



Minutes of meeting

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

Date: Wednesday 10 March 2010

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: Lord Pirbright's Hall, Pirbright

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys) (Vice Chairman)
Mr Mark Brett-Warburton (Guildford South-East)
Mr Graham Ellwood (Guildford East)
Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)
Ms Marsha Moseley (Ash)
Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)
Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)
Mr Keith Taylor (Shere)
Ms Fiona White (Guildford West)

Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)

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

* substitute

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

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

- The temporary bus stop in Albury (Albury Parish Council).
- Maintenance of roads and footpaths to prevent flooding (Councillor Clinton, Pirbright Parish Council).
- The difficulties of joining the A3, particularly at the A31 junction, because of the short joining roads and in light of the opening of the Hindhead Tunnel (John Heath, Campaign to Protect Rural England).
- The process for receiving petitions (Mike Dodd, Shere).
- Parking near the Foreman Park Estate by users of the train station (Mr Hague, Ash).
- Broken kerb stones in Ash Church Road (Richard Tolley, Ash).
- The route taken by the Merrow Park and Ride buses whilst the road works are taking place at the London Road / York Road junction (Peter Hattersley).

01/10 Apologies for absence and substitutions [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Nevins (Chairman), David Carpenter (substituted by Matt Furniss), John Garrett, Terence Patrick and Sarah Di Caprio (substituted by Wendy May).

02/10 Minutes of the last meeting (09 December 2009) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

03/10 Declarations of interest [Item 3]

Declarations of interest were made by: Matt Furniss (items 15 and 16), because he is a governor of St Peters and Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (item 7), because she is a member of the British Horse Society.

04/10 Petitions [Item 4]

Responses to three petitions are set out at **Annex 1**. The following also addressed the Local Committee:

- Upper Street, Shere: Bill Barker questioned if they have a Community Speed Watch scheme, to which Roy Davey replied that they are currently awaiting training. Keith Taylor thanked Roy Davey for his hard work in organising the petition and commented that Shere is not ideal for modern driving. He lent his support for lowering the speed limit, but recognised that there other speed limit schemes waiting for a change in policy before they can be considered. He also highlighted the difficulty of agreeing the detail of where to put traffic calming measures.
- Rights of Way 538 and 539, West Horsley: Bill Barker supported the petition. The Countryside Access Officer noted that they are aware of the petition and will bring a full response to the June meeting of the committee.
- Ashenden Estate: Fiona White noted that this affects many others parts of the Guildford West division and highlighted the need for the different parties

to work together to develop a permanent solution. Tony Phillips contended that Onslow is a priority.

05/10 Written public questions [Item 5]

Five written public questions were received. Answers are set out in Annex 2.

In relation to question 2, David Goodwin noted that a study would help to determine the costs of potential solutions to the problem. Caroline Reeves supported the suggestion of a survey.

In relation to question 3, Pauline Searle commented that buses do scrape the speed tables. She also noted that residents aren't against the speed tables, just their height and angle. The Local Highways Manager explained that he has met the bus company twice and they agreed that the buses do not catch the speed table if they drive at an appropriate speed. He also stated that new roads do not have design speeds. The Local Highways Manager agreed to meet Jim Blake to discuss the issue further.

In relation to question 4, the Area Director for the South West of Surrey confirmed that there would not be a short stay school sited on the vacant former Pond Meadow building. He also agreed with Joe Bullock's suggestion that local committees should always be consulted when a building becomes vacant or its use is changing.

In relation to question 5, David Davis noted that he hoped the consultation with voluntary and community groups would be soon. He also invited members of the Local Committee to visit both the Lifetrain Trust and GASP. Bill Barker noted that he would be delighted to visit.

06/10 Written members' questions [Item 6]

Two written Member questions were received. Answers are set out in Annex 3.

In relation to question 1, Bill Barker noted that he believes the speed signs show 40mph in one direction and 60 mph in the other direction.

In relation to question 2, Bill Barker commented that he is not happy with the frequency of visits of parking attendants to Ripley and East Horsley.

07/10 Byway Open to All Traffic 515 (Shere) & 137 (Abinger) Traffic Regulation Order [Item 7]

The Local Committee agreed that:

- a) the grounds for making a TRO as outlined below are met, and an Order should be made for Byways Open to All Traffic 515 (Shere) & 137 (Abinger) as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/68/H28 (see appendix 1).

Reason for the decision:

To protect the condition of the surface of the byway.

08/10 The 'Drive SMART' Initiative [Item 8]

The Superintendent for Neighbourhoods set out the aims and objectives of the Drive SMART campaign. Members questioned the types of interventions made and the variance in the number of interventions in each area. The Casualty Reduction Officer for Guildford explained that particular areas have been targeted and that more work would be done in the outlying parts of the borough. He also explained that further work is being done to expand the Community Speed Watch scheme. Richard Deighton of East Horsley Parish Council questioned if Surrey Police had considered approaching parish councils for financial contributions towards local traffic calming schemes and what progress had been made on the proposal to allow parish councils to operate and maintain Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS). The Casualty Reduction Officer explained that funds have not been sought from parish councils and that work is ongoing on the VAS proposal.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) note the contents of the report.

Reason for the decision:

Road safety is a key concern of the public.

09/10 Guildford Park and Ride Fares Review [Item 9]

The Local Committee agreed that:

- (i) the revised fares and pricing strategy as set out in this report should take effect from 5 April 2010.

Reason for decision:

The fares revisions will increase farebox revenue thus reducing pressure on the CPZ account.

10/10 Review of Parking within Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone [Item 10]

David Ellis, the Holy Trinity Amenity Group Road Rep for South Hill, questioned the consultation process. The On Street Parking Coordinator explained that the consultation process had taken place over two years and met all the statutory requirements.

The Local Committee agreed that:

- (i) the representations detailed in **ANNEXE 3** are not supported, and an Order is made, under sections 1, 2, 3, 32, 35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, in relation to the formally advertised changes to the parking restrictions in Castle Street, South Hill, and those associated with vehicle crossovers that have recently been constructed, as detailed in **ANNEXE 2** and shown on the plan attached as **ANNEXE 4**.

- (ii) if, prior to the making of the order, the applicant for the vehicle crossover at No.33 Pewley Way places an order for the vehicle crossover to be constructed, or the crossover is constructed, then this particular proposal be included within the made amendment order.

Reason for decision:

The controls will improve traffic flow, and in respect to vehicle crossovers, ensure easier vehicular access to adjacent premises.

11/10 Environmental Improvement Ladymead and Josephs Rd [Item 11]

The Local Committee agreed that:

the proposed environmental improvement as shown in the plans attached at **ANNEXE 1** be approved for implementation by Guildford Borough Council.

Reason for decision:

The project will enhance the environment and the visual appeal of the site.

12/10 Environmental Improvement Junction of Haydon Place and Sandfield Terrace [Item 12]

The Local Committee agreed that:

the proposed environmental improvement as shown on the plans attached at **ANNEXE 1** be approved for implementation by the Borough Council.

Reason for decision:

The project will enhance the environment and the visual appeal of the site

13/10 Highways Programmes and budgets 2010/11 Onwards [Item 13]

The Local Highways Manager explained that the Local Committees' minor schemes budgets had been reduced to zero in order to protect, as far as possible, the highways maintenance budgets. He agreed to provide further details of the centrally-held use of the £500,000 budget for improvements when these are known. Members asked questions about the status of a number of specific schemes.

The Local 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 officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver approved projects within existing budgets.
- (iv) that the Minor Schemes and Speed Limits forward programmes as set out in **ANNEXES A, B and C** be frozen as set out in paragraph 7 until such time as budgets are restored.
- (v) that officers should maintain an informal list of requests received for improvements and speed limits which, at an appropriate time, the Transportation Task Group can review and make recommendations to the Committee.
- (vi) that the management of the Committee's 2010/11 revenue maintenance budget be vested with the Local Highways Manager and Maintenance Engineer in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and where appropriate the relevant Local Members.
- (vii) **In addition, the Local Committee urges the County Council to allow under-spent highway capital funds from 2009/10 to be carried over in to 2010/11 so that projects which have already commenced may achieve their stated objectives.**

Reason for decision:

The recommendations are necessary in view of the Council's overall financial position and the need to prioritise maintenance of the highway over improvements to it.

14/10 Dirtham Lane, Effingham. Consideration of Objection to the Proposed Speed Limit [Item 14]

Sue Morris, representing Effingham Parish Council, explained that their preference is Option A. The Local Highways Manager apologised for the error in the plan accompanying the advertised Notice of Intent and draft speed limit order. He explained that both officers and Local Committees are required to comply with County policy, which Option A did not. Bill Barker suggested that in the future we could explore making the road a Byway Open to All Traffic and imposing a Traffic Regulation Order.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) that Option B as set out in the report be approved and that the intention of the County Council to make a Speed Limit Order under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which would be to lower the existing speed limit to 30mph on Dirtham Lane between its junctions with A246 Guildford Road and Orestan Lane be published, the Order be made and the scheme implemented, subject to funding being available.

Reason for decision

To improve the safety of the road.

15/10 Proposals for the Committee's Revenue Allocations [Item15]

The Area Director for South West Surrey proposed that in the future additional detail is provided in the report to the Local Committee about decisions made under delegated powers.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) to approve the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget listed in paragraph 5 and detailed in Annexe A.
- b) to note the allocations agreed under delegated authority from the 2009/10 budget since the Local Committee meeting held on 9th December 2009 (paragraph 4).
- c) to agree that any unallocated revenue budget from 2009/10, as of 31 March 2010, is carried forward into the financial year of 2010/11.

Reason for decision

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents.

16/10 Climate Change Fund [Item 16]

The Local Committee:

- a) considered the bids attached as Annex 1 and agreed to submit the bid by St Peter's Catholic Comprehensive School as its application to the Climate Change Fund.

Reason for decision

The project would reduce the impact of climate change in Guildford.

17/10 Services for Young People. Local Delivery Plan [Item17]

The Assistant Director for Services for Young People introduced the Borough Youth Plan and the transformation strategy. Members asked questions about the provision in different areas of the borough and the targeting of services. In relation to the transformation project, members asked questions about the future role of the Local Committee, as well as the role of voluntary, community and faith sector. David Davis questioned how smaller voluntary and community groups will be engaged in the transformation project.

The Assistant Director committed to engaging with the full range of voluntary groups. He also stressed the importance of working with young people to design services together. He also agreed to visit the Guildford West division and attend a future Guildford Youth Parliament meeting.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) approve the Youth Development Service component of the Services for Young People Delivery Plan 2010/11.

- b) note the transformation strategy for young people.

Reason for decision

The Local Delivery Plan for 2010/11 sets out a program for services for Young People in the borough. The transformation strategy for youth services will have a significant effect on the Local delivery plans for 2011/2012 and beyond.

18/10 Guildford Borough Fire Plan [Item18]

The Area Manager for the West of Surrey set out the priorities of the Fire and Rescue Service for 2010/11 in Guildford. Members asked a number of questions, particularly about the services approach to prevention and the targeting of services at young people, students and elderly people.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) recognise the achievements of the borough teams within Guildford and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Guildford safer through the delivery of the borough plan.
- b) note the targets and initiatives set within the Guildford borough plan for 2010/11 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.
- c) support the achievements of the retained duty personnel at Guildford and Gomshall and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

Reason for decision

The Borough Plan for 2010/11 will enable the Fire and Rescue Service to continue to play an important role in delivering community safety in Guildford, help meet the needs of the Local Area Agreement (LAA) and enhance the overall performance of the service.

19/10 Surrey County Council Day Services Change [Item19]

The Project Officer for the Day Services Project set out the developments since the last report to the Local Committee in November 2008. Members asked a range of questions about the proposals.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) review the updated changes to the original Day Service Change proposals and their implications locally.
- b) discuss finding local property solutions. A number of the Day Service proposals require the use of 'venues' – hired, leased, community space, working in partnership etc.

Reason for decision

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

This model will deliver systemic change within in-house day services over the medium and longer term.

20/10 Forward Programme [Item20]

The Area Director for the South West of Surrey proposed that a private meeting of the Local Committee be held to discuss highways matters and the future role of the committee in relation to highways. David Goodwin highlighted that a report on grit bins and gritting routes is due in June or September.

The Committee agreed:

- (i) to accept the Forward Programme 2009/10, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the report.
- (ii) to consider any further themes for Member briefings during 2009/10.

Reason for decision:

To enable preparations to be made for future meetings, reflecting members' wishes.

[Meeting ended at 10.50pm]

.....(Mr Bill Barker – Vice Chairman)

Contact:

Dave Johnson
(Area Director)

01483 517301
dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk

Chris Williams
(Local Committee & Partnership Officer)

01483 517336
christopher.williams@surreycc.gov.uk

The next meeting of the Committee will be on Wednesday 23 June 2010 at 7pm. Venue to be confirmed.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

Annex 1

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
West Horsley Parish Council on behalf of 176 signatories.	HORSLEYS Clandon & Horsley	<p>“We support the reclassification of By 538 and By 539 on the grounds of prohibiting vehicle access thus avoiding danger to those on foot, pedal cycle, horseback or horse drawn vehicles.”</p> <p>Covering letter from West Horsley Parish Council refers to three BOATS (also including 540) and requests that Traffic Regulation Orders be imposed on these. It also requests reinstatement of a ‘Not suitable for motor vehicles’ sign at the junction of Blakes Lane and BOAT 540 and provision of a ‘No through road’ sign at the junction of Fullers Farm Road and Shere Road.</p>	10 March 2010	<p>Officers will fully investigate and respond to the request for Traffic Regulation Orders on BOATs 538, 539 & 540 (West Horsley) at the next Guildford Committee in June. Each BOAT will be investigated on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Officers consider that a sign stating ‘No Through Road’ is not needed at the junction of Fullers Farm Road and Shere Road as the current signs are adequate. Officers will reinstate the missing SCC sign ‘Not suitable for motor vehicles’ at the junction of Blakes Lane and BOAT 540 (West Horsley).</p>

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Mr R. Davey on behalf of 41 signatories	SHERE Tillingbourne	"We do believe that the traffic situation in and through Shere, and in Upper Street in particular, represents a problem that needs urgent consideration and implementation of a 20 mph speed limit and measures to physically slow traffic speeds."	10 March 2010	<p>Officers are reluctant to recommend traffic calming except where there is a proven record of speed-related collisions involving injuries. Which is not the case here. Traffic calming is frequently requested, but almost always unpopular when installed. In this case, Shere is an attractive, historic village, and some would see traffic calming measures as urbanising and completely out of character with the local environment.</p> <p>Traffic calming on Upper Street, Shere has been considered within the last few months, in the context of the project to resurface and enlarge the car park off London Lane. Because of concerns about the speed of traffic on Upper Street and the poor sightline for vehicles emerging from London Lane, GBC officers proposed two chicanes, one close to the junction and one close to the wooden footbridge. This proposal had the support of Surrey County Council. After much discussion, Shere Parish Council resolved that they could not support both chicanes, and as a result that by the bridge was abandoned.</p> <p>The speed limit on Upper Street was last assessed in 2004, and found not to meet the criteria for a 20 mph limit.</p> <p>Reference to the report at Item 13 on this agenda (page 8) will show that the Shere Village Safety Scheme, Phase 2 is already on the forward programme, on the list of projects awaiting funding. As that report explains, the minor schemes budget has been set at zero for 2010/11 and is likely to remain at that level for some time to come. There is therefore little possibility of any such project being implemented in the near future.</p>

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

Principal petitioner/ organisation	SCC DIVISION / GBC Ward	Summary of concerns and requests	Date reported to GLC	Proposed action Progress achieved
Alistair Knowles, chairman of Ashenden Residents' Association, on behalf of 105 signatories	GUILDFORD WEST Onslow	"We the undersigned urge Guildford Borough Council to introduce waiting restrictions on the Ashenden Estate as soon as possible. At the very least they should put double yellow lines around junctions, but the council should investigate the possibility of introducing a means of better controlling the parking of non-residents."		<p>As part of the on-going non-town centre CPZ parking review, the parking situation in Southway and surrounding area, including Ashenden Estate, is being considered, along with various other issues in Westborough, Stoughton and Slyfield. In the first instance, this review is seeking to resolve the safety and access issues associated with the parking that takes place in these areas. Informal consultation is due to commence in the next month or so, and as a result of this, elected members will have an opportunity to finalise the scope of this review, before the formal advertisement of any proposals is undertaken.</p> <p>Reviews generally take around 18 months to complete and the introduction of controls tends to occur in a small number of phases (generally a couple) towards the end of the cycle. Clearly, elected members may wish to consider the possibility of prioritisation measures for residents in one or more of the geographic areas being considered, although they would have to be mindful that the consideration of such controls is far more involved than the introduction of waiting restrictions. Therefore, it would probably cause the duration of the review to be extended, resulting in a delay to the introduction of the controls both within the Ashenden estate and elsewhere, as well as the start of the subsequent review of the town centre CPZ.</p>

Annex 2

MRS MARIE CURTIS, HEADTEACHER, SANDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Q1 How will the council resolve the parking issue around the school? The school is over 100 years old and over the years the parking issue has never been resolved. The school catchment is wide and there are at least thirty families who need to drive to the school each day, this increases when the weather is poor. There are no roads in the locality that are unmarked, so parents must choose to either pay or park illegally, both of which are unacceptable and cause parental or local resident distress. There are approximately ten car spaces in the 2 hour parking bays in Sandfield Terrace, which operate 8.30 to 6pm, there are three linked problems:

1. Paying – parents can not afford to pay for parking each day and this is not expected at any other school in Guildford.
2. The children go into class from 8.30am to allow parents the time to drop off and get to work, the bays are not available before 8.30am.
3. Even if parents were willing to pay there are not enough bays to meet the parent need.

The school has operated a walking bus but families do not want their children escorted to school, they want to be able to come in and discuss matters with teachers and other parents. The local multi storey was explored as an alternative with a grace period idea, this was not accepted.

The school has explored other local parking areas, pubs, restaurants but none are without a cost to parents. Why should our parents have to pay to be able to walk their children into school, this is not the case in other Guildford schools. The transport surveys that we have undertaken of the 210 pupils, all who can walk do, we operate encouragement schemes for walking, biking, scooter or bus travel but some families (30-40) need to use a car.

When parents have complained to the council officials and traffic wardens who target the area, the solution told is to park in other areas and walk their child to school or alternatively advised to move schools. No other school in Guildford is without any drop off or parking facility.

A Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is responsible for off-street parking, while Surrey County Council (SCC) covers on-street parking. To avoid duplication, however, GBC acts as agent for SCC in on-street parking matters. Neither Council has any duty to provide parking for any group of road users.

Very few schools have parking facilities for parents, and as a result those who choose, or have no choice, to take children to school by car, often cause congestion and other difficulties for themselves, local residents and other road users. The results can be seen outside virtually every school in Guildford.

Sandfield School has a particular problem in being located close to the town centre at the junction of two heavily-trafficked 'A' roads; parents cannot fail to be aware of this when they choose this school. As a result parking is prohibited by the imposition of double yellow lines. These are essential for the safety of road users approaching the junction, and also to protect the capacity of the junction, without which delays would increase, together with driver frustration and probably the accident record at the junction. None of this is in the interests of Sandfield School.

Various discussions have taken place with a view to seeking a solution to this problem. For the reasons above no exemption can be allowed to the yellow lines. GBC officers have explored to possible use of the York Road car park, but this has not proved possible. SCC's Safer and Smarter Travel team would be delighted to advise on sustainable travel measures which might be adopted as part of the school's travel plan.

MRS MARIE CURTIS, HEADTEACHER, SANDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Q2 How will the council resolve the traffic issues at the York Road / Stoke Road junction which has resulting in many vehicle injuries and near misses of pedestrians, both children and adults? Councillor David Goodwin has offered a portion of his SCC allocation towards a road traffic survey to ascertain the extent of the problem but unfortunately other councillors whose residents are affected by this problem have not been so helpful. Local pedestrians also have major problems using the lights. They and the school community are affected daily and their comments need to be included in the survey. Local residents also have first hand experience of the regular collisions at the junction.

A This issue is not a new one, and given the location (described in the response to question 1 above) the situation is difficult if not impossible to resolve completely. The needs are to provide safe passage for pedestrians, particularly school children, and also to avoid increasing traffic congestion at one of Guildford's key junctions. It is not merely a question of trading public safety against delays; those delays in turn increase driver frustration, cause red-light-running, and increase the accident rate. There are many other such locations in Guildford and Surrey as a whole, but few with a school in such close proximity.

Cllr. David Goodwin has confirmed his willingness to contribute to funding a review of the potential for improvement, and Cllr. Mark Brett-Warburton has also agreed to consider this, subject to the level of funding required. Officers have asked for an estimate of the costs involved. It should be noted however, that in the current financial climate, it is unlikely that funds will be available to carry out any improvements which do prove feasible. Item 13 on this agenda provides greater detail on this.

JIM BLAKE, QUEEN ELIZABETH PARK RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Q3

1. Can the Committee please confirm the design speed of Grange Road and the desired speed the Road Tables - between Railton Road and Salt Box Road- have been put in place to achieve?
2. Why do the Tables not conform to the Council's own mandated standards and the Department for Transport's Recommended Standards?

Background: It is assumed that Grange Road has a design speed of 30 mph as it is a main bus route, is used by the emergency services as a through route and it does not fulfil the requirements to be designated a 20mph road but this has never been confirmed.

The officers have stated previously that the road tables met the standards in force in 1997 when they were first constructed. They do not; Table 1 of DfT Traffic Advisory leaflet 2/96 refers. (It should be noted that the "approximately 1:10" reported by Keith Love of SCC in response to earlier inquiries by QEPRA does not meet either SCC or Departmental Standards).

Road Transport Regulations provided guidance at the time of construction in 1997 regarding the recommended dimensions of Road Tables to the effect that they should be no higher than the currently recommended 75mm (the maximum permitted was, and is, 100mm with no tolerance) and have an approach angle of 1:15 (although as little as 1:10 was permitted in 1996 but was subsequently found to be inappropriate - it is recommended that 1:20 is the standard for bus routes). No flat face is permitted to be higher than 6mm and guidance is also given regarding provision for cyclists and motorcyclists. In 1996 they were to be at least 6m wide which has subsequently been increased to 7.5m.

Grange Road was resurfaced in 2009 and the Road Tables were replaced, from the road surface up, as part of the work. Since then the dimensions and approach angles of the Tables necessitate drivers slowing to speeds of less than 10mph to negotiate the Tables without causing damage to their vehicles. Bus passengers are badly shaken when the Tables are crossed (many Tables are in close proximity to bus stops). There has been a significant increase in traffic in adjoining streets to avoid the Tables and the traffic speeds up and slows down, with increased pollution and noise, rather than flowing smoothly. Some vehicles cannot negotiate the Tables without grounding; some Table leading faces are already showing damage.

A

Traffic calming measures have been in place in Grange Road for some time. Following the construction of the Queen Elizabeth Park housing development, and more recently the replacement of a gas main, Grange Road was in very poor condition, and as a result Surrey Highways completely resurfaced the road during 2009. This involved planing off the old road surface, including the speed tables, and then replacing these on a 'like-for-like' basis. The tables were replaced in the same positions they occupied previously, and to the same height.

Various suggestions have been made that we have constructed more tables than existed previously, or that we have deliberately raised the heights of the tables. These suggestions are untrue. No 'new' tables have been constructed. In most cases the tables were previously at the same level as the pedestrian pavements on either side of the road; this makes it easier for wheelchair users or parents with prams and buggies to cross the road. As can be seen on site, the tables are still at this level, no higher. The white spray paint marking the positions of the table ramps can still be seen on the kerbs, showing that the tables have been rebuilt in the same positions as previously.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 23 June 2010

Of course it is possible that any of the tables could be a few millimetres higher, or the ramps a few millimetres shorter than previously. Either of these would have the effect of increasing the gradient of the ramps, but not significantly. We have taken measurements of the tables, and found all to be within normal operating tolerances. The tables meet the same standards to which they were originally constructed. Subsequent standards are not retrospective, and Traffic Advisory leaflets contain advice, not standards.

Officers have also met on site with the bus company to examine the geometry of the speed tables to ensure that damage was not being caused to their fleet of vehicles. It was concluded that providing that buses, like any other vehicles, travel at appropriate speeds, there was no immediate problem. It is common for vertical traffic calming measures to suffer a degree of damage. This could be caused by excessive speed, modified vehicles or badly fitted exhaust systems, and does not necessarily prove that the measures are inappropriate.

It should also be noted that a number of representations have been received, albeit fewer in number than the complainants, that the new speed tables are very effective at reducing speed, and are therefore welcomed. It is possible (but we cannot be sure of this) that those living on Grange Road, and who therefore benefit most from low traffic speeds, are broadly in favour of the tables, while those living elsewhere, but who use Grange Road regularly, benefit less, and are therefore less well disposed. Overall the number of representations we have received is small compared to the population in the Stoughton area in general.

Various suggestions have been made that we should have taken the opportunity to remove the traffic calming, or to modify it, or replace it with chicanes or other measures. The simple answer to this is that the resurfacing was a maintenance project, and as such was not intended to alter the highway in any way - merely to replace worn out materials with a new surface. Local residents will be aware that at the end of 2008 we consulted widely on measures to improve the safety of road users, particularly pedestrians and those going to schools in the area. The consultation was comprehensive, and involved letter drops to thousands of homes in the area and an exhibition showing the options available. The conclusion of all of this was that there was no strong feeling in favour of substantial change. As a result, when the Guildford Local Committee considered the matter, it resolved to proceed with the option that involved no physical changes, but will seek to better control on-street parking in the area, and officers are now progressing this option.

Officers will continue to monitor the situation.

JOE BULLOCK

Q4 **The now-vacated buildings of Pond Meadow school in Westborough Ward represent a valuable resource for many local youth, community and educational services, which could be offered by a variety of providers.**

As the owners, how will Surrey County Council ensure that:

(a) the needs of local service providers are properly recognised when the future use of the buildings is decided

(b) the services offered form a coherent, non-overlapping provision geared to the recognised needs of the local community, and

(c) the buildings remain in public ownership and are properly maintained, recognising the site is worth in excess of £1 million?

A Surrey County Council is currently considering the future of the Pond Meadow in the context of Local Authority and community needs. These considerations are at an early exploratory stage and it will be some time before final decisions will be taken. There is a requirement that future building proposals are explicitly developed from a clear exposition of the needs to be met by the use of that building. It is recognised that Westborough ward is a designated Priority Place for both the Surrey Strategic Partnership and the Guildford Local Strategic Partnership and it is expected that Surrey County Council (and other partners) consult with and make best use of the community's ideas & aspirations when planning services. This is an ongoing, developing commitment.

To answer the specific points:

A number of initial discussions have taken place with Kings College, Guildford Grove School, Fiona White, (Surrey County Council Member for Guildford West division) and with officers in Schools and Learning and Services for Young People.

A range of alternative, local proposals is being developed and it is probable that some of these will be developed into formal business plans between now and the summer 2010.

In the initial discussions it was advocated and has been accepted that a wide shared use of the building is acceptable and that the eventual use could therefore have the widest possible benefit for the residents of Westborough. The main parties, who have currently expressed an interest to Surrey County Council are Kings College, Guildford Grove/the Spinney Children's Centre and the Youth Development Service and they have committed to the principle of sharing the building and to producing a joint business plan. Disposal of the buildings is one of the options being considered given the current financial climate. Any business case for community use would need to take into account the capital and revenue consequences of its reuse to fulfil the needs of the community.

It is known that there are no significant sources of capital for the future use of this building and the main parties considering the site are aware of this and the need to identify both their own capital options and combining with others to maximise the final pot to convert the building in the future. This will be a key part of any business plan to reuse the building.

The next stages will include a report to the Surrey County Council Members Asset Panel and it may be that the Local Committee is formally consulted on their view on the main options for the future use. Once the Members Asset Panel has considered the proposal they will make a recommendation to the Surrey County Council Cabinet who will take the final decision.

Dave Johnson, Surrey County Council Area Director

DAVID DAVIS, TRUSTEE OF GASP MOTOR PROJECT

Q5 As the County Council transforms its Services for Young People from being “service providers” to “service commissioners”, how can organisations like GASP best bring the benefits and opportunities it offers to the attention of Members and budget holders in the various services?

A The Transformation Project is currently in its first phase of operation, creating a comprehensive ‘needs assessment’ from which a strategic commissioning framework will be developed. We anticipate Voluntary Sector organisations will ultimately become significant partners in the commissioning framework, through which we will co-produce positive outcomes for young people.

The project plan anticipates that after the full business case for the project is approved by SCC, the procurement process will begin in late 2010/11 and continue throughout 2011/12 so that we are in a position to ‘go live’ for 2012/13. During procurement all appropriate agencies will be invited to explore with us how they can most effectively contribute to specific positive outcomes.

However, until the commissioning framework is finalised there is no immediate action for organisations such as GASP to take and in the meantime the project team will ensure all stakeholders and prospective partners are kept informed of progress through regular updates using all available media

Annex 3

CLLR. W. D. BARKER (HORSLEYS)

Q1 Is the Guildford Highways Manager aware of the appalling state of Wisley Lane and Lock Lane which runs through the village of Wisley from the junction on the A3 through to Lower Pyrford Road?

In particular is he aware of the increased volumes of traffic now using this through road, the narrow sections which cause vehicles to give way, the poor state of repair with severe potholes at the road edge, the number of recent car collisions and the photos provided by the resident of Church Farm?

Is he also aware that not even the speed limit signage is functional in that in one direction 30 mph is the regulated speed but in the other direction it is 40 mph?

While I am aware that part of the road is outside his managerial remit I would have thought there was some co-ordination on such important issues of traffic speed orders from Guildford to neighbouring Woking.

Will he agree that a road safety audit is long overdue and urgently needed?

A Wisley Lane and Lock Lane are similar to many country lanes in carrying higher levels of traffic than they were designed for, and in suffering from the effects of the recent winter conditions. The roads have been inspected, and all defects noted will be attended to in accordance with the County Council's normal priorities and within the budgets available.

The speed limit signage has also been inspected, and has been found to be correct. A 40 mph limit applies from a point close to the junction with the A3 slip road up to the northern extremity of Wisley village. Beyond these points the road is derestricted (i.e.60 mph). There is no 30 mph limit in force on these roads.

Members and members of the public are encouraged to report any defects or other concerns via the County Council's website (www.surreycc.gov.uk, and click on 'report it') or via the Contact Centre (0300 200 1003). Defects reported in these ways will be directed to an appropriate officer irrespective of administrative boundaries or individual officers' responsibilities.

CLLR. W. D. BARKER (HORSLEYS)

Q2 Will the Manager for Parking give details of how on street parking is regulated in the villages of Ripley and East Horsley? How often are parking attendants required to check for illegally parked vehicles and what are the amounts of fines collected by monthly break down from September 2009 to February 2010?

A In the past 6 months - Ripley has been visited on 14 occasions and resulted in 32 Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) being issued. During the same period, East Horsley has been visited on 14 occasions resulting in 25 PCNs being issued.

	<u>Month</u>	<u>Visits</u>	<u>PCNs issued</u>
<u>Ripley</u>	September 2009	3	11
	October 2009	2	3
	November 2009	3	11
	December 2009	1	0
	January 2010	2	2
	February 2010	3	5
	TOTAL		14
<u>East Horsley</u>	September 2009	3	6
	October 2009	2	3
	November 2009	3	10
	December 2009	1	0
	January 2010	2	2
	February 2010	3	4
	TOTAL		14

It is difficult to be precise about the fines collected, since some drivers pay a lower charge within 14 days, while some do not. Others may choose to appeal, and this takes some time to resolve.