



SURREY

COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of meeting

SURREY HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 29th April 2004

Time: 7.00 PM

Place: Kings International College, Watchetts Drive, Camberley.

Members present:

Surrey County Council [6]

Mr Maurice Neighbour (Camberley East)
Mr Fred Chipperfield (Camberley West)
Mrs Lavinia Sealy (Chobham & Bisley)
Dr B J Coffin (Heatherside & Parkside)
Mr Alan Peirce (Windlesham)
Mr John Phillips (Frimley Green & Mychett)

Surrey Heath Borough Council [5]

Cllr Moira Gibson
Cllr Vivienne Chapman
Cllr Edward Hawkins
Cllr Terence King
Cllr Patricia Pearce

All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.
The meeting was preceded by an Open Public Question Time. The notes of this are in Annex A.

Part 1. In Public - Part A.

55/04 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Borough Councillor Keith Bush.

56/04 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 18th March 2004.

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed. Borough Members requested that the report on Borough contributions to road schemes be brought to the Committee as soon as possible.

57/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

58/04 PETITIONS

None notified.

59/04 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None notified.

60/04 MEMBER QUESTIONS

None notified.

61/04 LOCAL COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

Members found the data from the Feedback forms particularly useful. It was noted by Members that the Surrey County Council formal review of Local Committees had stated that Local Committees are working very well.

RESOLVED

The Surrey Heath Local Committee:

1. noted the achievements of the Committee in 2003 / 04,
2. discussed the public's views about the Committee,
3. commented on the formal review of Committees,
4. noted that the draft Action Plan for 2004 / 05 will be brought to the Local Committee on 10th June 2004.

62/04 ANNUAL REPORT ON FIRE AND RESCUE

The report was presented by Martin Goad, Borough Manager for Surrey Heath, also in attendance was Paul Barrow, Group Manager. Heathland fires have led to a dramatic rise in Primary Fires. The numbers of heathland fires in Surrey Heath is well above average but Surrey Heath does have above average amounts of heathland. 15,000 leaflets have been sent out about this issue and another 12,000 are being sent out in the next few weeks. The one fire death recorded in the annex has now been shown to be due to other causes.

Members voiced the opinion that Surrey Heath is lucky to have a service that can deal so well not only with fires but with rescues as well. The level of abandoned car fires in Surrey

Heath is well below average but is still an issue. This is being monitored and regular talks are held with the Borough Council. The numbers of false alarms are down considerably.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- (a) Noted the performance of the Service within the Surrey Heath Area
- (b) Supported the achievement of the Retained personnel at Chobham Fire Station and acknowledged the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.
- (c) Endorsed the initiatives by The Service to reduce the hazards of fire in the community, especially those most vulnerable.
- (d) Endorsed the initiatives by The Service to undertake collaboration/partnerships that may realise scales of economy or effort and influence behaviour in the Community.
- (e) Recognised that following evaluation of these initiatives further funding may be required in order for them to be successfully implemented.

63/04 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS OUT TURN REPORT FOR 2003 /04 AND ALLOCATIONS FOR 2004 / 05

The Local Committee agreed last year to fund Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) for three years (03/04 – 05/06)

The detail of the speed alert signs will be brought to a future Committee meeting.

RESOLVED

The Surrey Heath Local Committee:

1. Noted the out turn report for 2003 / 04
2. Noted the level of funding available,
3. Noted that ALL allocations must be made by October 2004,
4. Agreed to pool £7,000 per Member into a central fund for 2004 / 05

64/04 FORWARD PLAN

The next meeting will be crime and disorder themed. Members requested that the regional Spatial strategy be brought to Committee in early 2005.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath

1. approved the forward plan of committee reports and suggested any additions
2. noted the changes to venues made in 2004
3. noted the election of Chairman and Vice Chairman at the next Local Committee meeting in June 2004.

65/04 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE

This report was for information only.

Part B – Transportation.

66/04 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Borough Councillor Keith Bush.

67/04 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

County Councillor John Phillips declared a personal interest in Item 18.

68/04 PETITIONS

A petition was received from Mr Brian Coleman on behalf of residents of Bisley. The petition requested a reduction in the speed limit on the A322 from 40 mph to 30 mph. Mr Coleman informed the Committee of the concern that local residents have over the speed of traffic using the A322. The A322 has a 30mph limit through Brookwood but not through Bisley. Many people including young people using the youth club and older people using the local shops have to cross the road. School buses also drop off and collect on the A322 and children have to cross the road.

69/04 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Public questions were received from Mr Ian Miller, Lightwater. The questions and answers were distributed to the meeting. These can be found in Annex B of these minutes.

70/04 MEMBER QUESTIONS

County Councillor Fred Chipperfield asked about the grass cutting contract in Surrey Heath. This changed over from the Borough to the County in January 2004. The contract is now part of the main Ringway contract. There is no start date as of yet as the details of the new contract have yet to be worked out. It was noted that some areas had already been cut and that many rural areas did not want regular grass cutting so that wild flowers were encouraged to grow.

71/04 HIGHWAY REVENUE BUDGET

The budgets in the report were set with regard to historical data. The community gang consists of two workers and a lorry with general equipment. This gang would not deal with emergencies but can report them back to the main office.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

1. noted the Highway Maintenance Revenue Allocation for the Surrey Heath district.
2. agreed that the functional breakdown of the allocation as set out in Annex 1 be agreed.
3. agreed that the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee, may vire up to 100% of the revenue maintenance budget, between indicative allocation levels, as agreed by The Executive, in order to respond to local conditions, whilst retaining County Council's policies and standards

72/04 ALMA DETTINGEN – DEEPCUT TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Police had voiced concern over this scheme about the potential for rat running in nearby roads. The Police had requested that a letter be sent to local residents and, subject to the response, they would review their earlier comments. The Section 106 agreement puts limits on the scheme.

Members noted that it would be impossible to get 100% agreement on schemes but that further consultation should be carried out, although some Members felt strongly that the schemes should go ahead.

The Lake Road scheme could be brought forward to assist with any problems in this area. The time limit for the Section 106 agreement had already passed so a delay could cause problems.

A motion was proposed by County Councillor Lavina Sealy and seconded by Borough Councillor Edward Hawkins. The motion that "The decision be deferred, pending further

consultation with residents until the next Local Committee meeting” was carried by 7 votes to 2.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath deferred the decision, pending further consultation with residents, until the next Local Committee meeting

73/04 A319 / BENNER LANE SCHEME

These works are already underway. The Local Transportation Director noted local people’s concerns. Talks are underway with Gordon’s School about the traffic generated by the school. There have been no personal injury accidents on Benner Lane or Windlesham Road since the trial scheme was put in place. Members voiced concern over the level of consultation and the worries of local people.

A motion was proposed by County Councillor Lavina Sealy and seconded by Borough Councillor Viv Chapman. The motion that “The decision be deferred, pending further consultation with residents until the next Local Committee meeting” was carried by 6 votes to 3.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath deferred the decision, pending further consultation with residents, until the next Local Committee meeting

74/04 WINDLESHAM SPEED LIMITS

This was a procedural report to alter the decision made by the Committee at its last meeting. Members noted the high level of public concern throughout Surrey Heath about speeding and the proactive steps being taken to combat it. In particular the Speed Indicator Device (SID), speed alert signs, speed posters and the work of the Police.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee agreed that Hatton Hill be excluded from the proposed 40mph limit in Windlesham, due to the adequate number of street lighting units that allow justification of a 30mph limit and the interpretation under the Speed Management Policy supports the introduction of a 30mph speed limit.

County Councillor John Phillips left the meeting.

75/04 WINDLESHAM ROAD, WEST END – STREET LIGHTING

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- i) Approved implementation and funding of the scheme shown in the Annex.
- ii) Agreed to provide time (approximately 2 months) for West End Parish Council to investigate funding alternatives to upgrade to decorative units,
- iii) Agreed that if additional funding is found then a decorative scheme will be progressed and that if additional funding is not found that the original scheme will be continued.

76/04 MIDDLEMOOR ROAD STREET LIGHTING

Members commented on the excellent work done by Surrey County Council’s street lighting engineer Keith Beard. Fred Chipperfield said that he would be willing to use a portion of his Member’s Allocation to co fund this project.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

1. noted the petition and,
2. agreed to allow the Street Lighting Engineer to use the previously agreed Lighting Improvement Matrix mechanism to determine the actual works programme.

77/04 CONTACT CENTRE USE

This report was for information only.

78/04 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (TRANSPORTATION)

This report was for information only.

The meeting finished at 9.03 pm

Chairman.

Open Public Question Time notes.

Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Surrey Heath.

29th April 2004 – 7 pm Kings International College, Camberley

Question 1 from Mrs Kingston, Camberley.

My son was killed on the Portsmouth Road four weeks ago. What will be done about the speed limits on the Portsmouth Road. Nothing has been done so far despite many accidents. There is a 50 mph limit outside the school and everyone is affected by this. Nothing was done after the death on the road 10 years ago.

Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chairman of the Local Committee.

Members cannot comment on this at the present time as the Police investigation has not yet been completed. When the result of the investigation is known a report will be brought to the Local Committee

Question 2 from Mr Laurensen

Can questions be asked about speed policy in general?

Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation director for Surrey Heath.

The speed limit had been assessed in line with County Policy. We must wait for the Police report. The Accident Working Group looks at all incidents.

Question 3 from Mr Laurensen

How wide ranging are the investigations? There are incidents now of dangerous driving on this road. Preventative measures are needed.

Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chairman of the Local Committee.

Members cannot legally comment on this particular case. Speed is a major issue in Surrey Heath and Surrey County Council takes a very proactive stance.

Question 4 from Mr Crow, West End

Can the Local Committee please postpone the decision on the Benner Lane scheme (Item 19). Very little consultation has been done. The traffic monitoring caused noise problems. The consultation was done four or five years ago and so is out of date.

Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation director for Surrey Heath.

Considerable public consultation was undertaken and the temporary scheme has been in for over six months. The Parish Council supports this scheme. This scheme aims to reduce the personal injury accidents that have been recorded here.

Question 5 from Lynne Wilson, St Catherines Road, Frimley Green

St Catherines Road residents are concerned about the traffic calming at Clewborough School. There is not enough room for cyclists and pedestrians and the school is looking at increasing its size.

Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation director for Surrey Heath.

There is no intention to do anything about this at this time. The problems with Lake Road will be raised with the Local Transportation Plan task group. If changes are needed then a report will be brought to the Local Committee.

Reply from Andy Stokes, Surrey County Council Development Control.

The scheme has undergone some recent changes which it is hoped will improve the situation. An initial safety audit was carried out after the improvements, another audit will be done in nine or ten months.

Question 6 from Jo Bune, Windlesham Road

How do the Local Committee propose to make safe passage for the residents of Windlesham Road. Walking is now a dangerous activity.

Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation director for Surrey Heath.

These views will be taken into account in the discussion of this item later on the agenda.

Item 15 Public Question Time

Questions received from Mr Ian Miller, Lightwater.

Question 1.

Why is the £3,000 unspent from Cllr Peirce's £7,000 allocation to a traffic and safety feasibility survey for Lightwater not listed in the Members Allocation report as a carry-over?

Answer from Jane Biscombe – Local Committee and Partnership Officer

The carry over referred to in the Members Allocation report refers to funds returned to the Local Committee when projects have been completed under budget. This returned funding is available for Members to reallocate to new projects. Some projects, like the Lightwater feasibility survey, have not yet finished and so the remaining money may still be spent by that project. It would be inappropriate to include these funds in the report as they have already been allocated to projects and so are not available for Members to reallocate.

Question 2.

Surrey Heath Borough Council have approved that the sum of £2,500 be budgeted for "School warning signs, Lightwater". How is it possible to propose expenditure on an item that in fact has already been completed? Or are other signs to be erected?

Response from Graham Hodgson – Local Transportation Director – Surrey Heath.

There are no specific needs to introduce more "School Warning Signs" in the Lightwater area, which were proposed by Surrey Heath Borough Council. It will be suggested that as an option, their funds are redirected. As the proposals for traffic management in the Lightwater area are developed, there may be a need to introduce further signing, which may offer opportunity to use these funds, subject to Local Committee agreement.

Question 3.

I am told by the Local Transportation Director that "The speed management policy review is still in progress". How is it possible for the Senior Transportation Engineer to state that a policy is being used when in fact it is apparently still under review?

Response from Graham Hodgson – Local Transportation Director – Surrey Heath.

All speed management assessments already committed will be completed to the existing County Speed Management Policy. The fact that the policy is under review was not and is not intended to indicate that the existing policy would be suspended in the interim, but that future assessments would be made under the new policy, when it has been approved by The Executive.

Question 4.

Borough Councillors mention “Three Pedestrian Refuges, central Lightwater” as being in the list of approved schemes. Are the Borough Councillors aware of the Scott Wilson report plus previous surveys carried out by the previous “Consultants” looking at traffic problems in Lightwater?

Response from Graham Hodgson – Local Transportation Director – Surrey Heath.

I am of course unable to comment on whether Borough Councillors are or are not aware of any previous surveys or scheme layout proposals. The LTS makes use of any previous documentation in developing concepts, which would assist in producing scheme options for local consultation, and hopefully ultimate approval and implementation.

Question 5.

The latest Scott Wilson report makes no mention of the traffic situation actually traversing through the village along Guildford Road and to the actual presence of a police “speed trap” outside the Red Lion Public House more or less at the time of the survey. Why was this information not included in the survey?

Response from Graham Hodgson – Local Transportation Director – Surrey Heath.

The brief to the consultant was to assess the level of through traffic using the residential roads, which included the need to count the turning movements into Guildford Road. Guildford Road is of course a classified road (with much residential frontage), which is expected to accommodate higher levels of traffic commensurate with its classification status. The ongoing road safety strategy in the district of using road safety posters, the Speed Indicator Device, and Police enforcement was irrelevant to the collection of the quantitative data.