hill. Reduced traffic loads are essential if the sets are ever to be kept in good order. It is only a matter of time before a loose set is thrown out by the wheel of a vehicle applying a high torque to accelerate up the hill – with possible serious consequences.

A There has been no change in policy regarding the High Street since the previous question put to the Committee. Surrey Highways was not consulted on the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal. The question of increased hours for the pedestrianised area has been considered by the Town Centre Management Group (TCMG), on which HTAG is represented. It was concluded that the hours should not be changed. Consultation by the TCMG highlighted the numbers of vehicles using the High Street illegally. Recent work has been undertaken which has successfully reduced this activity. This includes replacing the barrier padlock with a combination lock and securing greater levels of enforcement from Surrey Police. Substantial maintenance is under way in the High Street by Surrey Highways. In the next financial year, Guildford Borough Council will be continuing this work.

Although a reduced speed limit has been suggested (another correspondent has proposed 10 mph) officers do not consider that this is practical or enforceable, since there is no evidence of accidents, or that speed of traffic is a material cause of damage to the setts.

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

TIELEKE WILLIAMS, 115 ADDISON ROAD

Q5 Now the Merrow park and ride is open does the committee not think that it is time to make the parking at the Spectrum for sport enthusiasts only? At the moment this car park is filled with commuter cars and people wishing to swim (or make other use of the Spectrum) have to drive round in circles trying to find a space, sometimes even giving up and returning home without a healthy swim.

A The Spectrum car park has been used for both leisure and park and ride purposes for many years. It was recently extended for the express purpose of providing further park and ride spaces. The former car park has some 750 spaces; the extension provides a further 250 spaces. By comparison, the recently opened Merrow Park and Ride car park has 325 spaces.

It is not accurate to suggest that the Spectrum car park is filled with commuter cars, since this is not borne out by the level of park and ride bus passenger use. Nevertheless we are aware of the difficulties being posed to Spectrum users when the car park is operating at or near capacity. Officers and Members are considering measures which will address this issue. The first change is recommended in the report at Item 12 on this agenda. This proposes differential bus fares on the three main park and ride services which reflect their popularity and capacity.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT ITS
MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 5: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

K.C.MELDRUM on behalf of MERROW RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Q6 The planning application (ref: 08/P/01937) for the old DEFRA site on Epsom Road was approved by the Planning Committee on 17 February. However concerns remain about car parking spaces on the site and traffic congestion on the Epsom Road / Boxgrove Road junction at peak times, particularly in the morning when people leave the site to work and children are taken to school.

1. Will the Highways Authority place a copy of their assessment of the implication of the development of the DEFRA site in the public domain?
2. Will the Highways Authority monitor the potential traffic problems at the Epsom Road traffic lights and take appropriate steps should congestion occur at these lights?
3. Will Guildford Borough Council take appropriate action if any problems of off site parking arise?

- A**
1. The County Highway Authority's response to planning application 08/P/01937 can be seen on the GBC website. Alternatively, Merrow Residents' Association can request information relating to this application directly from Surrey County Council through the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Policy requires that developers demonstrate that their schemes are acceptable in highway and transport terms and the Highway Authority assesses all planning applications to ensure that the submitted plans, Transport Assessments, calculations etc are reasonable and acceptable from a highway point of view.
 2. As part of the assessment of this planning application, the Highway Authority consulted SCC's Traffic Signals Team to ensure that the proposed alterations to the traffic signals would be feasible and acceptable. The Highway Authority will then check to ensure that the traffic signals are built, commissioned and maintained to an acceptable standard, and that they continue to operate satisfactorily.
 3. The amount of parking permitted on this development site was increased during the planning process as a result of concerns expressed by residents. The Borough Council in conjunction with Surrey County Council reviews parking restrictions on the public highway on a cyclic basis. In the unlikely event that there were any major issues these could be considered under this process.

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 6: MEMBER QUESTIONS

CLLR. PAULINE SEARLE (GUILDFORD NORTH)

Q1 At the County Council Meeting on January 27th it was mentioned there was a planned redevelopment of the Martyrs Lane Waste Site in Woking, subject to approval of the scheme by the County Planning Authority. Works are scheduled to commence in May and completion in October and that any service while this is happening would be limited and that the nearest alternative sites at Chertsey and Guildford would be used during the development work.

My concern is Moorfield Road this road is the exit/entrance to the Slyfield Industrial Estate. There are over 94 Businesses, 56 of which are large sites; average 1.5 acres and the rest are smaller sites of about 500-1500 sq ft. The road has shown an increasing deterioration rate over the last year and the adverse weather conditions recently have accelerated the problem the road surface is dreadful, full of potholes and getting worse everyday. The volume of traffic on this road is horrendous and added traffic will only make it worse. In a recent traffic assessment survey carried out by Scott Wilson for the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project approx 760 vehicles enter the industrial estate in the AM peak hour and 360 departed. Approx 290 vehicles enter the industrial estate in the PM peak hour and 760 depart. Which totals over 1000 traffic movements in the peak hours of the day on Moorfield Road and I can assure you it continues all day.

Temporary repairs have been carried out on potholes in the road but have only lasted a couple of days due to the volume of traffic and are a waste of money. Please can I be assured that Moorfield Road will be prioritised and resurfaced in the near future?

A Officers are aware of the poor condition of Moorfield Road. When the current two-year major maintenance problem was compiled, this road was in much better condition, and as a result did not score highly compared with many other roads. The score is based on a range of factors, including the number of insurance claims and accidents, the importance of the road in the hierarchy (e.g. 'A' roads score higher than others), as well as a range of technical assessments of the condition of the road. In addition, Members were asked to nominate the three worst in their Divisions, and this added further weight to the scores. Those roads with the highest scores were included in the two-year programme. This programme has to date been regarded as an unbreakable commitment.

Since then, Moorfield Road has deteriorated rapidly, and the recent extreme winter weather has accelerated this process. The highway authority is bound to deal with any serious defects notified to us, as otherwise we could be held to be liable for any accidents. As a result, a number of reactive repairs have been carried out. Officers are examining ways in which the major maintenance of Moorfield Road might be brought forward. The most likely means of doing so would be to defer a scheme in the 2009/10 programme to release funds for Moorfield Road. Members of the Committee may wish to express a view on this; for information, the roads included in the 2009/10 programme are as follows:

- A25 Shere Road (immediately south of Clandon Crossroads)
- A 322 Worplesdon Road (Stoughton Road to Keens Lane)
- B2136 Horsham Road (Hoe Lane to Guildford boundary)
- B2215 Portsmouth Road, Ripley ('Jovial Sailor' to Newark Lane)
- B3411 Vale Road, Ash Vale (Shawfield Road to Orchard Close)
- D4023 Grange Road, Stoughton (Stoughton Road to Salt Box Road)
- C42 Forest Road, Effingham (Orchard Close to The Drift – part of bridge scheme)

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AT
ITS MEETING ON 24 JUNE 2009**

ITEM 6: MEMBER QUESTIONS

CLLR SARAH DI CAPRIO, GUILDFORD SOUTH EAST

Q2 In Item 15 this evening, the Local Committee is being asked to agree about the establishment of Transport for Guildford. I couldn't find specific mention in the report about engaging with haulage companies or the military, both of whom send vehicles through Guildford.

The A281 Shalford Road passes through my division and much of the traffic is large trucks from haulage companies - local, national and international. The noise, damage to the road surface and associated damage to residential properties along the route is significant. To a lesser extent this is the same with military transport which uses the road.

Can I ask that we make representations to the convenors of Transport for Guildford that they do engage in discussions with haulage companies and the military from the outset, to see if they can avoid using or minimise their use of roads like the A281 in Guildford?

A County policy is that heavy traffic (in terms of either volume or weight) and medium to long distance traffic should use the strategic road network. The A281 is the main road from Guildford to Horsham. It is a principal ('A') road and therefore is the proper route for such traffic. The only alternative route using roads of similar status would be via the A25, through Dorking town centre and then the A24, a significantly longer distance. Other alternatives would be via considerably less suitable country lanes.

This matter is probably more operational than strategic, and as such one for the Transport for Surrey or Highways services, rather than the Transport for Guildford (TfG) board (see Item 15 on this agenda). That said, it is for TfG to decide whether or not this matter is within its scope. If the Committee is so minded, the matter could be referred to TfG.