



Minutes of meeting

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)

Date: Wednesday 9 March 2011

Time: 7.00 pm

Place: St Mark's Hall, Guildford Road (A323), Wyke, Guildford GU3 2DA.

Members present:

Surrey County Council

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

Mr David Goodwin (Guildford South-West)

Ms Fiona White (Guildford West)

Ms Pauline Searle (Guildford North)

Mr Keith Taylor (Shere)

Mr Nigel Sutcliffe (Worplesdon)

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)

Mr Tony Rooth (Shalford)

Mr Graham Ellwood (Guildford East)

Ms Marsha Moseley (Ash)

Guildford Borough Council (for Transportation matters)

Ms Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley)

Mr Nigel Manning (Ash Vale)

Ms Mary Laker (Worplesdon)

Ms Diana Lockyer-Nibbs (Normandy)

Mr Matt Furniss (Christchurch) *

Mr David Carpenter

Ms Sarah Di Caprio

Mr Tony Phillips

Ms Caroline Reeves

Mr John Garrett

* substitute

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

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

- The Local Committee's understanding of the volunteering undertaken by the Trail Ride Fellowship (Steven Taylor and Mike Wheaton).
- The Local Committee's awareness of Surrey County Council's Walking Strategy (Keith Chesterton).
- Consideration of a pedestrian crossing on Kings Road (A248) in Shalford (James Palmer).
- The admissions process and criteria for George Abbott School (Clare Goddard).
- The closure of the X65 west-bound bus stop at Puttenham Cross Roads (George Smith).
- The need for councillors to act with impartiality (Steven Taylor).

79/10 Apologies for absence and substitutions [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Terence Patrick (substituted by Matt Furniss).

80/10 Minutes of the last meetings (8 December 2010) [Item 2]

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

81/10 Declarations of interest [Item 3]

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Diana Lockyer-Nibbs in relation to Item 7, because she is a member of the British Horse Society.
- Fiona White in relation to Item 11, because she is a member of the Barn Youth Project Management Committee.
- Graham Ellwood in relation to Item 4, because his wife is a teacher at George Abbott School.
- Pauline Searle in relation to Item 19, because she is a trustee of Disability Challengers.
- Keith Taylor and Tony Phillips in relation to Item 13, because they represent Guildford Borough Council on the court of the University of Surrey.
- Sarah Di Caprio in relation to Item 10, because she is on the management committee of the Short Stay School in Guildford.

82/10 Petitions [Item 4]

Two petitions were received and responded to in writing (**Annex 1**).

- Provide a safe route to school, Better Crossing Provision New Inn Lane Burpham (Mrs Karen Beard).

Graham Ellwood noted that c£70,000 is available from Section 106 planning gains and he will be pressing for implementation of the scheme.

- Closure of X65 west-bound bus stop at Puttenham Cross Roads, A31 Hog's Back (Mrs Karen Smith – Puttenham Hill Nursing Home).

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

Tony Rooth contended that the County Council must look at alternative options, including moving the bus stop and changing the route. The Bus Service Planning Team Manager noted his support for increasing bus usage, but also acknowledged the safety concerns of the Police and Highways colleagues. He explained that under legislation, a bus provider could stop using a route on safety grounds. He stated that he would continue to work with Stagecoach to look at alternative options.

A third petition was received from Tony Rooth and will be responded to within ten working days:

- 'The undersigned give notice to the Council of their concerns over large potholes at the entrance to East Flexford Lane from the A31 Hogs Back. Repairs need to be effected and be incorporated in the provision of much needed slip lanes. Attached is a copy of the Land Registry Proprietorship Register indicating ownership of the land in question.'

83/10 Written public questions [Item 5]

Five written public questions were received and responded to in writing (**Annex 2**).

- Ms Lori Winch-Johnson regarding winter maintenance in Charlottesville.

David Goodwin explained that the Winter Task Group was meeting to consider what improvements could be made to the County Council's response. He informed the Committee that the Task Group would be recommending that Priority 2 roads be treated as Priority 1 roads in future. However, this would need to be agreed by the Cabinet.

- Mr Brian Cohen regarding the efficiency of democratic processes.
- Ms Ruth Kirby regarding the bus stop at Puttenham cross-roads.
- Mr Chris Meeks regarding the bus stop at Puttenham cross-roads.
- Ms Nicki Coveney regarding the bus stop at Puttenham cross-roads.

Tony Rooth recognised that it was a mistake to remove the bus stop without consultation or consideration of alternative options, but also the commercial issues that would need to be addressed. David Goodwin highlighted that the route is not subsidised by the County Council. It is a commercial route and the council has limited opportunity to influence a private company.

84/10 Written members' questions [Item 6]

Three written member questions were received and responded to in writing (**Annex 3**).

- Cllr Diana Lockyer-Nibbs regarding the bridge over Glaziers Lane.
- Cllr Sarah Di Caprio regarding Winter Maintenance.

Members agreed to add Winter Maintenance to the Forward Plan.

- Cllr Sarah Di Caprio regarding lampposts in Holy Trinity.

85/10 Byways Open to All Traffic 538 & 539 West Horsley: Request to consider a Traffic Regulation Order (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) [Item 7]

The Countryside Access Officer noted that 1,018 letters of objection and 53 letters of support were received. She explained that the County Council has a duty to maintain the highway and that a request for funding for Silkmore Lane had been submitted.

The Principal Solicitor noted that everyone has the right to use the highway as long as they do not damage it or be a nuisance to others. Vehicles are entitled to use the two byways. She highlighted that officers did not believe that any of the criteria for making Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) were met. She stated that if the Committee were minded to make a TRO then clear reasons would need to be identified and recorded.

Members recognised the improvements made to Fullers Farm Road and no longer supported making a TRO on that byway. However, they challenged the classification of Silkmore Lane as a Category 2 byway, with some Members suggesting that it should be a Category 3 on the grounds that an individual can't reasonably walk along it.

Members appreciated that there were very strong feelings on both sides of the debate regarding Silkmore Lane. Some Members suggested waiting to see if funding was available for repair work to Silkmore Lane, and if so, what impact the repairs have once completed.

Jenny wicks recognised the cost that a public inquiry would incur, but asserted that it was important to explore the issue in greater detail and to make the right decision. She proposed holding a public inquiry into Silkmore Lane. Bill Barker seconded this.

The Local Committee agreed that:

- a) the grounds for making a Traffic Regulation Order on Fullers Farm Road have not been met. Therefore other management options will be applied.
- b) a public inquiry should be held to determine if a Traffic Regulation Order should be made on Silkmore Lane.

Reason for decision:

The repair work to Fullers Farm Road has improved the byway and it now no longer meets the policy criteria for a Traffic Regulation Order.

A more detailed consideration of Silkmore Lane is required to establish if a Traffic Regulation Order should be made.

86/10 The Hog's Back Action Plan [Item 8]

The County Council's Assistant Chief Executive reiterated the partnership approach to addressing the anti-social behaviour at the Hogs Back. She reminded the Committee of the proximity of the activity to the school. The Borough Inspector explained that the Police believe that closure of the lay-by, part-time or otherwise, would improve the situation.

Tony Rooth noted that progress has been made. He asked the Committee to support the partial closure of the lay-by. He contended that there are alternative options for HGV

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

drivers to use to take breaks and that the children attending the school must take priority.

The Committee questioned the cost of the proposal. The Senior Engineer explained that a robust arrangement is required to ensure that safety considerations are addressed. The Assistant Chief Executive noted that installing the barrier would lower other costs. The Borough Inspector explained that the Police were spending c£10,000 per year on patrolling the site. They were also incurring other significant costs and the issue was requiring considerable officer time. Whilst the Police would still have to undertake patrols if a barrier was installed, they would be able to reduce the number and cost of them.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) note the progress being made on the action plan.
- b) recommend to Cabinet that they support and fund the installation of a part-time barrier to restrict access to the lay-by on the A31 at the Hogs Back.

Reason for decision:

To address anti-social behaviour in the area around the lay-by by restricting access to the site.

87/10 Surrey Fire & Rescue Authority Public Safety Plan [Item 9]

The Assistant Chief Officer introduced the draft ten-year plan, and noted that the final version would have to be refreshed annually. He explained that the plan recognises that not all the stations are in the right place and that the whole time shift system hasn't changed over time and has become inflexible. He contended that the retained system is not sustainable and the current availability of retained appliances is inconsistent. Training is key for staff, especially for the retained service, because the decrease in emergency incidents has resulted in staff not getting experiential learning.

Members understood the need to keep down costs and increase income generation where appropriate, but they were concerned about the proposal to charge for responding to certain incidents, in particular domestic flooding. The Assistant Chief Officer recognised the importance of flooding advice received over the phone and stated that the point would be considered with the rest of the feedback from the consultation.

The Committee questioned what would be expected of volunteers and how could they get involved in helping to deliver the service. The Assistant Chief Officer explained that this would vary across the county; he provided examples of how the Women's Royal Voluntary Service and Age Concern already work with the Fire and Rescue Service.

Members were concerned about the proposal to remove the on-call appliance at Gomshall Fire Station and the impact it would have on response times. The Assistant Chief Officer explained that it is hard to recruit, retain and train retained staff, particularly in Gomshall since the tannery closed. He noted that in 2009/10 the retained appliance was only available for 21% of the time and only responded to 13 incidents.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

The Committee questioned if the plan would impact on the provision for Ash. The Assistant Chief Officer clarified that the current arrangements would remain in place and Hampshire would continue to send appliances when necessary.

Overall, Members welcomed the plan. They recognised that the Comprehensive Spending Review would require further savings to be identified and that the service would have to continue to adapt and change.

The Local Committee agreed that the minutes of the meeting would be submitted as a response to the consultation on the Public Safety Plan.

Reason for decision:

To ensure that the final Public Safety Plan reflects the needs and views of Guildford residents.

88/10 Borough Youth Plan and Transforming Youth Services [Item 10]

The Area Youth Manager West noted that the plan had been informed by significant consultation. He contended that the service had performed well against its targets despite it being a difficult year as the service was undergoing significant changes. He highlighted the proposal to deliver more youth work in Westborough and the proposal to develop weekend provision. He also noted that the cuts for 2011/12 are not likely to be as much as the 30% set out in the report.

Fiona White welcomed the Youth Development Service's proposal to deliver more youth work in Westborough, but highlighted that there is already a voluntary organisation delivering significant amounts of youth work in the area.

The Committee questioned if detached youth work provides value for money and if the service could do more to work with children from the age of 11. Members were also concerned about the provision for more rural parts of the borough and the support provided to young carers.

The Local Committee agreed the targets and priorities for youth service delivery in Guildford in 2011-12 as outlined in Section 2 of the report.

Reason for decision:

The targets set out in the plan and the resulting outcomes will benefit those young people in the borough that are most in need, as well as providing a range of activities and opportunities for all young people who choose to access them.

89/10 Libraries Public Value Review [Item 11]

The Committee were very concerned about the proposal to stop the mobile library service. Members recognised the important social role that it fulfils. They feared that if Community Partnered Libraries do not succeed and the libraries close there would not be a mobile service able to operate in their place, meaning that some areas would have no provision. Greater use of the mobile service would in turn make it more cost effective.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

The Library Operations Manager noted the Committee's concerns and explained that all users of the mobile library service would be contacted and alternative arrangements agreed. The alternative provision would remain free of charge. She recognised the importance of the service to individuals, but noted that the service was failing to meet its performance standard. £109,000 of funding has been identified to develop the alternative arrangements. This will include the promotion of Library Direct. Members requested a report back on the investigation into and development of the new arrangements made for existing users of the mobile library.

Members questioned if there were plans to explore further community partnered libraries. The Library Operations Manager explained that the Public Value Review of libraries used a set criteria to assess their performance and the full findings for each library would be put on the Surrey County Council website shortly.

David Goodwin acknowledged his disappointment at the Cabinet's decision and reaffirmed his disagreement with the proposals.

The Local Committee agreed to note that the service will maintain published opening hours and avoid closures by recruiting up to the level of the budget allocated.

Reason for decision:

To move the Public Value Review of Surrey Library Service into the consultation and implementation phase.

90/10 Parking Review in Slyfield [Item 12]

The Local Committee agreed:

a) the proposals shown in Annexe 4a-c be made as 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.

b) the effectiveness of the new restrictions is reviewed during the next review of the area.

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.

91/10 Parking Review in Southway/Ashenden [Item 13]

The On-Street Parking Coordinator highlighted an inconsistency between the report and the diagram attached at Annex 4.1. He explained that on the diagram the wording for the turning circle should read 'Introduce No Waiting Mon-Fri 10am-4pm', as outlined in the revised Annex 4.1 RevE1.

Fiona White asked the Committee to encourage the University of Surrey and the Royal Surrey Hospital to consider their own parking policies. Tony Phillips noted that the proposed arrangements would not solve all the challenges regarding parking in Ashenden. It is a good start, but the Council should use the new powers that it is going

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

to be granted. The On-Street Parking Coordinator said that officers would continue to review the situation.

The Local Committee agreed:

a) the proposals shown in Annexe 4.1 RevE1 and 4.2a-e be made as 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.

b) the proposals shown in Annexe 4.3 and 4.4 be formally advertised as an intention to make an Order, and if no objections are maintained, the Order be made.

c) any unresolved objections that may arise in relation to advertising the proposals in Annex 4.3 and 4.4 are decided, in accordance with the county council's constitution, by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the relevant divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman.

d) the effectiveness of the new restrictions is reviewed during the next review of the area.

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. The Committee agreed a revised version of Annex 4.1, because there was a minor inaccuracy in the original version.

92/10 Parking Review in Stoughton/Grange Road [Item 14]

The Local Committee agreed:

a) the proposals shown in Annexe 4.1 a-b,4.2a-d,4.3&4.4 be made as 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.

b) the effectiveness of the new restrictions is reviewed during the next review of the area.

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.

93/10 Guildford Park and Ride Fares Review [Item 15]

The Local Committee agreed:

a) the revised fares and pricing strategy as set out in this report take effect from 3 April 2011.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

b) the cessation of the Saturdays-only Park & Ride Route 101 operating to/from the Allianz Cornhill Ladymead car park takes place at the end of March 2011.

Reason for decision:

The proposed fares revisions will increase farebox revenue, and the withdrawal of the Ladymead service will reduce costs by approximately £34,500, thus reducing pressure on the Controlled Parking Zone account.

94/10 Speed Limit Prioritisation 2011/12 [Item 16]

Members asked for clarification about the process for altering a speed limit. The Area Highways Manager recognised that the report was ambiguous and explained that if objections were received they shall be referred back to the Cabinet Member.

The Clerk from Effingham Parish Council had submitted in writing a clarification regarding Annexe A as follows:

	Location	Existing	Requested speed
3	A246 Guildford Road, Effingham From existing 50mph westward toward East Horsley boundary	50	40
4	A246 Guildford Road, Effingham From existing 40mph eastward to borough boundary	40	30

The Local Committee agreed:

a) to amend Annexe A in line with the submission from Effingham Parish Council set out above.

b) that the updated Speed Limit programme shown in the amended Annexe A and Annexe B be approved and Officers be authorised to progress the assessment and implementation of these during the 2011/2012 financial year, subject to the level of funding available and to their meeting the requirements of the County Council's Speed Management Policy.

c) 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 improve the safety of Guildford's roads for local residents, as well as people who work and visit the borough.

95/10 Minor Improvements Programme Review [Item 17]

The Local Committee agreed:

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

- a) that the progress made in delivering the minor improvements programme since last year be noted, including the completed projects set out in Annexe A.
- b) that the list of schemes remaining in the forward programme as set out in Annexe B be noted.
- c) 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.
- d) 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 2011/12 budgets are known.

Reason for decision:

To improve Guildford's roads for local residents, as well as people who work and visit the borough.

96/10 2011/12 Highways Budget [Item 18]

The Local Committee agreed:

- a) that the Transportation Task Group recommendations set out in this report should form the basis of the Integrated Transport Schemes programme for 2011/12.
- b) that feasibility studies, design and construction of Vale Road, Ash and the New Pond Road / Binscombe Lane junction, which were frozen due to lack of funds in 2010/11, should commence during 2011/12.
- c) that consultation on Epsom Road, Merrow and feasibility studies and detail design on High Street, Ripley Shere Village Safety Scheme Phase 2 and Pirbright Village Safety Scheme Phase 2, should commence during 2011/12.
- d) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.

Reason for decision:

To improve Guildford's roads for local residents, as well as people who work and visit the borough.

97/10 2010/11 Local Committee Budgets [Item 19]

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) note the actions carried out under delegated authority.
- b) the proposed expenditure from the Members' Capital and the Members' Revenue allocation budgets.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

c) approve the return of revenue and capital committed in 2009/10 and 2010/11, which is no longer required.

Reason for decision:

To enhance the wellbeing of Guildford residents. The Committee is required to ensure the timely and appropriate deployment of its budgets.

98/10 Forward Programme [Item 20]

The Local Committee agreed to:

a) add the following items to the Forward Plan:

- Winter Maintenance

Reason for decision:

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

[Meeting ended at 10.40pm]

.....(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 June 2011 at 7pm. The venue is to be confirmed.

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 9 March 2011

Annex 1 Petitions [Item 4]

Principal petitioner/organisation	Karen Beard, on behalf of 69 signatories
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Guildford East / Burpham
Summary of concerns and requests	A petition for safe crossing provision for school children at George Abbot School and all pedestrians crossing New Inn Lane, Burpham. This is a concern because of the many children who cross this road at least twice a day at busy traffic times.
Response	<p>The provision of a pedestrian crossing facility was considered by the Members Task Group on the 16th of February and it was agreed that it should be included on the Minor Improvements List (see Item 17, Minor Improvements Programme Review report). Subject to the Committee's approval of the Task Group's recommendations, the scheme would be added to the waiting list, which currently consists of 26 schemes awaiting funding. At present on average two schemes per year are funded.</p> <p>Officers are aware that some funds are available through Section 106, Planning gains, which would reduce the amount of funding the Committee needs to fund the scheme.</p>

Principal petitioner/organisation	Susan Lowther, Chairman of the Hogs Back Residents Association, on behalf of 402 signatories (252 signatories are from Guildford Borough, of which 202 are from Puttenham and Wanborough Villages. The remaining 148 visitors to the area).
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Shalford
Summary of concerns and requests	<p>The signatories express alarm and concern at the closure of the Puttenham x-road bus stop. The sudden implementation without consultation with bus users or residents has caused inconvenience, distress and hardship to local people, workers and visitors.</p> <p>What has happened is in direct contravention of the Government's 'Green' agenda to encourage use of public transport. It deprives two villages of a vital transport link and has adverse affects on many people, including two nursing homes, 'The Good Intent' pub, villagers (especially the elderly and the young), as well as walkers accessing the North Downs Way and Puttenham Camping Barn.</p> <p>The petitioners call upon Surrey County Council to reinstate immediately the full bus service to Puttenham and Wanborough villages and the two Hogs Back nursing</p>

	homes whilst meaningful consultation takes place.
Response	<p>Background</p> <p>The bus stop in question is located on the westbound entry slip road to the A31 at Puttenham “Cross Roads”. It is served by bus service X65 from Guildford to Farnham and Alton, which runs hourly along the A31, Mondays to Saturdays. There are 12 trips per day and the operator (Stagecoach) advises that on an average day, perhaps around a third of that number involve a passenger(s) alighting or boarding at this point. Thus, volume of usage is modest at this stop.</p> <p>The service is run “commercially” and not under contract to Surrey County Council. Any decision to serve a particular stop, if there are road safety concerns, is at the operator’s prerogative.</p> <p>In 2009 as part of a response to proposals by the County Council for a Minor Improvement Scheme at the A31/B3000 interchange, Wanborough Parish Council expressed concern over the site of the westbound bus stop. It was noted that buses are expected to pull across in front of other vehicles that are merging onto the A31 from the slip road and that other drivers do not expect a bus to be at a bus stop on a slip road. They drive around the bus directly onto the main carriageway of the A31.</p> <p>A formal Stage 1 Road safety Audit by Surrey County Council in August 2009 re-iterated these concerns: “Drivers entering the A31 westbound carriageway via the acceleration lane and buses using the stop are required to cross each others path in a weaving pattern. This raises the potential for conflict, particularly for drivers unfamiliar with the route. When buses are stationary at the stop the acceleration lane is effectively shortened, creating an imbalance between the merging speed of drivers entering the A31 and traffic already on the 60mph dual carriageway, raising the potential for conflict.”</p> <p>Stagecoach expressed concerns for the safety of their drivers and passengers.</p> <p>Having attended the site, a Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Officer voiced concerns over traffic safety in the context of buses stopping, including conflicts that could result when a bus has to pull off the main carriageway in order to slow and steer across into the slip road to access the stop. Although no accident statistics backed up that view, a warning was made of the potential danger that exists.</p> <p>With such advice received from various sources, the</p>

	<p>County Council's Passenger Transport Team (which co-ordinates matters of bus stop location and infrastructure) identified the need to take action on public safety grounds, whilst recognising that no alternative site for the bus stop was readily available and that some hardship and inconvenience could result for a small number of bus users.</p> <p>Whilst mindful of policies that seek to facilitate and encourage bus usage, current obligations on the Council in terms of Health & Safety on the Highway meant that action had to be initiated. A notice was posted at the stop at the beginning of November 2010, warning bus users of stop suspension from 26 November. Comments were invited but none were received prior to the latter date. This followed established procedures for consultation and advice on bus stop suspensions. The local County Member was informed.</p> <p>Alternatives</p> <p>A meeting including a site visit was held on 9 February 2011. There was attendance from SCC Passenger Transport and Highways representatives, Stagecoach management, representatives of Puttenham and Wanborough Parish Councils and other interested stakeholders including Bus Users UK, local bus users and Hogs Back Residents Association. Chaired by the Divisional Member, the meeting examined the reasons for the suspension, noted objections to it and considered the alternatives. These have been reviewed by Stagecoach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) A new bus stop lay-by: unlikely that funding would be available in short/medium term. Would be costly and need to conform to current design requirements.b) Warning signs for motorists on A31 and B3000: deemed not sufficient to reduce safety riskc) Move bus stop further west on slip road: insufficient to improve safety for busesd) Relocate stop to Springfield Manor driveway entrance: insufficient acceleration/deceleration space; would block access and egress to driveway and would not conform to current design criteriae) Divert bus service westbound via A3 and Puttenham village: Stagecoach estimate the additional journey time to be between 5 and 15 minutes, depending on time of day. They felt this unattractive to customers travelling from Guildford to Farnham (their main clientele) and declined the proposal on commercial grounds.f) Move bus stop westwards to Hogs Back Café lay-by: generally considered by the meeting to be the most suitable alternative, pending a sustainable and affordable longer-term solution. Stagecoach have confirmed that they
--	--

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

	<p>would use this alternative if SCC provided appropriate bus stop furniture and markings and some minor improvement work was carried out on the road surface at the exit point. Stagecoach would insist on unfettered access between 0745 and 1900 hrs, Mondays to Saturdays.</p> <p>Current Position</p> <p>Option f) above is currently the only one proposed that is acceptable to Stagecoach, so they may restore a westbound bus service for Puttenham. For reasons previously outlined, SCC officers are unable, with regret, to recommend a re-opening of the old stop on the B3000 slip road.</p>
--	---

Annex 2 Written public questions [Item 5]

Question from Lori Winch-Johnson, on behalf of the Charlottesville Focus Group

Following downfalls of snow last year, residents living in the high gradient Charlottesville roads of Guildford, had weeks of unthawed ice with which to cope. Failure to grit this area effectively resulted in accidents and specific hardships that the lower areas in town did not experience because the roads there thawed more rapidly. Research shows, as explained by the Head of the County's Highways, that traffic flow has to be sustained in roads in order to ensure that grit is spread and embedded in roads for thawing to take place. As traffic flow ceased completely in the centre of Charlottesville, two schools were forced to close, eventually opening only with great difficulty of access as cars could still not travel along the roads.

Charlottesville residents have now been given money that would have been spent on an additional gritting box, to set up a self help group to shovel salt and to use gritting equipment to clear paths and some danger spots. This is an excellent idea. However, the area will still need key roads gritted to ensure traffic flow. This would greatly assist the 600 pupils' parents attending the two schools, the hospital and nursery, as well the elderly people at the sheltered residence who rely on the bus service, and the doctor's surgery which is a much needed facility. In addition, the traffic flow would provide access for the high number of Charlottesville residents who were left stranded long after the rest of Guildford's lower roads cleared. Members of the community police, the Headteacher of the schools, residents, and a representative of the Holy Trinity Amenity Group have identified eight linking roads.

These eight key roads are: Harvey Road, Bright Hill, Addison Road, Pewley Way, Semaphore Road, Pewley Hill, Sydenham Road and Jenner Road (both the up and down sides of the road). They represent about 4km and would require approximately twenty minutes use of a gritter truck. The roads have been submitted as a proposal to Highways and to the Chairman of the Local Committee, for being the minimum number of roads in the Priority Two route needing Council gritting to ensure essential traffic flow with access in and out of the area. It is understood that a small number of roads can be recommended - with supporting rationale - by the ward member, for agreement by the Committee for treatment.

Can the Highways officer, and the Local Committee, now guarantee that these 8 roads as a minimum, within the priority Two will definitely be gritted were there to be severe snowy weather in future?

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

Answer

Under the 2010/11 Winter Service Plan (available on the SCC website), all carriageways forming part of the public highway network are allocated to one of three groupings.

Priority 1: Approximately 37% of the network including roads carrying over 12,000 vehicles per day, accesses to A&E hospitals and major bus routes. Treated in advance of any forecast frost, ice or snow.

Priority 2: Approximately 11% of the network including roads carrying over 5,000 vehicles per day and access roads to important industrial and secondary education developments. Treated only when there is prolonged and persistent frost ice or snow which is expected to continue, or following snow, but only once the Priority 1 routes have been cleared.

Non-Priority: All other roads, comprising approximately 52% of the network. Treated following significant snowfall, but only once Priority 1 & 2 have been cleared.

All eight roads listed in the question are included in the 2010/11 Priority 2 network, though in the case of Pewley Hill only between South Hill and Semaphore Road. So these roads will be treated as above, namely when there is prolonged and persistent frost, ice or snow which is expected to continue, or following snow, but only once the Priority 1 routes have been cleared.

There will be a full review of 2010/11 winter operations, and a new Winter Service Plan will be prepared for 2011/12 (next winter). As part of the process the Local Committee can make recommendations to changes to the salting networks on a like for like basis - any additions would require the removal of an equivalent length which would have to be identified before any adjustments could be considered.

Question from Brian Cohen

Bearing in mind the need to save money in the present climate with budget cuts now coming into force, are the councillors on this committee expected to take into consideration the financial costs of any decisions they make with regard to other departments within the council and their budgets?

Answer

The Local Committee recognises the current challenging financial environment and the need to ensure that the decisions it makes achieve the greatest value for money. This remains true whether the Committee is committing funding from a budget it directly controls or if a decision it makes will impact on another service's budget.

Members and officers from across Surrey County Council and its partners work closely together to understand how each of their individual decisions impact on one another. Effective partnership working is paramount. More now than ever we need to work together to do our best to mitigate the effects of the spending cuts and to design new ways to deliver services.

Question from Ruth Kirby

Given the commitment of Central and Local Government to the idea of involving communities in decision-making, how does SCC justify the removal of the west bound bus stop at the Puttenham cross roads without any public consultation? This shows a total disregard to the

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

needs of the local population and reflects an absence of long-term strategic thought and planning. Please can you explain?

Answer

Please see the response to the petition from the Hogs Back Residents Association [Item 4].

Question from Chris Meeks, Puttenham Eco Camping Barn Project

In the light of the following Surrey County Council policy (Surrey Transport Plan, 2006-2011), how can the Council justify supporting the closure of the bus stop at Puttenham cross-roads? Does the County Council recognise how absurd it appears to many people that the X65 bus should pass by a village bus stop when people actually wish to use the service?

POLICY 7) It is our policy that the local bus network should provide an adequate, attractive and comprehensive level of service to cater for the needs of the following types of users:

- a) People who have no access at all to private transport
- b) People who do not have access to private transport at certain times of the day (for instance people in a one-car household when that car is in use elsewhere)
- c) People who are frequently unable to use private transport (for instance the elderly and the young)
- d) People who have access to private transport but who want to use public transport (for environmental reasons, or because policies pursued by the County Council in recognition of the societal advantages of public transport have made it more attractive than the car)
- e) People who use private transport and who need persuading to use public transport in order to achieve County Council priorities such as reducing congestion on busy roads, or reducing pollution.

Answer

Please see the response to the petition from the Hogs Back Residents Association [Item 4].

Question from Nicki Coveney

My son is presently studying at Farnham College. We live in Puttenham and he applied for a student bus pass, which would allow him to travel to and from college at a reduced student rate. The bus pass was sent to college and then the bus stop was shut without any explanation. I now have enquired to Surrey County Council re: refunding my money. I have received no correspondence. What is the situation? When will the bus stop be resumed?

Answer

Please see the response to the petition from the Hogs Back Residents Association [Item 4]. With regards to receiving a refund, please can the questioner contact Chris Williams so that we can resolve this matter (Christopher.Williams@surreycc.gov.uk / 01483 517336).

Annex 3 Written members' questions [Item 6]

Question from Cllr. Diana Lockyer-Nibbs

Regarding the bridge over the railway in Glaziers Lane.

Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 22 June 2011

John Hilder advised me on 27th November 2010 that it has been accepted by Surrey County Council Officers that severe damage has happened and that it would be kept under observation. Also that he was still awaiting a report from Network Rail Structural Engineer that he requested on 19th January 2010.

The photos sent to me on 3rd December are quite alarming! The bridge has continued to show further signs of collapse with the undulation in the road surface being more apparent, yet we have Surrey County Council and Network Rail just leaving the matter to the other. This is not an acceptable position. What is happening? A full report and plan for action is requested.

Answer

Discussions have continued between Surrey County Council and Network Rail, with both parties monitoring the road and structure respectively. Network Rail has now confirmed permanent repair work is programmed for 2011/12, but has not advised Surrey County Council of dates as yet.

Question from Cllr. Sarah Di Caprio

SCC has produced a Winter Response report and as I understand it this looks at the authority's planned response in cases of harsh weather like we've had for the last three years. This is something that local communities, and I'm speaking here in particular about my own ward of Holy Trinity, are extremely concerned about and want to know what is being proposed before we get further bad weather.

Answer

The winter performance report and recommendations are published in the Cabinet papers for 28 September 2011 Item 8. We have also taken an interim report on the Winter Performance Task Group to the Transportation Select Committee on 3 March 2011.

Question from Cllr. Sarah Di Caprio

Can we have an update please on the installation of 'conservation area' friendly lampposts in Holy Trinity?

Answer

All conservation area roads have been temporarily removed from the programme to enable a detailed survey to be undertaken of the current equipment within in these areas.

Once the results of these surveys are available and reviewed, it is the intention of the Council to enter in to discussions with the relevant Conservation Officers regarding the delivery schedule and equipment types. The survey is currently underway and the results for Guildford are currently under review.

The Council is in the process of seeking opportunities for additional equipment types which, after review, maybe made available as an alternative to the current design options offered.