



Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda
Meeting held at 7.30 pm on 19 March 2003
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mr David Rousell – Chairman	
Mr Geoff Marlow – Vice-Chairman	
Cllr Gordon Brown	Cllr Neville Hinks
Mrs Elizabeth Compton	Cllr John Kingsbury
Cllr Bryan Cross	Cllr James Palmer
Mrs Sheila Gruselle	Mrs Val Tinney
Mrs Margaret Hill	

Part One – in public

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

17/03 **Apologies for absence** [Item 1]

Cllr John Pattison sent his apologies for absence.

18/03 **Minutes of last meeting held on 22 January 2003** [Item 2]

Confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

19/03 **Declarations of interests** [Item 3]

No declarations of interest in accordance with Standing Order 58 were made.

20/03 **Petitions** [Item 4]

No petitions in accordance with Standing Order 62 were received.

21/03 **Public questions on transportation matters** [Item 5]

This question from Mrs Pauline Marshall was carried forward from the last meeting:

"Can you please explain why the number 34 bus cannot run along High Street/Limecroft Road, Knaphill as it previously did, serving the (active) Nursing Home, the Priory Hospital, school, dentist's surgery and Baptist church as well as the large populations in areas off Chobham Road (north) and Limecroft Road?

When it ran regularly and reliably there was always someone waiting at the 'Garibaldi' crossroads stop. I understand that a survey of users was done in 2001 but this was in the unreliable period, so cannot be compared with any current figures, or as a measure of present demand. As many of the residents in the area covered by the "old" 34 bus are over 60 (bus passes) or under driving age this seems to be an ideal area where a revamped service would promote bus use. Passengers used to come into the area as well as people going both ways to Woking and Bisley, West End and Camberley.

Is there any reason in the SCC agreements with Sainsbury's or Arriva etc. why the 34 bus on a half-hourly service cannot be re-instated now along Limecroft Road/High Street, as people from St. Johns, Bisley and West End would still have a half-hourly service to Sainsbury's? The 48 bus that was diverted to Chobham Road is not a replacement as it starts too late for workers and school children, finishes too early and doesn't connect the villages."

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

"This matter has been raised with Surrey County Council Passenger Transport Group who have overseen the Route 34 Quality Bus Partnership. The following reasons have been given for there being no change to the position:

Service 34 is an integral part of the legal agreement for the Section 106, between Sainsbury's, Health Authority, Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council. The Section 106 includes for the Service 34 to go via Sainsbury's otherwise the funding is invalidated and there would be no Quality Bus Partnership.

Fewer passengers use the High Street section and Limecroft was recorded as 12 per day by Arriva, most of whom were thought to be students. Only Limecroft Road does not have a bus service along its length.

The 48 is deemed to be of sufficient frequency and connects St Johns (Post Office) with Knaphill (Post Office) and travels along Chobham Road and the High Street. The first bus from Woking leaves at 07.40 arriving at Knaphill at 07.56 whilst the first bus in the opposite direction leaves Knaphill at 08.08 arriving at Woking Station at 08.24. Buses at the end of the day finish around 18.00-18.30.

It should also be noted that the new routing benefits housing on the Brookwood site giving links to St Johns, Bisley, West End, Lightwater and Frimley Park Hospital. The shops on the A322 also advantage Chobham Road and Ivydene which is connected by path to the A322."

This question was received from Mr. Andrew Cockerill:

"Have the traffic calming measures for White Rose Lane been agreed and when will work commence?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

"The traffic calming measures were agreed for the purpose of consultation at the Committee meeting on 22 January 2003. Residents will be consulted in April/May. Assuming a favourable response, a further report will go to June Committee. Works are programmed to commence in October 2003 however if the start date can be advanced in conjunction with our new Constructor this will be the aim."

This question was received from Mr. Bruce McLaren (Chair of Governors, Sythwood School):

"What is the average speed of traffic in the immediate vicinity of Sythwood School?; by what means was it measured? and what thought has been given to traffic calming measures such as rumble strips, hatching in the road centre and additional signage?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

"Typical average speeds (two-way) outside the school are just under 33mph. However, at school times they are slightly lower, typically about 30mph.

These speeds were measured using an automatic traffic counter between 11 and 18 July 2003. The counter measures speeds by means of two rubber tubes stretched across the carriageway.

The results of this survey were made known to the Committee on 22 January 2003 (Speed Safety Appraisals Report). The report stated that, because of the presence of parked cars outside the school, vehicle speeds on Sythwood at school times were lower than at other times, and no further speed reducing measures were being considered.

Rumble strips are typically used in rural areas on the approach to villages. Their use in residential roads is not recommended because of the noise they generate. Hatching in the centre of the road could be confusing to motorists at school times, because parked vehicles would force other motorists into the hatched area. New highly reflective school warning signs on yellow backing boards are to be erected shortly."

Mr Masson, Senior Engineer Integrated Transport, promised to supply information about how many vehicles in the survey travelled at over 30 mph.

This question was received from Cllr Geoff Smith:

“What is the County Council's legal liability position concerning accident victims? Should the Lockfield Drive/Well Lane, Woking traffic lights/right turning project be implemented despite police objections on safety grounds?”

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

“Advice from Surrey County Council’s legal staff is that Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980 which deals with the protection of public rights makes it the duty of the Highway Authority to assert and protect the rights of the public to the use and enjoyment of any highway for which they are the Highway Authority. It follows from this that highway safety is of paramount importance to any Highway Authority and it must be a weighty factor in the promotion of any highway scheme.

If Members decide to approve a highway scheme in the face of police objections on the grounds of highway safety then they need to be able to give considered reasons for that course of action. A highway user, aware that a scheme had recently been implemented, who is then involved in an accident the reason for which can be linked to the installation of the new traffic lights may wish to sue the Highway Authority if the highway user can prove negligence on the part of that Highway Authority. Of course there is such a thing as contributory negligence and the Highway Authority may be able to prove that it was not their scheme that was at fault.”

This question was received from Mr. Michael Gammon:

“Is the Committee aware that Woking Borough undertook traffic surveys before and after the barrier was installed at the junction of Lockfield Drive and Arthur’s Bridge Rd which showed a 30% increase in flows on Brewery Rd and Horsell High Street and 15% rise in Sythwood? Please will they take account of the potential risks of accidents on those roads from the diverted traffic when considering whether to install the traffic lights at the junction?”

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

“The Committee is aware that implementing a scheme on the highway will often change traffic patterns. The data to which you refer was reported to the 4 January 1999 meeting of the Highways and Traffic Management Sub-Committee of Woking Borough Council.” The table is included below together with the appropriate paragraphs:

Changes in 2-way traffic flows (12 hours 7am-7pm)

Road	Before	After	Change
Well Lane (south of Abbey Road)	2238	1615	-623 (-28%)
Abbey Road	692	562	-130 (-19%)
Arthur's Bridge Road	2289	1974	-315 (-14%)
Sythwood (south of Bullbeggars Lane)	3353	3791	+438 (+13%)
Sythwood (north of Bullbeggars Lane)	3818	3665	-153 (-4%)
Brewery Road	5569	6165	+596 (+11%)
Church Hill	5004	5521	+517 (+10%)
Lockfield Drive	16080	15286	-794 (-5%)

"It can be seen from the table that there has been a shift from Well Lane and Arthur's Bridge Road to Brewery Road and Church Hill. It should be noted that the Brewery Road/Church Hill route is part of the classified road network and is designated as a local distributor road. The increase of 10-11% is considered to be acceptable and the route is still operating well within capacity.

It can also be seen that there has been an increase in traffic of around 13% on the southern part of Sythwood. However, on the northern section of Sythwood where the school is located, there has been a slight decrease in traffic since the introduction of the scheme. The increase does not appear to have resulted in an increase in accidents on the route.

The table reflects the change in traffic flows at that time both up and down. For example there has been a 19% reduction in flow on Abbey Road and a 14% reduction on Arthur's Bridge Road.

The issue of potential risks of accidents on roads as a result of diverted traffic will be highlighted to Committee both in respect of increased and decreased traffic flow. It should be noted that in a report to Woking Borough Council Executive Committee on 26 July 2001 it was stated that 'An inspection of the accident records show that accidents have not transferred to the surrounding area. There appears to be no overall increase in accidents but a slight decrease, 3 in total'."

This question was received from Mr. & Mrs. F J Osborne:

“Can you please explain why all drivers wishing to turn right out of Well Lane into Lockfield Drive to head west should be denied FULL TRAFFIC LIGHTS to facilitate this AS ALREADY AGREED, because of the false premise that traffic lights cause accidents, which has not been supported by the fact that the existing pedestrian controlled lights have not caused a serious accident since their original installation many years ago.”

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

“The current scheme has been successful in reducing accidents to the extent that only four slight accidents have occurred at the junction location in the last three years. Installation of the traffic light scheme as proposed will only allow traffic to turn right out of Well Lane to head west along Lockfield Drive. Traffic lights do not ‘cause’ accidents; road users must understand that currently in Surrey the average accident figures at traffic signal junctions in the most recent 3 year period are as follows:

All movements	=	4.2 Surrey and 5.9 Woking
Right turn accidents	=	1.6 Surrey and 3.7 Woking

Statistically based on the current rate of accidents occurring at traffic lights in Woking, it is anticipated that on average 5.9 may occur at this location with 3.7 due to right turn movements.”

This question was received from Mrs. A.J. Worgan

“At the Police & Community Partnership Meeting on 3rd March, the Police stated that accidents would increase by 6.5% as right hand turns at traffic lights carry a record of high collision risk. Surrey County Council then said that this figure of 6.5 is not a **percentage**, but the **number** of possible accidents, this figure having been supplied by the Police. At Horsell Residents Association’s AGM, a Police Inspector confirmed that this figure was 6.5 accidents and that Surrey County Council supplied the figure to the Police. Having now received a letter from the Police Inspector confirming that indeed the figure is 6.5% on accident figures over the past four years, this would equate to 1 additional accident every 15 years. 6.5 additional accidents however would mean a 300% increase over the accident figures before the right turn ban was introduced.

Could the committee please inform me:

- Who did supply the figures to whom and from where did they originate? i.e. actual records extrapolated or statistical probability calculations?
- What is the actual figure, a % or absolute and over what period?
- Which figure was used in PC Brake’s assessment and objection?”

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

"Surrey County Council Casualty Reduction team provided the accident data for the site and the accident statistics. Data is based on accident forms submitted by the Police and processed into the Surrey County Council database. The report on Lockfield Drive to today's Local Committee meeting reports the figures in paragraphs 26 to 31. Confusion has arisen regarding the term 6.5%. This relates to the average accident rate, 1997 to 1999, for a typical traffic signal junction in Woking which is 6.5. I assume that PC Brake has used the data available to make his assessment. A recent review to update the data indicates that the 6.5 figure has reduced slightly to 5.9 for the three year period."

This question was received from Mrs. Dorothy Smith:

"The objection letter of the 8th January 2003 from PC Brake states in paragraph 5, quote 'Having allowed traffic to turn right out of the Arthur's Bridge Road the pedestrian lights will also become a hazard at this location. There does not seem to be sufficient distance from the junction to the pedestrian crossing.'

Logic would dictate that the traffic signal system would be all embracing. This must be one of the hazard factors taken into account by PC Brake. Does this mean that the proposed traffic lights do not incorporate the pedestrian crossing? If this is the case, the hazard can be removed by incorporating the pedestrian crossing into the traffic light scheme; and if the signals do incorporate the pedestrian crossing, why is this included in the objection as a hazard?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

"The traffic light system at this junction will encompass vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. The new system is designed to incorporate the pedestrian facilities and the traffic travelling eastbound will stop at red effectively where the pedestrian lights are now. The concern of Surrey Police is that traffic turning right out of Arthur's Bridge Road will encounter a red light and traffic will back up across the junction. The design allows for two lanes of vehicles approaching the lights and timings of the lights will be such to minimise any problems."

Geoff Wallace, Senior Principal Engineer, confirmed that the police still see the proposed traffic signal as a hazard even though the proposal is for combined lights for vehicles and pedestrians.

22/03 Members' Questions [Item 6]

This question was received from Cllr Gordon Brown:

"As we are considering safe routes to school, I have been asked about a footpath on the east side of Sheerwater Road, to facilitate children walking from Holm Close and Silver Birch Close to the Marist School. Whilst we appreciate that this would require a footbridge over the Basingstoke Canal, we have been requesting this, in the

interests of safety, for at least 15 years. With the ever-increasing traffic on Sheerwater Road, the alternative of crossing the road twice to reach the school is totally unacceptable. Please can we have some action after so long?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, replied:

"This location has been raised with the Local Transportation Service by members of the public via Councillor Rousell. Officers are considering alternative solutions to facilitate safe crossing of the canal on the east side as well as the west side. This was highlighted in the A245/A320 Transportation Study published in September 2002. The proposal was to 'provide new bridge for pedestrian/cycles along east side of canal bridge'. Estimated cost of the proposal was £100,000. Any proposals at this location are not included in this year's or next year's programme."

Mr Rousell added that he had also received several submissions from the public about the situation, and was exploring feasible and affordable solutions.

These five questions were received from Cllr Bryan Cross:

1. "Can the Chairman of the Local Transport Committee please advise me what the minimum and maximum height and width is for speed humps and speed tables as prescribed by the relevant authority. Would the Chairman also please advise the date on which these regulations were last changed and in what respect they were changed."
2. "How many speed humps/tables/cushions that are presently installed in residential roads in the Borough of Woking are higher than those in Kingsway and how much higher are they?"
3. "How many speed humps/tables/cushions currently installed in residential roads in the Borough of Woking are the same height as those on Kingsway?"
4. "How many schemes of road humps/tables/cushions have been installed in residential roads in the Borough of Woking in the last five years and what is the height of each scheme?"
5. "Why are there considerably larger distances between the speed humps/tables/cushions in Walton Road than in the Kingsway?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, replied:

"The dimensions of speed humps/cushions/tables are constrained by the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1996. The only dimensions so constrained are maximum and minimum heights of road humps/speed tables, which are 100mm and 25mm respectively, and the minimum length of a road hump which is 900mm.

For speed cushions the maximum recommended height is 80mm. The maximum recommended width is 2 metres and the maximum recommended length is 3.7 metres.

The Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1996 superseded the Highways (Road Humps) Regulations 1990, which governed the dimensions of road humps more strictly and did not permit speed cushions."

The table below gives details of all existing traffic calming schemes (by means of vertical deflection) in the Woking local area.

Existing Traffic Calming (Vertical Deflection) in Woking

Location	Traffic Calming Measure	Number	Road Length (m)	Distance between measures (m)	Height (mm)
Kingsway	Speed cushions	13 sets	650	35 - 75	75
Bullbeggars Lane	Road humps & speed tables	4 humps 3 tables	695	100	100
Chertsey Road, Byfleet	Speed tables & width restrictions	9	660	65	100
Ormonde Road	Road humps	4	270	35 - 95	100
Oyster Lane, Byfleet	Speed tables & width restrictions	7	470	25 - 55	100
Victoria Road, Knaphill	Speed cushions	15	740	50	50 - 60
Walton Road	Speed tables	11	880	80	100
Well Lane	Road humps	8	440	35 - 85	100
Wych Hill Lane	Speed tables	6	500	80	75-100

"Apart from the scheme in Kingsway, no other similar traffic calming schemes have been introduced in the last five years.

The spacing of the cushions in Kingsway was designed to encourage drivers to maintain a constant low speed. The recommended maximum spacing for speed cushions is 70 metres."

Three questions were received from Cllr John Kingsbury. The first was:

"St John's Road:- At the last meeting on 22nd January, under paragraphs 45 and 46 of the 'Agency Transfer Work-Speed Safety Appraisals', it was agreed to carry out some speed reducing measures which it was said could be introduced quickly and relatively low cost! Could the Chairman kindly indicate when this work might be done, as I cannot see it on any future work programme!"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, replied:

"The work consists of laying some coloured surfacing and modifying the existing road markings. This work will be funded from the 'Aids to Movement' budget for 2003/4. The proposals will be drawn up and ordered next month, and I anticipate that the work will be carried out in May/June 2003."

Second question from Cllr John Kingsbury:

"Hook Heath Road:- The introduction of double yellow lines at the beginning of Hook Heath Road has been hailed as a great success with the risk of accidents being reduced considerably. The road re-surfacing programme has led to their temporary removal! Already the situation is beginning to deteriorate, with indiscriminate parking causing traffic problems around the Garage area. Would the Chairman please indicate when it is hoped the double yellow lines will be re-instated!"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, replied:

"This work was included in a recent programme of road markings within the district. The double yellow lines and access protection markings at Hook Heath Road have been ordered and work is in progress. At the time of writing the white lining has been completed and the yellow markings are imminent."

Third question from Cllr John Kingsbury:

"Robin Hood Roundabout, Lockfield Drive (adjacent to Amstell Way):- The street lighting at this roundabout and adjacent area has been out for some time! Could enquiries be made as to when it is likely to be re-instated, as it is a busy location and the lack of illumination makes driving hazardous."

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, replied:

"This is work in connection with the A324 Lockfield Drive/Denton Way pedestrian/cycle facilities scheme approved by Local Committee and commenced in March 2003. New lamp columns have been installed but as yet not connected, the existing streetlights should still be operational. It is anticipated that works will be complete by the end of March however electrical connection to the new streetlights may take a little longer."

Cllr Kingsbury pointed out that there were no lights there at the time of the meeting, and asked if something could be done as an interim solution.

Stephen Child replied that the street lighting engineer was investigating the problem and would sort something out very soon.

Executive Functions

23/03 Lockfield Drive junction with Arthur's Bridge Road [Item 7]

In relation to the Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting the right turn from Lockfield Drive into Arthur's Bridge Road and the traffic signal junction, Mr Rousell emphasised that the Committee was being required only to consider the police objection, and not to review the need for the project which Woking Borough Council had initiated and would largely pay for.

Stephen Child, Local Transport Director, said that he had responded to questions from the police, and had accurate accident data.

Stephen Child presented the results of consultation. Consultation covered a wide area in Horsell similar to the previous exercise undertaken by Woking Borough Council in 1999. In addition questionnaires were placed at LA Fitness and given to Horsell Residents Association to pass to other businesses. Total questionnaires issued were 3350.

Summary of response

Return Rate 31% (1030) [WBC Return Rate 32% (825)]

39% Do nothing, leave it as it is.

61% Do something.

Of those that said 'Do something' (629):

36% Agree with right turn out only.

57% Change it to full movement in and out.

7% No comment.

With knowledge of likely collisions at signals:

5% Would not support signals.

87% Still support signals.

3% of those that replied were businesses.

The Committee gave careful consideration to the prediction from the police that the change would increase the risk of accidents at the junction, noted that this risk was not different from the risk associated with all traffic lights, noted the need to enable people to travel in and out of Horsell, and took into account the clear views of respondents to the questionnaire.

Resolved

After considerable discussion, Members decided by 8 votes for, three against, that the Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting the right turn from Lockfield Drive into Arthur's Bridge Road be confirmed and made permanent, notwithstanding the objection, and that implementation of the limited movement traffic signal junction be progressed to completion. Mrs Sheila Gruselle asked for her vote against the decision to be recorded in the minutes.

24/03 Local Transportation Plan Implementation Programme for Woking 2003/04
[Item 8]

Members received a report on the result of the Committee's bid for funding the Integrated Transportation Programme for Woking 2003/04. Stephen Child reported that as a result of a very good submission Woking received a 30% uplift on the base figure to give a total of £572,000. Members noted that the A320 study, A322 Chobham Road and the A320 intermediate scheme would not be funded in the financial year 03 / 04. All items would be reconsidered for bids for funding next year. It was also noted that £130,000 is anticipated for Pegasus school bus related projects on safe routes to school.

In reply to a question from Cllr Cross, Stephen Child said that officers considered a roundabout as well as traffic lights for the A320 Almond Avenue junction, however with the school in the area, traffic lights are the best solution, as it provides safer facilities for pedestrian movements.

Cllr Kingsbury was pleased that the crossing was to be put in at Monument Road / Maybury Hill. In relation to the A322 Chobham Road scheme (not funded in 2003/04) he asked for action before funding is secured to improve sight-lines and conclude the land acquisition. Stephen Child agreed to deal with vegetation, if it impedes sight-lines and would report on progress with the land acquisition

Resolved

That the Integrated Transportation Programme for Woking 2003/04 be approved.

25/03 Local Bus Services [Item 9]

Members discussed a report about bus services in the Woking area, the problems with and shortcomings in current service provision, including revisions to the section relating to bus route 437 which were presented by officers.

Mrs Tinney expressed her concern that only three buses go from Pyrford to the hospital in Ashford, yet many people cannot afford cars. Laurie James of the Passenger transport group said that the contract will be re-tendered this summer, and they will address this if possible.

In reply to a question about subsidy levels from Mr Rousell, Laurie James said that the Surrey-wide subsidy for buses is £6.5million a year, up from £3 million two and a half years ago for much the same level of service. The increased cost is because of higher wages, premises, insurance and other costs. He reminded Members that two bus companies have gone out of business, while another has withdrawn from all except routes in Woking and Guildford. He would supply information about the subsidy to buses in Woking.

Cllr Hinks reminded Members that he had asked for routes 34 or 35 to be re-routed to cover the same roads as the 34 covered before its route was changed. He had 30

replies to a questionnaire to people in Knaphill, a lot of whom said that they would use the bus if it were reinstated along Limecroft Road and part of the High Street. Laurie James reminded Members that routes 34 and 35 are not wholly Surrey County Council-subsidised, being a Quality Bus Partnership, a public-private partnership with Arriva; this take into account routes, simplicity, and ease of partnership. The success of the Partnership to achieve modal shift requires a simple attractive route structure which facilitates promotion to the current non-bus users in the area. Surrey County Council gets a share of additional revenue and uses it to offset the cost of providing the enhanced 34/35 services. The aim is that within five years, the route would require no subsidy in daylight hours Monday to Saturday. The Committee asked Laurie James to review the routes again, consulting users; he said that he would be able to take advantage of the questionnaires described by Cllr Hinks, and a survey of use which is already planned for the spring.

Cllr Brown praised the new A472 route.

In response to a question from Cllr Brown, Laurie James said that it is not significantly more expensive to run buses in the north than in the south of England, but it is more difficult to recruit drivers.

Resolved

That the report be received, and to note that:

- i) a further report on bus services to and from Fullbrook School will be brought to the June 2003 meeting of the Committee; and
- ii) a report on bus shelter provision in Woking will be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

26/03 Annual Highway Maintenance Plan 2003/04 [Item 10]

Members discussed the Annual Highway Management Plan and Highway Maintenance Budget Allocations.

Officers agreed to amend the report to show that Harvest Road is in Byfleet, not West Byfleet.

Mr Marlow pointed out that the maintenance programme needs to recognise faster growth of vegetation in the spring.

Cllr Palmer asked about progress on the contract on residual clearing, which some Members had assumed would be between Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council. Stephen Child said that Ringway would be responsible from 28 April for 10 years, if they perform well.

Cllr Cross pointed out the need to review the cost effectiveness of cheap treatments to ensure value for money given visual appearance and use on residential roads.

Cllr Cross asked for action on metal barriers which separate pedestrians from traffic where these are bent out of shape. Stephen Child said that these had been surveyed and they are liaising with the contractor to repair them.

Resolved

That the Annual Highway Management Plan and Highway Maintenance Budget Allocations for the Local Transportation Service Woking 2003-2004 be approved.

27/03 Rising bollards – Chobham Road / Chertsey Road [Item 11]

Members received a report on the operation of rising bollards in Chobham Road at its junction with Chertsey Road, in use since 15 January 2003.

Stephen Child introduced the report and took opportunity to highlight a query from a local business together with the officer response regarding operation of the bollards. No comments had been received at the time the report was produced. A copy of the query together with officer response has been issued to the Local Committee.

Mr Rousell suggested that part of the problem is that the pedestrian area was not enforced for several years, and that it still looks like a road. Stephen Child suggested he could consult the Town Centre users group the following week, and look at the Town centre access study. Cllr Kingsbury said that there had been extensive discussions when Woking Borough Council decided to create the pedestrianised area, and recommended that Surrey County Council does not go over old ground with the same individuals.

Resolved

- a) that the pedestrianised area and Traffic Regulation Order is enforced by the permanent use of rising bollards.
- b) that officers consider how the area could be more clearly shown to be pedestrianised.

28/03 Cycle route, Woking Station – Sutton Green [Item 12]

Members considered the proposed cycle route between Woking Station and Sutton Green. Stephen Child handed out copies of the maps in the report highlighting the route in colour for clarity.

In reply to a comment from Mrs Tinney, John Masson, Senior Engineer Integrated Transport, confirmed that cyclists should dismount in order to travel the wrong way past St Dunstan's church in White Rose Lane.

Resolved

- a) that the proposed north-south cycle route between Woking Station and Sutton Green, as shown in Annexes A – C, be approved for implementation; and

- b) that Woking Borough Council be requested to permit cycling on those paths within Woking Park which form part of the proposed route and to allow the erection of direction signs within the park, and
- c) that officers liaise with their counterparts in the Guildford Transportation Service to agree and progress the improvements needed at the junction of Blanchards Hill and Clay Lane.

29/03 Westfield Estate traffic calming proposals and survey results [Item 13]

Members noted that the survey held during February 2003 demonstrated overwhelming support for the proposals for the Westfield Estate traffic calming scheme.

Resolved

That the scheme be approved for implementation.

30/03 Chertsey Road, Byfleet and Princess Road, Maybury – proposed changes to waiting restrictions [Item 14]

Stephen Child handed out copies of the maps in the report highlighting the restrictions in colour for clarity. Members agreed the proposal at Princess Road, Maybury. The waiting restriction proposed at Chertsey Road, Byfleet was discussed. An amendment was proposed by Councillor Marlow to end the restriction at the boundary between 99 and 101 Chertsey Road. Members agreed changes to waiting restrictions in Chertsey Road, Byfleet as in the report except that the restriction will end at the boundary between 99 and 101 Chertsey Road.

Resolved

- a) To advertise a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to:
 - i. introduce waiting restrictions in Chertsey Road, Byfleet, as shown on Drawing No. 11440 except that the restriction will end at the boundary between 99 and 101 Chertsey Road and not as shown;
 - ii. remove the existing waiting restrictions in Princess Road, Maybury and introduce "no waiting at any time" at the Princess Road/Maybury Hill junction as shown on Drawing No. 11441
- b) and that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

31/03 A322 Bagshot Road and Lockfield Drive – proposed amendments to speed limit [Item 15]

Members agreed an extension of the existing 30 miles per hour speed limits on A322 Bagshot Road and Lockfield Drive.

Resolved

- a) to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to extend the existing 30mph speed limits in A322 Bagshot Road and Lockfield Drive as shown on Drawing Nos. 11438 and 11439 respectively; and
- b) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

32/03 Goose Rye Road – proposed changes to speed limit [Item 16]

Members considered the recommended reduction in the speed limit on the section of Goose Rye Road which lies within the Borough of Woking. Cllr Palmer pointed out that as proposed, there would be a short section in Burdenshott Road from Goose Rye Road junction to the 40 mph signs to the north where vehicles would go out and in of speed restrictions in quick succession. Members agreed that this should be added to the order Members therefore added this part of Burdenshott Road (from Goose Rye Road junction to the 40 mph signs to the north) to the area to be covered by the order.

Resolved

- a) that the Guildford Local Committee advertise the Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce a 40mph speed limit on the whole length of Goose Rye Road and the length of Burdenshott Road from Goose Rye Road North to the existing 40mph signs.
- b) that the Guildford Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Guildford Local Committee Members, consider and, if possible, resolve any objections to the Order regarding the Guildford section of Goose Rye Road; and
- c) that authority be delegated to the Woking Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman, to consider and, if possible, resolve any objections to the Order regarding the Woking section of Goose Rye Road and Burdenshott Road.

33/03 Westfield Avenue and Westfield Road proposed junction improvements [Item 17]

Members agreed a junction improvement scheme at the Westfield Avenue and Westfield Road junction with Bonsey Lane, Westfield, in conjunction with Safe Routes to schools and Project Pegasus initiatives.

Resolved

- a) that the proposed junction improvements be approved for implementation, and
- b) that approval be given for the improvements to the existing crossing point of Westfield Avenue.

34/03 Highway Services and Works Partnering Contract [Item 18]

Members received a report on the current situation regarding the Highway Services and Works Partnering Contract, the appointment of Ringway Highway Services as constructor in the west of the county with contract start date of 28 April 2003, and a meeting on 8 April at which Ringway Highway Services will be giving a presentation of how they see the partnership working.

Resolved

- a) that the contents of the briefing be noted
- b) that Members were encouraged to attend to meet Ringway Highway Services on 8 April.

35/03 Review of progress implementing the Integrated Transportation Programme for 2002/03 [Item 19]

Members noted good progress in implementing the agreed Integrated Transportation Programme for the current year 2002/03. Cllr Kingsbury commended the double roundabouts at A324 Hermitage Road and the real time bus information. In response to a comment from Mrs Compton, Geoff Wallace, Senior Principal Engineer, agreed to check the visibility for drivers at the junction, adding that the design ensures clear visibility for the first vehicle waiting at the give way line. The visibility of other queuing vehicles may be impeded.

Cllr Cross said that disabled drivers told him that it was hard to park in the town centre on Sundays because the disabled parking bays are not enforced. Stephen Child replied that there are no Sunday parking restrictions anywhere expect double yellow lines. Cllr Cross will find out what action is being taken by Woking Borough Council and inform the Local Transportation Service.

Cllr Brown wondered why the programme does not mention rail, when rail is the least flexible element of an integrated transport strategy. Mr Rousell reminded Members that rail is in the Local Transport Plan.

Resolved

That the report be received.

36/03 Forward Programme [Item 20]

Members agreed the Forward Programme for the Local Committee for Woking (transportation agenda) and noted that any other items should be submitted to the Chairman for decision, with copies to Stephen Child and Christine Holloway.

Members gave their best wishes to Cllr Gordon Brown on his retirement as a Woking Borough Councillor; and John Kingsbury noted that this was the last meeting before the Woking Borough Council elections and thanked all for their involvement in the last year.

Resolved

That the Forward Programme for the Local Committee for Woking (transportation agenda) be agreed.

37/03 Exclusion of Press and Public [Item 21]

There was no business that involved the likely disclosure of exempt information and thus required the public to be excluded from the meeting under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972.

[The meeting ended at 9.35 pm]

Chairman