



**Minutes of meeting**

**Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford)**

**Date:** Wednesday 13 June 2012

**Time:** 7.00 pm

**Place:** Worplesdon Memorial Hall, Perry Hill, Worplesdon GU3 3RF

**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 Keith Witham (Worplesdon)

Mr Bill Barker (Horsleys)

Mr Simon Gimson (Shalford)

Mr Graham Ellwood (Guildford East)

Ms Marsha Moseley (Ash)

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

Councillor Mark Chapman Westborough (Lib Dem)

Councillor Christian Holliday Burpham (Con)

Councillor Diana Lockyer-Nibbs Normandy (Con)

Councillor Bob McShee Worplesdon (Con)

Councillor Nigel Manning Ash Vale (Con)

Councillor James Palmer Shalford (Con)

Councillor Tony Phillips Onslow (Lib Dem)

Councillor Caroline Reeves Friary & St. Nicolas (Lib Dem)

Councillor Tony Rooth Pilgrims (Con)

Councillor Iseult Roche Worplesdon) \*

\* substitute

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

### **01/12 Apologies for absence and substitutions [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Councillor Jenny Wicks (Clandon & Horsley) (substituted by Iseult Roche)

### **02/12 Minutes of the last meetings (21 March 2012) [Item 2]**

Agreed and signed by the Chairman.

### **03/12 Declarations of interest [Item 3]**

Declarations of interest were made by:

- Fiona White in relation to Item 6, because she was a trustee of the Barn Youth Project and Item 8 because she had provided advice to Tongham Toddler group who had been in receipt of Local Allocation funding from Simon Gimson.

### **04/12 Petitions [Item 4]**

- i. Ms Karen Dunn welcomed the petition response and a number of road safety options were suggested at the meeting. The local divisional member would work with officers to determine the best solution.
- ii. Mr Case-Green countered the petition response by informing the meeting there had been at least two serious accidents involving pedestrians crossing Salt Box Lane. This was confirmed by Pauline Searle. The meeting tasked officers with reviewing the data to ascertain if there were controls required that would make the road safer and to ensure future reports were accurate. The Chairman asked for the matter to be brought back to a future committee.
- iii. Mr McShane explained that in his view of the condition of Cabell Road was very poor and the meeting heard that repairs were scheduled for later this year.

### **05/12 Written public and member questions [Item 5]**

There were no written questions received.

### **06/12 Local Prevention Framework (Youth Service) [Item 6]**

1. This was an information item for the Local Committee.
2. The Local Committee received an explanation of the how the service had been restructured. An organisation chart was tabled.
3. There was a presentation from Inglis Wightman of the Surrey Youth Consortium (SYC). It was explained that the SYC had been awarded the contract to provide preventative services in the borough.
4. Lists of young people had been provided to SYC. The largest number of targeted young people were in Ash (92), Stoke (52) and Westborough (73). These areas had been previously identified as priority areas by the Local Committee. The list would be updated twice a year.
5. There would be a range of practical activities delivered by Gasp and Peer Productions. Outreach work would be delivered by the Matrix Trust. There would be

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

mixed and single sex activities. SYC would be linking with all local agencies including statutory bodies, schools, the Police and Voluntary sector.

6. Pauline Searle requested that there be some outreach work undertaken in Stoke which was accepted.

### **07/12 Approval of Small Grants Bids (Youth Service) [Item 7]**

1. The Small Bids Fund had been promoted through the Surrey County Council website and the Surrey Youth Focus network. In future the Fund will also be promoted alongside the 'Love where you live' Campaign.
2. It was requested that bids should demonstrate that activities are accessible to both young men and young women.
3. Members requested that the criteria for the selection of bids be brought back to committee.

#### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:**

Fund the six bids as described in the committee report

#### **Reason for decision:**

The spending proposals put forward for this meeting had been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money and the Local Committee agreed that they should be approved.

### **08/12 Guildford Local Committee Budgets 2012-2013 [Item 8]**

#### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:**

1. To note the summary of the Local Committee's expenditure in 2011/12 detailed in paragraph 2 of the committee report; and
2. that each local member has an allocation of £12,615 revenue and £3,500 capital to fund projects within the local area in 2012/13; and
3. the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue and capital funding as set out in paragraph 3 of the committee report; and
4. to note the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in paragraph 4 of the committee report; and
5. that the community safety budget of £3,160 delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Guildford Community Safety Partnership and that the Community Partnership Manager authorise its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision, as detailed in paragraph 5 of the committee report.

#### **Reason for decision:**

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

The spending proposals put forward for this meeting had been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money and the Local Committee agreed that they should be approved.

### **9/12 Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Review [Item 9]**

1. The process of consultation and decision by the committee was outlined.
2. Tony Phillips asked if the consultation for Onslow Village could be scheduled to could come back to September committee for decision. Officers would endeavour to achieve this request.
3. Members noted the impact that the new Waitrose development could have an impact on street parking for local residents.
4. Members further noted that a 'creep' of parking problems had been observed in areas which had not been included in the CPZ.

The meeting was adjourned and restarted at 9pm to receive a public question.

### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:**

- i. to consult further with properties in the area of Onslow village shown in **ANNEXE 2** of the committee report about the possibility of an extension to the CPZ as shown in **ANNEXE 5** of the committee report; and
- ii. to develop proposals, in consultation with local ward and divisional members, to amend the existing parking controls in the Dene Road area, and to conduct any further informal consultation with residents as considered appropriate; and
- iii. to formally advertise the proposals shown in **ANNEXE 10** of the committee report at the appropriate stage during the review cycle, with a view to including Rivermount Gardens within the Guildford town centre CPZ, and to consider any formal representations received accordingly; and
- iv. to develop proposals for St Lukes Square in consultation with local residents, local ward and divisional members, and such views will be fully taken into account when considered at a future Local Committee. Whilst considering there was likely to be some displacement parking in St Lukes Park (Lancaster Avenue, Newlands Crescent and Sells Close) if parking controls were introduced in St Lukes Square the committee noted the wishes of the residents not to have any controls and resolved not to develop proposals for St Lukes Park; and
- v. to report the feedback associated with the ongoing consultations in the Millmead, Warwicks Bench and Woodbridge Road areas back to the September meeting of the Committee.

### **Reason for decision:**

The Local Committee agreed the consultations and proposals in the recommendations best reflected the parking control needs of the local areas.

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

### **10/12 Highways Capital and Revenue Allocations 2012/13 [Item 10]**

1. The Local Highways Services Group Manager noted that the funding for the current year was the largest ever administered by the Local Committee.
2. It was explained that the area of 'Guildford Town' referred to in the committee report related to areas with the heaviest footfall and which had a high public profile.
3. Bob McShee asked if the gates at Woodstreet could be removed.
4. The local maintenance engineers would contact members to discuss how the community gangs will operate. The members asked for clear communications between themselves, officers and the local community.
5. The Community Highways Officers were commended for their work.

#### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:**

- i. Complete 2011/12 Speed limits, estimated cost £37,000; and
- ii. design only four ITS schemes formerly planned for construction in 2012/13, with construction deferred until 2013/14, estimated costs £45,000; and
- iii. ad-hoc signs, bollards etc ordered by area team, allocate £25,000; and
- iv. employ a 'Community Gang' for 48 weeks, allocate £96,000; and
- v. employ a jetter for five weeks, allocate £25,000; and
- vi. ad-hoc maintenance work by area team, allocate £25,000; and
- vii. local re-surface schemes, ten divisions at £50,000 per division, allocate £500,000; and
- viii. local re-surfacing schemes in Guildford town, allocate £180,000; and
- ix. the introduction of two bus stop clearways in Southway, Guildford.

#### **Reason for decision:**

The Local Committee agreed the findings and advice of the Transportation Task Group and that the proposals met the needs of the local community and were the best use of the Highways budget.

### **11/12 Guildford: Various Speed Limit Assessments [Item 11]**

1. James Palmer told the committee that there was no footpath between the Watts Gallery and the Watts Chapel which despite any new speed restriction remained a safety issue for pedestrians. Simon Gimson reported that the matter was being investigated.
2. Keith Taylor requested any new speed limit put in place on the B2126 should be in effect along the entire road and not only where it runs through Guildford Borough. It was noted that the road also runs through Mole Valley District.

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:**

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessments.
- (ii) Agree that, speed limits should be changed as follows:-
  - i. Green Dene, East Horsley. Introduce a 30mph limit in conjunction with measures to reduce vehicle speeds (30mph limit had been requested); and
  - ii. Down Lane, Compton: Reduce the speed limit from 60mph to 30mph (30mph limit had been requested); and
  - iii. A322 Worplesdon Road, Worplesdon: Reduce the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph (40mph had been requested); and
  - iv. B2126 Horsham Road, Abinger Hammer: Introduce a 40mph limit (30mph had been requested).
- (iii) Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes, and subject to no objections being upheld, the Order be made.
- (iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local Divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

### **Reason for decision:**

The Local Committee agreed the transportation task group advice and that the proposals reflected a full assessment under the County Council's speed policy and addressed all safety concerns.

## **12/12 Local Committee Public Engagement Protocol and Task Group Membership [Item 12]**

### **The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:**

- i. The provisions of the Local Protocol on Public Engagement as set out in Annexe A of the committee report, and
- ii. the terms of reference for the two Task Groups as set in Annexe B of the committee report; and
- iii. that the membership of the Transportation Task Group for 2012/13 would be Mark Brett-Warburton, Graham Ellwood, David Goodwin, Jenny Wicks, James Palmer and Tony Phillips; and
- iv. that the membership of the Youth Services Task Group for 2012/13 would be Keith Taylor, Pauline Searle, Sarah Creedy and Caroline Reeves; and
- v. that Mark Brett-Warburton would be the Local Committee representative on the Guildford Local Strategic Partnership; and

**Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

- vi. that Fiona White would be the Local Committee representative on the Safer Guildford Partnership; and
- vii. that Simon Gimson and Mark Brett-Warburton would provide the Local Committee representation on the Guildford Railway Station Regeneration Group

**Reason for decision:**

It is important that the Local Committee continues to play an active role in local partnerships. The work of the task groups will be invaluable in considering the implications of complex issues where priorities have to be established within limited budgets.

**13/12 Forward Programme [Item 13]**

The Local Committee agreed to:

- a) the Forward Programme 2012/13, as outlined in Appendix 1.
- b) Consider any further themes for Member briefings during 2012/13.

**Reason for decision:**

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

**[Meeting ended at 09.56pm]**

.....**(Mr Mark Brett-Warburton – Chairman)**

**Contact:**

Michelle Collins  
(Community Partnerships Team Leader –  
West)

01372 832606  
michelle.collins@surreycc.gov.uk

Carrie Anderson  
(Community Partnership and Committee  
Officer)

01483 517336  
carolyn.anderson@surreycc.gov.uk

The next meeting of the Committee will be on Wednesday 18 July 2012 at 6pm, at Committee Room 1, Guildford Borough Council Offices, Millmead, Guildford GU2 4BB

**Annex 1 Petitions [Item 4]**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b> | Carolyn Piggott, on behalf of 827 signatories (speaker: Karen Dunn)   |
| <b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>            | Worplesdon / Normandy   |
| <b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>   | <p>Wyke Primary School is located in School Lane, Normandy and there are a large number of parents bringing children to school by car due to the semi-rural location, wide catchment area and the removal of the Pegasus bus service in July 2010. There is insufficient parking in School Lane and there is often complete gridlock and poor visibility of pedestrians. Parents are put off 'park and stride' (parking in nearby areas) as all options require dangerous crossing of the nearby A323 Guildford/Aldershot Road.</p> <p>To enable a safer crossing of the A323 we need an extension of the 30mph limit of at least 150m towards Ash as currently it is inadequate to warn drivers to slow down to 30mph before the crossing. We need a safer crossing on the A323 between Westwood Lane and School Lane (e.g. zebra/pelican crossing, 30mph/SLOW signs clearly painted on the road at both ends of the village of Normandy), and the installation of flashing school 'wigwag' signs in close proximity to School Lane in both directions, so that young school children with their parents are able to cross the road to the school more safely. These traffic calming measures will also benefit the whole village of Normandy.</p> |
| <b>Response</b>                           | <p>The petition calls for a number of measures to improve pedestrian safety crossing the A323. The area in question is a staggered crossroads, School Lane being to the North and west, with Westwood Lane to the south and east. There is a pedestrian refuge island located between School Lane and Westwood Lane. The former Guildford traffic engineer, and a representative of Smarter Safer Travel have visited the site and met representatives from the school.</p> <p>The petition called for the 30mph speed limit on the western approach to be moved 150m west. The traffic Engineer has advised that this is inappropriate, as the current speed limit is located at a change of environment and is over 100m from the crossing point. The current speed limit sign is incorporated into the village gateway, it is yellow backed and there is a 'SLOW' marking at the change of speed limit from 40mph to 30mph.</p>  |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>The petition requests the provision of a pelican or zebra crossing in the area of the current pedestrian refuge. Site observations are that there is too little pedestrian traffic to the school to justify this type of crossing.</p> <p>The petition requests '30mph/SLOW' markings at each end of the village. As well as the previously mentioned 'SLOW' marking to the west, there are two 'SLOW' markings on the westbound lane, one prior to Westwood Lane the other prior to the crossing point.</p> <p>SCC has agreed to fund and provide 'wig-wag' signs in accordance with the petition. These are scheduled for installation in the school summer holidays.</p> <p>As a follow up to the initial site visit a Speed Watch survey was undertaken, with Surrey Police. In excess of 40 motorists, the majority being local residents, were stopped for exceeding the 30mph limit. Many of those stopped said that they were unaware of the speed limit, despite there being a system of street lighting and the 30mph repeater signs.</p> <p>Accident records for this junction area are very low, only two in the past five years, and the factors leading to accidents are not speed related. There are no pedestrian injury accidents on file.</p> <p>SCC traffic engineer have made further site visits and identified a number of simple improvements that could be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Foliage to be trimmed back to signs throughout the area, and where it overhangs the footways.</li><li>• Slow markings to be refreshed, together with other road markings.</li><li>• At the western entry to the village, coloured surface and '30' marking to be provided.</li><li>• Hatched area to pedestrian area to have coloured surfacing to highlight the area.</li><li>• Possibly apply anti-skid surfacing to approaches to crossing point – this depends on the existing surfacing being of sufficient quality.</li><li>• Future thought to be given to works to the Westwood Lane junction to provide a refuge island and pedestrian protection to the footway.</li></ul> <p>Funding needs to be identified to implement these measures and officers will discuss this with the local SCC Member and the Parish Council.</p> |
|--|---|

**Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b> | Mr Rob Case-Green, on behalf of 185 signatories   |
| <b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>            | Worplesdon / Worplesdon   |
| <b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>   | <p>We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Introduce a safe crossing point next to the railway bridge on Salt Box Road, Guildford.</p> <p>A blind corner exists along Salt Box Road where it passes under the London to Portsmouth railway line. Immediately to the West of this bend a public bridleway crosses the road. This bridleway is used by many pedestrians as the main access point to Whitmoor Common, and the crossing is at the moment extremely dangerous.</p> <p>The road under the railway bridge does not have a pavement or verge. Therefore people wishing to walk under the bridge to access Britten's Pond have to walk in the road, a hazardous experience</p>  |
| <b>Response</b>                           | <p>Salt Box Road is classified as the C14. Although classified as a 'C' ROAD, Salt Box provides a link for traffic from the west to access the A3 Trunk Road. It is heavily used in peak period with traffic queues at both its eastern and western junctions. Despite high traffic volumes there is only one reported accident in the vicinity of the bridge in the past five years, this being a two-vehicle accident.</p> <p>The request is for a safe crossing point of Salt Box Road for persons using Bridleway BW 434 which in this location runs parallel and to the west of the railway line. There is a restricted height (11'6") rail bridge to the immediate east of the crossing point, the road curves to go under the bridge. Salt Box Road is bounded by Common Land on either side. The petition also makes note that there is no footway under the rail bridge. The speed limit in this area is 40mph. The area is not within a system of street lighting. Currently there are signs advising of pedestrians in the road to either side of the crossing point. Due to the existing geometry of the road sight lines on at the crossing point are poor.</p> <p>A safe uncontrolled (non signalised) crossing point on line with Bridleway BW 34 cannot be provided, as the sight lines to the east cannot be improved. This means that any uncontrolled crossing point would have to be moved significantly, at least 80m with 100m being the desirable sight line, to the west – this would take the crossing point away from the desire line and hence make it very unlikely to be used. The position is compounded by the common land issues, as there is no automatic right for the Highway Authority to carry out construction on the Common Land, possibly precluding construction of a footway.</p> |

**Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>With regard to pedestrians walking under the rail bridge, there is insufficient room to provide a footway under the bridge, while maintaining two way traffic flows.</p> <p>A solution to both the crossing of Salt Box Road for those using Bridleway BW434 and those wishing to walk under the railway bridge however is possible. The solution would be provision of traffic signals controlling flows under the bridge, basically making it alternate way. The signals would then allow footway construction on either side of the road under the railway bridge. The signals could also incorporate a pedestrian phase with push button controls to allow pedestrians and equestrians to cross the road while traffic in both directions is stopped. The traffic signal installation would require the area to be provided with a system of street lighting. The common land problem remains an issue.</p> <p>Traffic signals would have a significant impact on traffic flows in Salt Box Road leading to increase congestion, journey times and possibly rat running on other roads in the area.</p> <p>Costs for the signalised arrangement described above would be in the region of £150,000 and would entail the closure of Salt Box Road for their implementation.</p> <p>SCC officers would not recommend the implementation of the scheme described above to the local committee, since there have been no accidents involving pedestrians and the impact the introduction of traffic signals would have on congestion in Salt Box Road and the surrounding road network.</p> <p>Officers will investigate placing signs on the Bridleway as it approaches Salt Box Road advising those crossing of poor visibility and to cross at a point sufficiently far from the bridge that in their judgement they may cross the road safely.</p> |
|--|---|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b> | Westborough Liberal Democrats, on behalf of 135 signatories<br>(Speaker: Wayne McShane)  |
| <b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>            | Guildford West / Westborough   |
| <b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>   | We the undersigned call upon Guildford Local Committee to insist that Surrey County Council must do whatever work is necessary to repair Cabell Road as a matter of urgency to make it a fit and proper road for local residents and other road users. We believe it is now a safety hazard and to delay any further puts residents at risk as well as |

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
|                 | the road becoming more expensive to repair with each year that passes.   |
| <b>Response</b> | <p>Surrey Highways is aware of the concerns raised for Cabell Road. The road is due for major maintenance works later this year. This will involve full surface reconstruction between the junctions with Homestall and Barnwood Road. Cabell Road is typical of many built in residential areas, being of concrete slab construction. Concrete is actually very long lasting, but unfortunately the slabs move as the foundations become eroded. The actual type of treatment we will use to repair the road will be determined by highway engineers working with our contractor. It is possible that the existing concrete slabs will need to be removed, nevertheless the end result will be a smooth road surface.</p> <p>All of the public highway benefits from periodic safety inspections undertaken by trained Highway Inspectors. Any identified defects, which meet our intervention criteria will be repaired. Unfortunately, defects do on occasion, occur between inspections. If a member of the public notices safety issues we would encourage they report it via our website (<a href="http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport">www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport</a>)</p> <p>Earlier this month Officers undertook an additional site assessment over and above the periodic safety inspections. As a result a number of interim repairs were made. Officers will continue to keep a close watch on the condition of the road until the major repairs are completed later this financial year.</p> |

**Written public questions [Item 5a]**

None submitted

**Written members' questions [Item 5b]**

None submitted

**Informal Public Question Time (prior to the meeting)**

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

- James Nicholls, Effingham Parish Council, commented on the scheduling of maintenance works to roads, pavements and trees in Effingham. He felt that work was behind schedule.
- Philip Benson, resident of St Lukes, was opposed to the implementation of parking controls in St Lukes. He also expressed concern regarding the safety and maintenance of the mini roundabout at the junction of Warren Road and Lancaster

## **Draft Minutes to be agreed at the meeting of the Local Committee on 12 September 2012**

Avenue and maintenance of the grit bins. Later in the meeting he asked if the yellow lines in Lukes Square could be reduced in length to provide more space to park.

- Wendy Bennett, resident of St Lukes Square, commented that there was a need for parking control measures in Lower St Lukes because inconsiderately parked vehicles obstructed deliveries and emergency services vehicles could not get through.
- Tom Bliss, resident of St Lukes, requested that the process for implementation of parking control measures be explained for the benefit of the meeting. This was done.
- Mr Harden, resident of Park Barn, commented on the condition of Cabell Road and asked what maintenance would be undertaken.
- Shona Dunsmuir, resident of St Lukes, asked why parking control measures were being proposed for St Lukes Square when few respondents had replied to the consultation.