



# SURREY

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### **Minutes of meeting**

#### **SURREY HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE**

**Date:** Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2005

**Time:** 7.00 PM

**Place:** West End Parish Pavilion, West End

### **Members present:**

#### **Surrey County Council [6]**

Mr Maurice Neighbour (Camberley East)  
Mr Fred Chipperfield (Camberley West)  
Mrs Lavinia Sealy (Chobham & Bisley)  
Mr David Ivison (Heatherside & Parkside)  
Mr Alan Peirce (Windlesham)  
Mr Chris Pitt (Frimley Green & Mychett)

#### **Surrey Heath Borough Council [4]**

Cllr Patricia Pearce  
Cllr Richard Brooks  
Cllr Edward Hawkins  
Cllr Ian Bell

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.**

#### **73/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Borough Councillors Moira Gibson, Vivienne Chapman and Terry King.

#### **74/05 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 21<sup>st</sup> July 2005**

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

#### **75/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

#### **76/05 PETITIONS**

None

#### **77/05 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

None

#### **78/05 MEMBERS QUESTIONS**

None

#### **79/05 ANNUAL REPORT ON COMMUNITY SAFETY**

Sue Warren, North West Surrey Chief Superintendent, and Mark Adams, Borough Inspector, attended the meeting.

Carolyn Rowe outlined the report. There is a new Community Safety Strategy (CSS) in place, so this report was an opportunity to look back at the last three years. There is a three yearly fear of crime survey and crime audit. Surrey Heath is relatively safe as a borough but people don't always feel safe. Anti-social behaviour is a major concern.

Mark Adams took the Committee through some of the detail in the report. The underlying trend in Surrey Heath is a reduction in crime. Total recorded crimes were down by 8.4% in the last year with reductions in violent crime, vehicle crime and dwelling burglary. However, there is still the need to further reduce crime and increase reassurance. The Police are undertaking public education in partnership in Surrey Heath to ensure that local people know how to protect themselves.

There has been a recent increase in violent crime but last year Surrey Heath was the only borough to record a reduction in violent crime in the whole of Surrey. The town center is a hot spot due to the large numbers of pubs and clubs in the area. Prioritised policing in this area has contributed to reducing the level of violent crime in the town center over recent years. The outlying areas are now targeted by Neighbourhood Officers (NOs) and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), additional work is being undertaken at weekends to increase reassurance. Members requested that the Police inform the Parish Councils of this at their next regular monthly meeting.

The Police need the public to assist in the fight against crime locally by reporting all concerns and incidents to the Police.

Three of the PCSOs are jointly funded. There are two in the rural areas and one in St Michael's. All of the PCSOs in Surrey Heath are proving very effective and provide support for the NOs. They have strong links with the community and feedback intelligence to the Officers. They have been well received in their communities and it is hoped to bring in more PCSOs next year.

The Police hold regular Neighbourhood Panel meetings throughout Surrey Heath. The numbers of these will grow over the next 12 months. The Panel meetings highlight local issues from local people and actions are reported back to the Panel. Fear of crime has been highlighted as a major concern, NOs and PCSOs are key to addressing this issue.

The Police are working closely with the licensing authority at the Borough Council. The Police are proactive in challenging applications and in enforcing action against establishments who break the conditions of their license.

Member highlighted crime and disorder on the roads leading out of the town center as a local issue. Inspector Adams informed the Committee that there would be a Police focus on this area in coming weeks and operations are planned in this area. Members also asked if the Police were capable of policing the new development at the land west of Park Street. Sue Warren replied that the Police will police any area according to criminality and will assess the situation as and when the development takes place. Private security will be discussed with new premises managers and the Police can bid for additional staff if necessary. Surrey Heath has a new speed enforcement officer who will look at areas of concern, including the town centre.

Borough Members requested that the Police inform the local Borough Members of Neighbourhood Panel meeting dates. Ian Haller, Surrey Heath Transportation Manager, confirmed that the Ambulance Service is consulted on the provision of speed humps but to not reply.

#### RESOLVED

The Local Committee:

1. Noted the update of Community Safety issues.
2. Commented on any particular issues of concern arising from the report or the presentation.
3. Authorised the Area Director to contribute funding to the Safer Surrey Heath partnership (SSHP) shared fund.
4. Endorsed the importance of the contribution made by services to Community safety.

#### **80/05 MEMBERS' ALLOCATIONS**

The following allocations were agreed:

£2,310 to Lakeside School, Frimley, from Mr Chipperfield's allocation, for works to the Reception class area to provide an internal folding door to enhance the diversity of activities that can be provided.

£60 from Mr Peirce's allocation towards the Bagshot Funday that was held in the summer to contribute to the running costs.

£1,500 from the capital fund towards the RAF building works.

£500 from Mr Neighbour's allocation towards the curtains for Pine Ridge School's hall.

Mrs Sealy asked for a bid from her allocation to the Rural Housing Trust to be brought to the next meeting.

Members noted that all allocations must be made by the end of this financial year.

#### RESOLVED

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

1. Noted that in order to process allocations before the end of the financial year, allocations should be made at the December Local Committee meeting.
2. Agreed the allocations detailed in paragraphs 9 and 10.
3. Members also agreed £500 to Pine Ridge School from Maurice Neighbours Allocation and £1,500 to the Royal Air Forces Association from the Capital fund.

#### FOR INFORMATION ONLY

#### **81/05 STRATEGIC CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS FOR THE FORMER DERA (NORTH) SITE, CHOBHAM LANE, LONGCROSS, CHERTSEY.**

This development has serious implications for local traffic provision and housing.

#### RESOLVED

This report was for information only.

#### **82/05 FORWARD PLAN**

Members requested reports on local schools including exam results and truancy and a report on the development of the Wilton Road amenity site.

#### RESOLVED

This report was for information only.

#### **83/05 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE**

Members noted the report.

#### RESOLVED

This report was for information only.

## Part B – Transportation.

### **84/05 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

As in 73/05.

### **85/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **86/05 PETITIONS**

A petition was received from Dr George Daghish regarding traffic and parking issues near Frimley Park Hospital. The petition was in two parts from the Area of Parkside and from the Area of the Grove, Frimley.

Each Petition represented a request, by the Residents, for the Complete Alleviation of the Traffic Congestion in these Areas, both of which are adjacent to Frimley Park Hospital. Due to the escalation of what may be referred to as 'OVERSPILL' or 'DISPLACEMENT' of vehicles from the parking facilities of Frimley Park Hospital, local residents are finding that:

- (a) Too many vehicles are being displaced into our surrounding localities and are swamping the roads in these said localities, which include Grove Cross Road, The Grove, The Cloisters, Denton Way and Partridge Close among others.
- (b) Some serious effects of the Vehicle Overcrowding are:
  - (i) Dangerous restriction of road widths by double parking.
  - (ii) Blocking of fields of view at frequently used and critical Junctions.
  - (iii) The blocking of roads by illegally parked vehicles.
  - (iv) The resulting blocking of access for Delivery and Emergency Services (Fire and Ambulance).
  - (v) The degradation of Amenity and also Infrastructure in these Areas.
- (c) The residents in the above Areas are in agreement that these problems have escalated to a critical state. This would appear to be due to the provision for Parking at Frimley Park Hospital failing to absorb the demands made upon it by vehicles belonging to staff, contractors, visitors and patients.

Residents in these surrounding Areas have been at pains to:

- (a) Gather evidence of:
  - (i) why individuals are failing to use the Parking Space Facilities provided by Frimley Park Hospital.
  - (ii) where either inconsiderate parking, dangerous parking or disregard for Parking Regulations has led to Police Incidents, aggravated behaviour and the Blocking of Thoroughfare.
- (b) Quantify and to Statistically model the effect of the Centralised Facility of the Frimley Park Hospital on the Traffic that flows in its Orbit. This has resulted in:
  - (i) correspond with the Assistant Chief Planner at SHBC, quantifying the degree of the Congestive State in the above neighbourhoods.
  - (ii) A program which models a typical 24 hour cycle of traffic flow both inside and outside the periphery of Frimley Park Hospital.

As a group the petitioners stressed that they fully realised that the prime Function of Frimley Park Hospital NHS Trust is to both heal and save lives and therefore would have no intention of hampering this humanitarian work. The Residents strongly urge that

planning effort be put into Traffic Engineering within these areas with the aim of alleviating the present severe traffic congestion, after due and full consultation.

### **87/05 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Two questions were received from Mr Ian Miller, Lightwater. The responses are attached as Annex B.

### **88/05 MEMBER QUESTIONS**

None

Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation Director, informed the Committee that there has been a reorganisation in Transportation and he has been seconded to Surrey County Council's Highways contractor to assist in improving management capability. Ian Haller is the new Local Transportation Manager and Will Ward is the new Area Transportation Director. Members offered their thanks to Graham Hodgson for his hard work over the past few years and welcomed Ian Haller as the Transportation Officer for the Committee.

### **89/05 DECRIMINALISED PARKING ENFORCEMENT IN SURREY HEATH.**

Ian Haller, Local Transportation Manager, outlined the report. The financial projections are estimates only, the income may increase but this depends on the number of tickets issued. Surrey County Council is unlikely to break even but costs are balanced out across the County Council as a whole. The Borough Council set the parking charges, not Surrey County Council.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- i) noted the financial forecast for the introduction and subsequent operation of DPE in Surrey Heath as shown in Annex A to the report.
- ii) approved, for consultation, the draft parking management plan as shown in Annex B to the report.

### **90/05 GUILDFORD ROAD, LIGHTWATER – PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO PEDESTRIAN/BUS FACILITIES**

Ian Haller outlined this report. The scheme is to improve pedestrian facilities in and around Lightwater. Detailed concerns will be addressed in the detailed design work. The scheme should be in place after Christmas.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- i. Approved the scheme as shown on Appendix A, for construction and implementation as soon as possible, subjected to funding availability.
- ii. Approved the advertising of a Notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the purpose of installing the zebra crossing and delegate authority to the Local Transportation Director and his subsequent successor, in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee or in their absence by their delegated representatives, to resolve any objections received in relation to the Notice.

### **91/05 B311 CHOBHAM ROAD, FRIMLEY – PROPOSED CYCLE FACILITIES**

Ian Haller informed Members that this new cycle route links two existing ones together. The majority of comments received were in favour of the scheme. Members discussed the advantage of speed cushions over speed tables and asked Officers to amend the recommendations to include speed cushions or tables.

#### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath:

- i. Approved the scheme as shown on Annex A subject to further consideration of speed cushions or tables, for construction and implementation at the earliest opportunity.
- ii. Designated the footway for use as a cycle route, in addition to the existing pedestrian use, along the length shown on Annex A.
- iii. If agreed, approved the advertising of a Notice in accordance with the Highways Act 1980 for the introduction of the speed cushions and delegate authority to the Local Transportation Director and his subsequent successor, in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee or in their absence by their delegated representatives, to resolve any objections received in relation to the Notice.

### **92/05 A322 BRACKNELL ROAD, BAGSHOT PROPOSED CENTRAL SAFETY BARRIER IMPROVEMENT**

This design takes into account new guidance. The recommendation is to implement the scheme in one phase, although there will still be the standard 28 day consultation period. Members expressed dismay at the high costs involved and asked whether the scheme was necessary. Highway Agency guidance is that all central reserves under 10m in width should have a safety fence. This is commended to highway authorities and may be mandatory in the future. The section of road needs to be made safer for all road users, including motorcyclists and serious injury is likely to occur to motorcyclists if a bike guard is not installed.

The additional finances will be sourced from the A319 scheme that cannot be completed this financial year. These funds will be lost if they are not used this year. Using the funds to implement this scheme will mean the funds are spent locally and will help protect the budget for next financial year.

The Police feel that this area has been unsafe for many years and so support the scheme. Signage has been used to help reduce the number of accidents but they are still occurring.

Members had differing views about this scheme due to the high costs but felt that their responsibility to prevent further deaths in this area was paramount. Members also felt that it was important not to lose agreed schemes due to reprioritization.

#### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath approved:

- (a) the scheme to provide central safety barrier along the A322 Bracknell Road, Bagshot as shown in Annex A,
- (b) that funding from the local budget, if required, is re-allocated from the A319 Bagshot Road/Benner Lane scheme with budget provision for this scheme being made available in 2006/07

- (c) a permanent traffic order be advertised under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the purpose of which will be to close the central reservation gap along the A322 Bracknell Road, Bagshot outside 'Bovingdon Cottage', and subject to no objections being maintained, the traffic Order be made,
- (d) the Local Transportation Director or his subsequent successor in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee resolve any objections received in connection with the proposal.

**93/05 PETITION RESPONSE – REQUEST FOR TRAFFIC CALMING ON D3448  
COLEFORD BRIDGE ROAD, MYTCHETT**

This area is not an overall priority.

**RESOLVED**

The Local Committee in Surrey Heath

- i) noted receipt of the petition.
- ii) recommended Coleford Bridge Road be considered together with other roads in the district, and prioritised as and when suitable funding becomes available.

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

**69/05 SURREY HEATH ROAD SAFETY ADVICE DAY**

This report was for information only.

**47/04 SECTION 14 (1) and (2) DELEGATED POWERS**

This report was for information only.

**48/04 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE (TRANSPORTATION)**

This report was for information only.

The meeting finished at 9.20 pm

---

Chairman.



Open Public Question Time notes.  
Surrey County Council's Local Committee in Surrey Heath  
21<sup>st</sup> July 2005 – 6.30 pm St John's Link, Windlesham

**1. Simon Lowe, West End Parish Council**

When will the Church Lane scheme be made permanent? Children are throwing the cones about and motorists ignore them.

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

We have been waiting for GOSE approval. As soon as this has been received the scheme will be progressed. Accidents at this junction have reduced so the scheme is proving successful. This will be a top priority for next year. Even if permission is received now we will be unable to progress the scheme this year so it is important that the funds are used elsewhere otherwise they will be lost.

**Reply from Ian Haller – Local Transportation Manager**

The hold up is due to common land issues. We are making progress but could be up to 6 months away. We apologise for the delay and for the temporary solution being in place for so long.

**2. Simon Lowe, West End Parish Council**

A Residents Association has been set up in Halebourne lane. They are concerned about speeding and have offered to pay for a speed assessment. Understand this has already been carried out by SCC and the Police. Can we now go ahead with a 30 mph limit?

**Reply from Ian Haller – Local Transportation Manager**

If all the issues are resolved, this will be going to the next Committee.

**3. Time Price, Windlesham Parish Council**

Do we expect such unreasonable delays in all areas? E.g. the A322?

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

The Hen and Chicks is a centrally funded project, I understand that there are some issues with GOSE here though.

**Reply from Ian Haller – Local Transportation Manager**

I have spoken to our legal department this morning and GOSE have accepted the scheme. We can now move onto advertising and resolving objections.

**4. Tony Ewer, Yorktown and Watchmoor Business Association**

There are no yellow lines in Stanhope Road. Large lorries park along this road and cause obstruction back onto the A331. What can be done?

**Reply from Ian Haller – Local Transportation Manager**

There will be no new restrictions until DPE is brought in in February 2006. After this there will be a full review of restrictions.

**5. Kate Gilfillen, Frimley**

What is happening with the parking around Frimley Park Hospital?

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

Negotiations with the hospital are continuing. That area will be looked at after DPE has been brought in.

**6. Mr Wagstaff**

Cars park on corners near Frimley Park Hospital and that is dangerous. What are you doing about it?

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

Ian Haller will talk to the Police about this area and ask for a survey to be done. It is important that all such instances are reported to the Police.

**7. David Williams, The Cloisters**

We called the Police three weeks ago but no action was taken.

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

Ian Haller will talk to the Police about this area and ask for a survey to be done.

**8. Jo Proctor**

Why can't existing laws be used?

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

Ian Haller will talk to the Police about this area and ask for a survey to be done.

**9. Jo Proctor**

We need a saltbox near Denton Way.

**Reply from Maurice Neighbour, Chair of the Local Committee.**

Ian Haller will take this forward.



**Item 15**

**Questions from Mr Ian Miller, Lightwater**

1) For some years now the residents of Lightwater have received various statements and suggestions as to the existing traffic and road safety problems and solutions within their area. The Borough Council during its period of responsibility made several investigations (eg see letter ex Mr Haller dated 4<sup>th</sup> January 2000 to Mrs Browning) and eventually produced 5 suggested safety schemes for the village centre – without any result and this was in 2001. During the period in which your committee has been responsible for traffic and road safety we know of the surveys by the local transportation department which followed the residents petition and survey results addressed to Dr. Coffin when he was heading the County Council in June 2002. There have been many statements made on this issue by your committee, Mr Peirce and Mr Hodgson. We have seen other road safety projects either completed or in the final phase of acceptance in Chobham, West End, Mytchett, Frimley etc. all of which appear to have arisen since your committee commenced its activities yet Lightwater is still the apparent backwater – this in spite of new residential constructions adding to the inevitable increase in pedestrian and vehicular traffic in and around Lightwater. (Can it be that advancement of safety/traffic control projects are based upon the frequency and strength of representations made by the constituent local councillor which does rather appear to be the case?)

When precisely will residents of Lightwater receive the already prepared survey questionnaire regarding suggested safety/traffic measures for Lightwater? I say “already prepared” since there have been statements to the effect that it has been prepared (see e-mail ex Mr Hodson dated 15<sup>th</sup> September 2004; public statement by Mr Peirce dated 5<sup>th</sup> May 2005); letter ex Leader of Surrey County Council dated 8<sup>th</sup> October 2004). Yet nothing happens save that projected funding diminishes. The use of public funds for items such as a “Living Christmas Tree” “Shelving for pamphlets”, refurbishment of RAFA Club premises (for example) appear to residents of Lightwater to denote perhaps a sad lack of priorities by the local area committee particularly in view of its expressed and implied responsibility to ensure public safety which none of the aforementioned items will in any way impact upon.

**Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation Director**

The promotion and progression of Integrated Transport schemes, depends on a number of factors. There is a constant need to re-appraise scheme priorities that have then to be approved by the Local Committee. The potential traffic management scheme for the village of Lightwater, has been reduced in terms of priority, not least because of the very low road casualty figures associated with the area, and currently there are no designated funds. The “prepared survey questionnaire” referred to is in relation to the Guildford Road, Lightwater (village centre scheme), which was sent out for consultation on 17 August 2005, and you were included in the distribution. This specifically is trying to address the works required as part of the Bus Quality Partnership, as well as local safety issues in that part of Guildford Road.

The use of the County Councillors’ allocated funds is detailed in the Members Allocation report (Item \* on this meetings agenda)

2). What has been the total cost involved in the many surveys and investigations made in Lightwater regarding traffic and road safety issues – both during the period of your committee (i.e the traffic survey cost of £9,000 subsequently and mysteriously amended to £7,000 “donated” by

Mr Peirce – see Item 8 – Members Allocations 3 September 2002) AND previously (from 1997) by the Borough? The figures must be available since the Borough Council handed over its traffic/road safety responsibilities to the Area Committee presumably together with the relevant data. I would draw your attention to the “agreed criteria” concerning Members Allocations since it would seem that these criteria are not being fully met.

**Reply from Graham Hodgson, Local Transportation Director**

Any costs of surveys carried out by Surrey Heath Borough Council will have to be produced by that authority. Such detailed information would only be available from their financial department. As far as any surveys carried out by Surrey County Council as highway authority is concerned, this information has already been given in previous responses.