



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)

Date: Thursday 14 October 2010

Time: 6.30 PM

Place: Kings International College Camberley

Members present:

Surrey County Council [5]

Cllr Bill Chapman (Camberley East)

Cllr Denis Fuller (Camberley West)

Cllr Lavinia Sealy (Chobham, Bisley & West End)

Cllr Stuart Macleod (Windlesham, Bagshot & Lightwater)

Cllr David Ivison (Heatherside & Parkside)

Surrey Heath Borough Council [6]

Cllr Richard Brooks (Town)

Cllr Vivienne Chapman (St Pauls)

Cllr Colin Dougan (St Michaels)

Cllr Paul Ilnicki (Heatherside)

Cllr Wynne Price (Bisley)

Cllr David Whitcroft (Mytchett and Deepcut)

All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.

The meeting was preceded by an Open Public Question Time. The notes are in **Annex A**.

Part 1. In Public - Part A (voting by county members on decision items).

52/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Chris Pitt.

53/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 15 July 2010 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) held on 15 July 2010 were agreed and signed.

54/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None were received.

55/10 PETITIONS [Item 4]

None were received.

56/10 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

None were received

57/10 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]

None were received.

Items for Information Only

58/10 FUNDING FOR VOLUNTARY SECTOR GROUPS IN SURREY HEATH [Item 8]

Saba Hussain presented the report and was accompanied by Chris Furneaux from Voluntary Services Surrey Heath.

Members welcomed the report, agreed that it was useful to have information about local funding and requested regular updates in future.

The report was for information only.

59/10 SURREY HEATH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK AND INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN [Item 9]

John Devonshire, Surrey Heath Borough Council, introduced the report. The Chairman commented that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan was a “living” document. Members discussed the documents and agreed that the Local Development Framework and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan would be valuable in setting out the future development needs of the borough.

The report was for information only.

60/10 UPDATE ON LOCAL ISSUES [Item 10]

The report was for information only.

Non-Executive Items for Decision

61/10 APPLICATION FOR A MAP MODIFICATION ORDER – FORD ROAD TO FOOTPATH NO. 45 (CHOBHAM) [Item 11]

This report was DEFERRED until the next meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) in order for a site visit to be arranged so that Members of the committee could fully consider the implications of the proposals.

Part B – In Public (voting by county and borough members on decision items).

62/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 12]

As in 52/10 – no further apologies were received.

63/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 13]

None were received.

64/10 PETITIONS [Item 14]

None were received.

65/10 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 15]

A revised Item 15 was tabled at the meeting.

One question was received. A copy of the question is set out in **Annex B**. In a supplementary Ms Carpenter advised the committee of the problems experienced at The Three Mariners in Bagshot following the recent downpour, and that she had not heard from the borough council in response to her question.

66/10 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 16]

A revised Item 16 was tabled at the meeting.

Four written Member questions were received from Councillor David Whitcroft. Copies of the questions are set out at **Annex C**. In a supplementary, Councillor Whitcroft asked officers for details of the two priority sites before the Lightwater Bypass and asked what representations could be made to the Cabinet bearing in mind the seriousness of the incidents at that location.

Mr Bolton advised that the Local Transport Plan capital allocation had been reduced and that he would confirm the local priorities after the committee.

Executive Items For Decision

67/10 ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON STREET PARKING IN SURREY HEATH [Item 17]

Jack Roberts introduced the report.

Members were concerned that the proposals had not been consulted on widely enough. Mr Roberts confirmed that the county council followed the statutory process for consulting the public and other stakeholders. He had also consulted Bisley Parish Council as requested by the local committee at the previous meeting. He advised the committee that formal consultation would take place when the traffic regulation order was advertised, both on site and in the local press, thereby allowing further comments to come forward.

Mrs Sealy was concerned that all parish councils were not consulted as a standard part of the process. Mr Bolton confirmed that where specific requests to consult with parish councils on proposals local to them were received, the county council would extend the consultation to relevant parish councils. He explained that there were a considerable number of parish councils in the county and that it would not be practicable to consult with them all on every proposal, and confirmed that the advertising process was designed to enable comments from all. In some parts of the County, the County Councillor prefers to liaise with their Parish colleagues. It was confirmed that once the advert goes out there is a period of 28 days to make any objections. If objections are received, they will be considered by the Group Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional member. Mrs Sealy asked under what powers the committee could allocate member allocation funding for the proposals and Ms Rowe advised that it was within the social, economic and well-being remit of the local committee.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Surrey Heath as described in the report and shown in detail on drawings presented at the committee meeting as annex A (Drawings 1, 3-16, and 19-20)
- (ii) to allocate funding as detailed in paragraph 7 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments
- (iii) to make and advertise an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Surrey Heath as shown on the drawings in annex A (Drawings 1, 3-16, and 19-20) subject to no objections being received.

Executive Items for Decision

68/10 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS [Item 7]

A revised Annex A was tabled for Item 7.

Carolyn Rowe introduced the report.

The committee discussed applications received, and noted allocations made under delegated powers.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) The following allocations:

From the Individual Revenue allocation –

- 11.1 Surrey Police - £211.50 (Mr Ivison)
- 11.2 Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership - £201.74 (Mr Fuller)
- 11.3 Camberley Baptist Church - £1100.00 (Mr Fuller)
- 13.2 Prior Heath School - £297.83 (Mr Ivison)
- 13.3 The Grove Primary School - £988.50 (Mr Ivison)
- 13.4 Heather Ridge Infant School - £988.50 (Mr Ivison)
- 13.5 Crawley Ridge Infant/Junior Schools - £300.00 (Mr Chapman)
- 13.7 Frimley Martial Arts Centre - £976.00 (Mr Fuller)

From the Pooled Revenue allocation –

- 12.1 Kings International College - £2000.00
- 12.2 Frimley & Camberley Cadet Corps - £1500.00
- 12.3 Sandhurst Chess Club - £750.00
- 12.4 Home-Start Surrey Heath - £1500.00
- 12.5 Surrey County Council (SCC) Annual Review of On-Street Parking - £5000.00

From the Pooled Capital allocation –

- 13.1 Frimley Green Pre-School - £3000.00
- 13.6 Carwarden House Community School - £1137.00
- 13.8 Camberley and Farnborough Sea Cadets - £1800.00
- 13.9 St Mary's Nursery - £3000.00
- 13.10 SCC Annual Review of On-Street Parking - £15000.00

- (ii) to note the allocations agreed under delegated powers as detailed in paragraph 14 of the report;
- (iii) to note the summary of allocations as set out in the tabled Annex A attached to the report.

69/10 LOCAL CAPITAL AND REVENUE BUDGETS 2010/11 [Item 18]

Richard Bolton introduced the report which detailed proposals for the expenditure of local capital and revenue budgets.

Members discussed the merits of the various proposals.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) to debate further the implications for the local capital budget as set out in paragraphs 3 – 11 following updated scheme estimates, set out their priorities based on this information, and agree expenditure of the local capital budget on Bagshot High Street and Martindale Avenue
- (ii) the proposals for budget expenditure for the local revenue budget as set out in paragraph 12 of the report
- (iii) to delegate authority to review scheme priorities and ensure budget expenditure within the timeframe set to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, one nominated Divisional Member and one nominated Local Ward Councillor, each from the Local Committee
- (iv) to the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement a 20 mph speed limit on all sections of the High Street, Bagshot (including The Square) between the A30 London Road and Bridge Road and Park Street between High Street and A30 London Road, Bagshot and subject to no objections being maintained, make the Order.

70/10 DEVELOPMENT RELATED WORKS AT A30 LONDON ROAD [Item 19]

Richard Bolton introduced the report which sought permission for the erection of regulatory signs.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- i) to approve the erection and use of regulatory signs to diagram numbers 955, 956 & 957, in accordance with the Traffic Signs and General Directions 2002.

71/10 SMALL DISADVANTAGED AREAS FUND [Item 20]

Members were asked to consider three bids to the Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund. Bids had been compiled and submitted by local community groups, and each bid was introduced by a supporting Member.

Members discussed the bids and Carolyn Rowe reminded the committee of the process for making recommendations to the Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund (SDAF) Panel.

Mrs Sealy, supporting the Chobham Recreation Ground Charitable Trust bid, advised Members that the bid comprised three elements – refurbishing the playground, updating the Scout hut kitchen and refurbishing the football club pavilion. Mrs Sealy encouraged the committee to support the football club element since this was the heart of the bid.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed:

- (i) to consider all the bids detailed in paragraph 2.4 (and attached to the report as Annex A)
- (ii) to submit the following bids to the SDAF Panel:-
 - a. Chobham Recreation Ground Charitable Trust, which will be amended following discussions at the meeting, and the committee agreed it would support the bid for the football club pavilion of up to £78,200;
 - b. St Michaels Community Project which will be amended following discussions at the meeting;
 - c. Old Dean Community Group which will be amended following discussions at the meeting
- (iii) to recommend all three bids, subject to the above amendments, to the SDAF Panel for its consideration.

Executive Items For Information Only

**72/10 TASKS COMMISSIONED BY THE LOCAL COMMITTEE – MONITORING REPORT
[ITEM 21]**

Richard Bolton introduced the report.

Mr Chapman commented that some items could now be removed from the report and Mr Bolton agreed that the Area Highway Manager would undertake a full review in advance of the next committee.

73/10 FORWARD PLAN [Item 22]

The report was for information only.

Councillor Dougan requested that a future item on Controlled Parking Zones be included. Item 11 (Deferred) Application for a Map Modification Order - would be brought forward to the next meeting.

The meeting finished at 9.15pm

Chairman.

Open Public Question Time - Notes
Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Surrey Heath)
14 October 2010, Kings International College, Camberley

1. Tim Dodds, Borough Councillor, Lightwater

Following the death of a jogger on the Red Road on Saturday (9th October), there are three kissing gate entrances onto heathland, all of which are hidden by vegetation and there is no indication to vehicles of people passing into them. Will Surrey County Council consider signing the crossings to identify them? Red Road is paved for a part only, many people cross the heathland to walk and there needs to be some safe access onto Lightwater Road and Briar Avenue so they can cross to get to Heatherside. It requires a county council study in that area to see what the potential is by the next local committee, having studied it and report back.

Reply from Bill Chapman, County Councillor

We will look at it. It is the Local Committee's desire to reduce the speed limit on Red Road.

2. David Cox, Heatherside

The decoration of the shopping precinct at Heatherside is a mess. There are issues over ownership of the land and no-one seems to take responsibility for the facades of the shops, particularly the goods entrance to Sainsburys at the rear, which is very bad. The proposed recreational facilities at the green on Heatherside have been deferred for planning consent – when will something happen?

Reply from David Ivison, County Councillor

There was an article in the local newspaper drawing attention to the situation. I have been looking into the matter and talking to Sainsburys to see who is responsible. There are eleven shops there who do not own the freehold, there is a management company that has the support of the borough councillors. The delivery area is not our area – there are six shops on that side and it is up to the six shop owners to repair – it will deteriorate if they do not do so. With regard to the village green, it will go ahead but when?

Reply from Paul Ilnicki, Borough Councillor

I am the Chair of Surrey Heath Borough Council Planning Committee and there was an item on the agenda for the meeting on 20th September 2010. The item was withdrawn because of the need to carry out a noise study – this study should not take long. I have asked for a meeting with the new Chief Executive as I am aware the proposed surface needs to be improved to help the noise issue and there will be a small additional cost to that, but the item should be received by the Planning Committee by the end of the year.

Reply from Vivienne Chapman, Borough Councillor

I hold the Community Portfolio at the Borough Council – the money is there and we want to go ahead as soon as possible – the sooner the better.

3. Paul Deach, Deepcut

Who designed the hideous welcome signs in Deepcut – which were vandalised within three days – why weren't the local residents committee involved in the design?

Reply from David Whitcroft, Borough Councillor

I will make no further comment – I believe it was the county council as opposed to the borough council.

Reply from David Ivison, County Councillor

No, I believe it was the borough council and not the county council – similar to the signs in Camberley.

Reply from Bill Chapman, County Councillor

I believe that the borough council is responsible not the county council.

Reply from Richard Brooks, Borough Councillor

I think they are borough council but it is unclear so we will take it away and come back to you.

4. Cyril Pavey, Camberley

There is no No Cycling notice on the footpath leading from The Avenue, Camberley into the London Road Recreation Ground.

Reply from Richard Bolton, Surrey County Council Highways

I will check with the Rights of Way team at county and come back to you.

5. Ms Glyn Carpenter, Bagshot Business Association

Why are the new signs in Camberley not everywhere? If the Bagshot Business Association raises the funds can we have some?

Reply from Colin Dougan, Borough Councillor

The Atrium development paid for the Camberley signs.

Reply from Wynne Price, Borough Councillor

In Bisley, the Parish Council put up our own signs.

Reply from Vivienne Chapman, Borough Councillor

There could be some funding available out of the Section 106 funds for the Notcutts development. I will look into this.

6. Malcolm Vaughan, Bisley Parish Council

Bisley Parish Council has been involved in Speedwatch with many vehicles travelling at 35 plus miles per hour in Church Lane – what are the expectations of long-term safety measures?

Reply from Lavinia Sealy, County Councillor

Bisley residents are committed to speedwatch. Would it be possible to move the 30mph sign towards the Woking side? There are dangerous bends needing a reduced speed limit because the bends conceal the residential parking there. Warbury Lane feeds into Church Lane but only one way and there are often vehicles travelling in the wrong direction. This needs Surrey Heath and Woking Borough Council officers, the parish council and local residents to look at together.

Reply from Richard Bolton, Surrey County Council Highways

The county council would need to assess the costs of moving the 30mph sign. Surrey County Council Local Committee (Woking) also have concerns about Warbury Lane and I suggest that the Area Highways Manager could meet with appropriate officers and Members to look at what can be done. The police are the enforcement authority.

7. Valerie White, Windlesham Parish Council

The Archaeological Society pays a peppercorn rent for the facility on London Road, Bagshot and the rent is to be increased. The Bagshot Society want to keep the centre in Bagshot – what can be done about the rent?

Reply from Denis Fuller, County Councillor

I have met with officers and the Society – there are lots of societies experiencing funding cuts and, if you ask the taxpayers, it is not a priority. I have offered to help them review their business practices and others have offered to help too.

Reply from Lavinia Sealy, County Councillor

The meeting was very useful – they do need to regularise their rent arrears, which are substantial, to prove they are worth it.

8. Alan Kirkland, Southern Road, Camberley

The zebra crossing in Charles Street is ignored by drivers. There should be a study of the crossing – it is an accident waiting to happen.

Reply from Colin Dougan, Borough Councillor

I support the comments.

Reply from Richard Bolton, Surrey County Council Highways

If people are ignoring the crossing, it is because they are going too fast or people are not expecting it to be used. It would cost between £80-£100k to make the crossing into a pelican crossing. Injury accidents are reported to Surrey County Council, and decisions about appropriate schemes and studies are made on evidence available. It is not recommended that an additional study is carried out at this location.

Item 15 (Tabled) – Written Public Question from Ms Glyn Carpenter, Bagshot Business Association

I understand that there is a "Drain Reserve" which can be used for improving drainage in Surrey Heath, at the Bagshot Business Association Meeting held on the 27th September this was the main topic of conversation. Some businesses in Bagshot are severely affected when we have a large down pour and are very frustrated with the lack of response from both the council and Thames Water. How can we access this money and put it to good use in our village?

Whilst not within the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked officers if they could investigate.

1. The Surrey Heath Borough Council Drainage Engineer, Wayne Purdon, responded as follows -

I am not aware of any specific drainage issues in Bagshot but will contact Bagshot Business Association direct in order to discuss their concerns.

In addition

2. Richard Bolton, Surrey County Council Operations, Highways and Countryside responded –

Surrey County Council and Surrey Highways are not aware of a 'drain reserve'. Where a highway-flooding problem exists this can be reported to wah@surreycc.gov.uk where it will be programmed for investigation. We have been notified recently of a problem in Guildford Road, Bagshot that has been added to our list of drainage problems in the Borough. The combination tanker/jetting vehicle will be in Surrey Heath the week commencing 25th October and this problem will be investigated during that week with the originator of the report notified of our findings.

Item 16 (Tabled) – Written Member Questions from Cllr David Whitcroft

The Chairman, on behalf of the Local Committee, has asked for responses from Richard Bolton, Surrey County Council's Local Delivery and Customer Service Group Manager - Operations, Highways and Countryside;

1. Following a request in July 2009 will SCC Highway Dept install 2 bollards either side of the tactile pavement in front of The Brook Church in Bagshot Square? If so, when will the work be carried out?
There is no specific budget currently for the provision of new bollards and so these currently sit amongst our other priorities. Naturally, priority is given to our maintenance defects. It would be possible to include the provision of the bollards as part of the High Street, Bagshot 20mph speed limit scheme. An item on the agenda for the Committee on the 14th October will seek to discuss funding priorities following receipt of a small capital budget. If Members agree to fund the speed limit proposal for the High Street then the bollards could be implemented as part of this work.
2. Is it the intention of SCC Highways Dept to 're-white' beacon stands and repaint the Safer Ways to schools crossing on the Guildford Rd in Bagshot, nearest to Whitmoor Rd end? If so, when will the work be carried out?
There are no plans to repaint the Belisha Beacon posts. These have been checked and their performance found to be satisfactory. The Borough's road marking maintenance programme has been issued to the Council's contractor forming part of a wider West Area programme. Work has commenced and they will be in Surrey Heath shortly.
3. In respect of the pedestrian crossing in the centre of Bagshot High Street, is it the intention of SCC Highways Dept to provide improved signage to improve safety and remind motorists that they are approaching a crossing? If so, when will the work be carried out?
There is no budget currently for the provision of new signing. However, when preparing a draft signing layout in relation to the 20mph speed limit in High Street, Bagshot, their provision was included. An item on the agenda for the Committee on the 14th October will seek to discuss funding priorities following receipt of a small capital budget. If Members agree to fund the 20mph speed limit proposal for the High Street then the warning signs will be implemented as part of that work.
4. In view of the latest serious accident to take place on the A322 Lightwater By-Pass, is the County Council in a position to reconsider the possibility of providing a safety barrier along the Surrey Heath section of the road?
There is currently no funding to provide new safety fencing in the County. The Lightwater Bypass, under the last county assessment, is the 3rd listed priority site for funding should it become available.