



Minutes of meeting

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

Date: Wednesday 23 June 2010

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: Lancaster Hall, Send

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)

Mr Mark Brett-Warburton (Guildford South-East) Chairman

Mr Graham Ellwood (Guildford East) Vice-Chairman

Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)

Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)

Ms Fiona White (Guildford West)

Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)

Mr David Carpenter (Merrow)

Ms Mary Laker (Worplesdon)

Mr Terence Patrick (Send)

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 Sarah Di Caprio (Holy Trinity)

Mr John Garrett (Lovelace)

* substitute

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

At the start of the meeting one minutes silence was held for Mike Nevins, the former Chairman of the Guildford Local Committee and Member for Worplesdon.

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

- Enforcement of planning law in the green belt (Sandra Morgan, Worplesdon Parish Council).
- Anti-social behaviour at the Hog's Back (Tamzin Yates, Puttenham resident and Richard Griggs, Puttenham Parish Council). It was agreed that if an appropriate resolution has not been agreed prior to the next meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010 this item would be included on the agenda.
- The resurfacing of the B2215 (John Creasey, Send).
- The design speed of Grange Road (Jim Blake and Nick Holloway, Queen Elizabeth Park Residents' Association). It was agreed that the Local Highways Manager would meet with residents to discuss the issue further.
- Pedestrian crossing by Debenhams (Maurice Barham, The Guildford Society).

21/10 Apologies for absence and substitutions [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Pauline Searle, Marsha Moseley, Keith Taylor, Nigel Manning (substituted by Matt Furniss),

22/10 Minutes of the last meeting (10 March 2010) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

23/10 Declarations of interest [Item 3]

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Sarah Di Caprio (Item 10), because she is a Trustee Director of Voluntary Action South West Surrey.
- Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Items 7 and 8), because she is a member of the British Horse Society.
- Tony Rooth (Items 7 and 8), because his wife is a horse rider.

24/10 Petitions [Item 4]

- None were received.

25/10 Written public questions [Item 5]

One written public question was received. The answer is set out in Annex 1.

In relation to question 1, David Goodwin highlighted that he has received complaints from a range of people who use the bridleway, including walkers and riders. He noted that it has been a bridleway for a long time and that the restrictions should have been enforced in the past.

26/10 Written members' questions [Item 6]

Three written Member questions were received. Answers are set out in Annex 2.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

In relation to question 1, Matt Furniss questioned how many responses were received to the consultation and what was the distribution of developer's newsletter. He also suggested that the previous road layout had been satisfactory for the employees who worked for DEFRA on the site. The Local Highways Manager proposed discussing the issue further outside of the meeting. He highlighted that it is the responsibility of the planning authority to approve the plans of the developer for the road layout, and that the Highways Authority cannot go against decisions made during the planning process.

In relation to question 2, Tony Phillips questioned if Surrey County Council will ensure that the alleyway remains open in the short-term and is adopted by them in the long-term. The Local Highways Manager said that he would work with Rights of Way colleagues to discuss getting the hedges cut and adopting the alleyway.

In relation to question 3, Jenny Wicks and Terrence Patrick questioned when the bollard was installed. The Local Highways Manager responded that the work was completed on Monday 21 June 2010.

27/10 Byways Open to All Traffic 538 and 539 West Horsley. Request to consider a Traffic Regulation Order [Item 7]

The Committee received an additional written response from the owners of Fullers Farm, attached at Annex 3.

Brian Cohen (local resident):

- objected to the proposed TRO and suggested that the condition of the byways is not too bad. He noted that it is not just motor vehicles that cause damage.

Charles Hope (Chairman of West Horsley Parish Council):

- supported the proposed TRO and contended that the byways are not suitable for motor vehicles. He suggested that the condition of the byways is worsening.

The Countryside Access Officer highlighted that there are byways across Surrey that are in worse condition than the two under consideration. She noted that cutting back the hedges would improve visibility and safety. In addition, local people had expressed an interest in maintaining the hedges.

Members highlighted their concern for the safety of users of the byways, particularly those walking, cycling and riding. They suggested that the byways are not suitable for use by both motor vehicles and non-motorised transport.

The Committee were concerned that spending a modest sum of money on repairing the byways will only temporarily fix the problem and that further funding would be required to repair further damage done to the byways. The Committee felt that better value for money would be achieved if the byways were repaired and then closed to motor vehicles to prevent further significant damage.

Bill Barker proposed that the Committee should approve the publication of a Notice of Intention to make Traffic Regulation Orders prohibiting all motor vehicles on Byways Open to All Traffic 538 and 539. This was agreed by a unanimous vote. This decision went against the officer's recommendation.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) that the grounds for making a Traffic Regulation Order are met, and a Notice of the Intention to make an Order should be published for Byways Open to All Traffic 538 and 539 (West Horsley) prohibiting all motor vehicles, between points A-B on drawings No3/1/72/H12 (Appendix 1) and 3/1/72/H13 (Appendix 2).

Reason for the decision:

To protect the Byway from unsuitable use and to avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the Byway.

28/10 Byway Open to All traffic 137 (Effingham) Traffic Regulation Order [Item 8]

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) that the grounds for making a TRO are met, and a Notice of the Intention to make an Order should be published for Byway Open to All Traffic 137 (Effingham) prohibiting motor vehicles exceeding 7ft in width, as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/58/H13 (see appendix 1).

Reason for the decision:

To protect the Byway from flytipping and maintain the amenity for users.

29/10 Local Committee Protocol [Item 9]

The Committee welcomed the changes to the protocol to increase public engagement. Members questioned how the business community had been made aware that they could ask questions and submit petitions to the Local Committee. The Area Director for South West Surrey informed the Committee that this had been done through the Chambers of Commerce and other business forums.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) to adopt the revised protocol attached as Appendix A, including the reduction in the number of people required to sign a petition being presented to the Local Committee from 100 to 50.

Reason for decision:

The revised protocol provides residents and businesses greater opportunity to influence local decisions.

30/10 Local Committee Budgets 2010/11 [Item 10]

The Committee discussed the most appropriate way to allocate the capital budget. Members noted that other local committees divided the £30,000 between each Member. At the same time, they also recognised that allocating the funding to just a few voluntary groups often achieves greater value for money. The Committee agreed to identify potential projects over the summer to be considered at the next meeting. If one or more suitable projects could not be identified by September, it

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

was agreed that the Committee would divide the funding equally amongst the County Council Members.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) to note the actions carried out under delegated authority.
- b) the proposed expenditure from the Members' Revenue Allocation budget.
- c) the return of revenue and capital funding committed in previous years and no longer required.
- d) the principles for allocating the revenue budget of £82,500.
- e) the principles for allocating the capital budget of £30,000.
- f) the delegation of the Community Safety budget of £14,500 to the Area Director for use with the Safer Guildford Partnership.

Reason for decision:

The Committee is required to agree arrangements for the allocation of its budgets.

31/10 Annual Report on the Safer Guildford Partnership [Item 11]

The Area Director for South West Surrey highlighted the significant achievements of the Safer Guildford Partnership over the past year and set out the financial challenges that it will face in the near future. The Borough Inspector noted that the burglary figures are now at their lowest level since 2006. Members recognised the important contribution of the Street Angels in achieving the significant reductions in alcohol related violence.

The Committee questioned what is being done to address anti-social behaviour at the Hog's Back. The numbers of incidents being reported to the Police do not reflect the level of public concern and the Borough Inspector encouraged local residents to report incidents as soon as possible. It is recognised as a neighbourhood issue, which means that it has additional resources allocated to addressing the issue. The Area Director for South West Surrey highlighted that the key partners are working together to develop a coordinated response.

The Chairman thanked Fiona White for her work as the Committee's representative on the Safer Guildford Partnership. It was agreed that the new Vice-Chairman would take on this role.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) to note the contents of the report and the activities of the Partnership in the year 2009-2010.
- b) to offer comments on the work of the Partnership and on priorities for the future.
- c) that Graham Ellwood will represent the Committee on the Safer Guildford Partnership Executive.

Reason for decision:

The Local Committee is responsible for monitoring the work of Community Safety Partnership. The Committee is required to nominate a County Council Member to be its representative on the Safer Guildford Executive.

32/10 Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy [Item 12]

The Committee commended the excellent work of the Surrey Waste Partnership and noted the significant achievements made in Guildford, including the support provided by Guildford Borough Council Officers to other local authorities in Surrey. Members approved of the new approach to waste management and the decision not to use incinerators. Members encouraged all partners to continue to consider new technology as it emerges.

The Local Committee:

- a) endorsed the effective joint working of the Surrey Waste Partnership and the proposed changes to the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Reason for decision:

The Committee had an opportunity to contribute to the current consultation.

33/10 Civil Parking Enforcement [Item 13]

Members raised significant concerns regarding the proposals to change the Civil Parking Enforcement and Controlled Parking Zone surplus arrangements.

The Committee noted with satisfaction the progress made by Park and Ride in Guildford in keeping over 1,000 cars a day (1,500 in the busiest times) out of the town centre, reducing congestion in line with Surrey's Local Transport Plan objectives and enhancing the viability of town centre businesses.

Members recognised that this would not have been possible without the capital contributions from both GBC and SCC and the financial arrangements relating to the controlled parking zone (CPZ) surplus put in place in 1999. They highlighted that the surplus from the Guildford CPZ arose from good management and realistic pricing since its inception in 1997.

The Committee recognised that the subsidy from the CPZ surplus fund (£373,046 in 2009/10) is essential to the continuance of the Park and Ride service. Of that sum £196,929 was spent on subsidising buses, the remaining £176,117 contributed to the running costs of the sites, including business rates, security and maintenance of the car parks themselves. Members were mindful of the need for further subsidy for the major transport scheme for Guildford, which includes two more Park and Ride sites. The Department for Transport has already approved this scheme in principle.

The Committee was alarmed at the County Council's proposal to transfer the Guildford CPZ surplus fund to pay for the deficit of other Surrey districts which have not managed their controlled parking zones effectively or had pricing policies designed to recover their expenses. Annex 4 sets out the net cost of Controlled Parking Enforcement by district across Surrey.

The Committee recorded its satisfaction with the current administration of civil parking enforcement in Guildford. Members noted that they value the well trained and stable workforce that carries out a difficult task with distinction. The Committee recognised that the negligible number of appeals against Guildford

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

parking tickets are a testament to the good relations between the officers and members of the public.

Members reiterated that they do not want to see enforcement linked to commercial gain. They were concerned that this would result in incentives to maximise the issue of parking contravention notices and increase the clamping of vehicles. This would affect businesses, deter visitors and impact on residents.

Members questioned if Guildford Borough Council would tender to take on responsibility for parking in Guildford and Waverley if the County Council adopts a new approach. The Parking Services Manager noted that all options are being considered.

The Surrey County Council Cabinet Member for Change and Efficiency recognised that parking is a divisive issue across Surrey and each area has its own arrangements. He encouraged the Local Committee to lobby the Cabinet so that they are better informed of the arrangements in Guildford.

Jenny Wicks proposed that the Local Committee urges the County Council not to alter the well established current arrangements for the Guildford CPZ surplus and to defer the tendering of the Civil Parking enforcement. This was seconded by Tony Rooth and agreed unanimously.

It was agreed that the Chairman and Jenny Wicks would meet with the Deputy Leader of Surrey County Council and the Cabinet Member for Transport to put forward the views of the Local Committee. It was noted that the Cabinet would now not consider the issue until 13 July 2010, rather than 29 June.

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) to note Annex A to this report.
- b) that any comments made by the Committee be passed to the Cabinet Member for Transport with a request that they be taken into consideration in any decision taken by the Cabinet on this issue.
- c) to urge the Surrey County Council Cabinet not to alter the well established current arrangements for the Guildford CPZ surplus.
- d) to call on Surrey County Council to defer tendering this function so that discussions on the future of civil parking enforcement can take place between the County Council and Surrey districts.

Reason for decision:

The Local Committee is very concerned that the proposed changes to Civil Parking Enforcement across Surrey will have a disproportionately negative impact on Guildford, in particular the provision of the Park and Ride service.

34/10 Local Committee Response to the Joint Scrutiny Review of the Severe Winter Weather [Item 14]

The Committee praised Council staff that struggled in through the snow to deliver essential services to the most vulnerable members of our community. They suggested that it is unreasonable for people to expect Surrey to function normally in such extreme circumstances.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

Members recognised that the provision of grit bins is one means of enabling residents to help themselves. They suggested that it is important that residents are clear who is responsible for the bins, know who to contact and what the salt is to be used for. In addition, residents should be given clear advice regarding clearing the footways outside their house.

The Committee recommended that a review of gritting routes is needed. They recognised that some B roads carry more traffic than A roads and this should be taken into consideration. Any review should also make most of Members local knowledge. The Committee requested a further report in September showing all the proposals regarding grit bins and revised gritting routes.

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) to note the report attached at Annex A.
- (ii) that any comments made by the Committee be passed to the Cabinet Member for Transport with a request that they be taken into consideration in any decision taken by the Cabinet on this issue.

Reason for decision

The response to the severe winter weather is an important issue and all Local Committees were invited to comment on the report attached at Annex A.

35/10 Review of Parking Restrictions in areas outside the Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone [Item15]

Members supported the recommendations of the review. The Committee recognised that the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) surplus currently funds the CPZ review process. They questioned how this would be funded in future if the proposals set out in Item 13 were agreed. The Parking Services Manager informed the Committee that a central Parking Team based at County Hall currently reviews all the other Controlled Parking Zones in Surrey, however it is not clear if this arrangement would remain under the proposed changes.

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) that the Guildford Non-Town Centre CPZ and Guildford Parish Consolidation Orders 2004 and subsequent amendment orders are consolidated into two new consolidation orders covering those areas.
- (ii) that the proposals shown in Annex 4 be formally advertised as an intention to make an Order under sections 1,2,3,32,35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made.
- (iii) a further report is presented to the Committee to consider any unresolved representations that may arise.
- (iv) that Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport Group considers the introduction of bus stop clearway restrictions at bus stops in the immediate vicinity of the proposals.
- (v) that the resources necessary to effectively enforce the proposed restrictions in both this and the other review areas are considered further.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

- (vi) that reports dealing with the other areas being considered (Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough and Stoughton), and the ad-hoc changes, be reported to the next meeting of this Committee in September.

Reason for decision

The proposed controls will ensure easier traffic flow, particularly around junctions and promote a better balance in the use of kerbside space.

36/10 Speed Management [Item 16]

The Committee welcomed the policy and recognised the important role of parish councils.

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) that the willingness of Parish Councils to contribute resources to the management of speed be welcomed.
- (ii) that for the reasons set out in the report, the rules in paragraphs 3 to 14 be approved as the Committee's policy for the deployment of Vehicle Activated Signs by Parish Councils in Guildford.

Reason for decision

The willingness of Parish Councils to participate in the management of speed is welcomed, and the proposed rules are designed to maximise the effectiveness of the proposal while minimising the risks.

37/10 The Transportation Task Group [Item17]

The Local Committee agreed:

- (i) that the membership of the Transportation Task Group for 2010/11 will be Mark Brett-Warburton, Graham Ellwood, David Goodwin, Jenny Wicks, Tony Phillips and Terence Patrick.
- (ii) that the Terms of Reference for the Transportation Task Group as set out in Annex A be approved.

Reason for decision

The work of the Transportation Task Group has been invaluable in considering the implications of complex issues where priorities have to be established within limited budgets and taking into account the wishes of local residents expressed through public consultation.

38/10 Heathrow Airtrack. Objections to the Transport and Works Act Order 1992 [Item18]

The Head of Transport for Surrey updated the Committee on negotiations with BAA and informed Members that he would be meeting them to discuss a new package of concessions on the 1 July 2010, with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Transport. Members were concerned about the implications of

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

Airtrack on the train timetable. The Committee questioned if the project would ever be implemented in light of the current financial situation and the reduction in public expenditure.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- (i) give its views on the general approach and principles of the report, which will form the basis of the report to Cabinet in July.
- (i) give its views on the specific recommendations, regarding objections to the Heathrow Airtrack scheme, to be made to Cabinet as set out in the report.

Reason for decision

The Committee had an opportunity to comment on the current status of the County Council's objections to Heathrow Airtrack scheme.

39/10 Forward Programme [Item19]

The Local Committee agreed that the following items would be considered for future meetings:

- a) the capital building project for schools.
- b) an update on the winter plan.
- c) Anti-social behaviour at the Hog's Back, if an appropriate resolution has not been agreed prior to the next meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010.

Reason for decision

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

[Meeting ended at 10.00pm]

.....(Mr Mark Brett-Warburton – 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 22 September 2010 at 7pm at St Peter's Centre, Ash.

Annex 1: Written Public Questions

KEITH CHESTERTON, CHESTNUT AVENUE

Q1 Green Lane above Guildown - Bridleway 14, Guildford

Surrey County Council has recently erected intimidatory notices threatening prosecution to people taking their cars onto the tarmaced stretch of the BW at the top of the Down. It has done this to make clear its right to stop the owners of 1 new house & others with planning permission to build other houses from using this section of the BW for access to these properties by motor vehicle.

However, this will have the effect of stopping the long standing access by car to that stretch by residents wishing to use the down for totally innocuous reasons.

What actions are Surrey County Council & Guildford Borough Council taking to ensure that residents, especially the elderly &/or infirm will continue to be able to access that section of the BW, on the top of the down, which is tarmaced?

I have used this BW for more than 35 years mostly on foot or by bicycle, but on a number of occasions by car. This use has occurred when I have been taking children for a picnic on the open fields owned by GBC & joining a walk starting from the top, but mostly taking elderly relatives to the top, so they could go into the fields & see the view. Other residents have done likewise & also taken cars up there to exercise their dog in the fields. At least 1 resident has done this for 50 years. In my use on foot, I have never experienced any problems from the limited car use there has been.

There are a number of ways by which this might be able to be accomplished, varying from using SCC's ownership of Henley Fort, GBC's ownership of the fields, or a determination by SCC not to enforce against the class of visitors to the countryside.

A Surrey County Council has been reminded of its duty to protect walkers and riders using a public bridleway by the local Members and a large group of local residents. The lane is recorded as a bridleway. It has been an offence to drive a motor vehicle on a bridleway without lawful authority since 1930. However, considering the volume of complaints and other evidence received the County Council is currently reviewing its position.

Annex 2: Written Member Questions

MATT FURNISS (CHRISTCHURCH)

Q1 Following the changes to the Boxgrove Road / Epsom Road junction can the accident statistics be published for this junction? Also what public consultation and safety assessments were conducted before the works were completed to the road layout and pedestrian crossing at this junction?

A In the five years 2005 to 2009 inclusive there were 6 personal injury collisions at the junction. All resulted in slight injuries. There were a range of causations – a motorcycle skidding on gravel, another motorcycle skidding on ice, two right-turning collisions (different configurations), one shunt, and one with no details given.

The planning applications for the redevelopment of the DEFRA site included details of the proposed changes to the old DEFRA site access at the signal junction. Those applications were publicised and the public were able to make representations that the LPA considered when deciding the applications. Prior to construction, local residents were informed of the works by a newsletter from the developer, who appears to have been proactive in these matters and keen to involve the local community. Advanced notice signs were erected on site and the works advertised on SCC's roadworks webpage.

The proposed highway works are subject to SCC's normal three-stage road safety audit process. Stage 1 was carried out at the planning stage; Stage 2 was carried out as part of the review of the developer's highway design within the county/developer highway agreement. Stage 3 will be carried out when the junction works are complete, and before SCC formally adopts the developer's highway works.

The junction works are not yet fully complete. Further work is required to the detection loops following which the signal controller will be calibrated. Until this is complete, the controller assumes 'permanent demand' on all approaches to the junction, which results in the signal sequence operating inefficiently with resultant delays. The signal company will be attending the site again later this week.

TONY PHILLIPS

Q2 Alleyway Between High View Road & Farnham Road

Would you please advise what can be done so that measures are put in place to ensure that responsibility is taken for the maintenance of the above footpath. What needs to be done for Surrey County Council to adopt the footpath (if it is claimed it is currently not adopted) and to issue confirmation it is a right of way bearing in mind the following:

- The alley way has been in continuous use in excess of 30 years.
- Handrails and steps have been installed by Surrey County Council.

Letter from Surrey County Council dated 7 April sent to Onslow Village Residents Association stating the alleyway is owned by Guildale Estates Ltd but the surface is vested in Surrey County Council as Highway Authority.

You have issued a further letter dated 20 May claiming the footpath is not adopted and the route is not a right of way and stating that Guildale Estates Ltd has been dissolved and in theory the ownership has passed to the crown.

A The alleyway between the turning circle of High View Road and the A31 Farnham Road is currently not shown on either of the two methods of recording public highways. It is not shown on the Definitive Map of Public Rights of Way (which shows where the public have rights), nor is it recorded in the List of Maintainable Streets (which shows which paths and roads are maintainable at the public expense).

The County Council's Highways Information Team sent a letter on 7 April to the Onslow Village Resident's Association stating, in error, that the alley was recorded as part of the adoption of High View Road. On the 20 May the same team corrected that statement after reviewing the information available to them. Principally this was the records of the West Area Highways Team, as the original adoption plan for High View Road no longer exists.

Neither the Countryside Access Team (who look after public rights of way) nor the West Area Highways Team have any records of maintaining the path, nor installing the steps and handrails. The land over which the path runs is registered to Guildale Estates Ltd. It seems likely that the steps were installed by Guildale Estates Ltd; they were not installed by the County Council.

As it stands a public right of way is not recognised over the alleyway, but this is not to say that the long use referred to has not brought about a public right of way at least on foot. After 1960 the creation of a public right of way in this way does not result in any resulting highway becoming maintainable at the public expense. The County Council would have only the basic duty of the highway authority to assert the public's right to use the way and prevent or remove obstructions, but would have no power to maintain it.

Alternatively the owner of land may dedicate land as a highway, and may serve notice on the County Council for it to become maintainable, or may make an agreement with County Council for it to be maintained at the public expense in future. However, the owner must put the path into repair to the required standard and maintain it for a period of at least 12 months. A search at Companies House reveals that Guildale Estates Ltd has been wound up. In this case any land belonging to the company would revert to the Crown. It seems unlikely that the Crown Solicitor would willing to have the way made up to the required standard.

JENNY WICKS (CLANDONS & HORSLEYS)

Q3 The bollard at the top of the A3 on-slip road at Burnt Common was demolished in an accident. This location has had a long series of accidents. It has no street lighting and the bollard (a traditional square one) is very important to the safety of the road. The demolition was reported to the SCC call centre on February 4 (reference 83061591) with a request that the bollard be speedily replaced.

Four and a half months after this was reported no replacement has been made. The call centre said the job had been done and the case closed. This is patently wrong. I received a further message, having involved my county councillor, that the replacement would be done in early June by the community gang, but still nothing has happened.

Just how much longer will it take to perform this simple task in this dangerous location?'

A The bollard was scheduled for replacement when the community gang was operating in the Shere division in the week commencing 7 June. Unfortunately due to a misunderstanding the correct fittings were not obtained in time. This has now been rectified and the new bollard has now been installed.

Annex 3

**Byways Open to All Traffic 538 & 539 West Horsley:
Request to consider a Traffic Regulation Order (Road Traffic
Regulation Act 1984)**

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

23 June 2010

Update to the Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

Item 7 Appendix 4, the owners of Fullers Farm wish to state that Mr Brian Cohens letter is factually incorrect on the following points:

- In response to the first paragraph on page 3, we do not own the land on which the barbed wire fence has been erected.
- In response to the third paragraph on page 3, we paid in full for the surfacing of the road marked B to C on the map.
- In response to the third paragraph on page 3, we purchased the property over 15 years ago.

Elaine and Peter Scott

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 September 2010

Annex 4

Income on a district by district basis - 2008/09

Note - figures for 2009/10 not all yet available.

Income - income from PCNs etc

Expenditure - district staff costs / overheads. Note not all areas have the same number of CEOs

District	Income - for CPE	Expenditure for CPE	Net cost for CPE	Income for CPZ	Expenditure for CPZs	Net cost for CPZ	Total income per district	Total expenditure per district	Total net cost
Elmbridge	£239,055	£314,241	£75,186	£281,724	£215,499	-£66,225	£520,779	£529,740	£8,961
Epsom & Ewell	£108,684	£149,360	£40,676				£108,684	£149,360	£40,676
Guildford	£194,038	£196,038	£2,000	£1,080,553	£678,391	-£402,162	£1,274,591	£874,429	-£400,162
Mole Valley	£119,885	£193,125	£73,240				£119,885	£193,125	£73,240
Reigate & Banstead	£301,260	£329,919	£28,659				£301,260	£329,919	£28,659
Runnymede	£91,024	£138,609	£47,585				£91,024	£138,609	£47,585
Spelthorne	£61,092	£132,032	£70,940				£61,092	£132,032	£70,940
Surrey Heath	£121,028	£232,181	£111,153	£118,410	£176,040	£57,630	£239,438	£408,221	£168,783
Tandridge	£67,368	£170,557	£103,189				£67,368	£170,557	£103,189
Waverley	£106,290	£286,318	£180,028				£106,290	£286,318	£180,028
Woking	£84,188	£239,167	£154,979	£155,979	£121,621	-£34,358	£240,167	£360,788	£120,621
TOTALS	£1,493,912	£2,381,547	£887,635	£1,636,666	£1,191,551	-£445,115	£3,130,578	£3,573,098	£442,520