



Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda
Meeting held at 7.30 pm on 12 June 2003
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mr David Rousell – Chairman	
Mr Geoff Marlow – Vice-Chairman	
Cllr Peter Ankers	Cllr Anthony Branagan
Mrs Elizabeth Compton	Cllr Bryan Cross
Cllr Philip Goldenberg	Mrs Margaret Hill
Cllr John Kingsbury	Mrs Val Tinney

Part One – in public

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

38/03 Welcome to newly appointed Woking Borough Council Members on the Local Committee – Transportation [Item 1]

The Chairman welcomed the Members to the Committee. In reference to a recent welcome letter sent by the Community Support Team, he invited Members to take up the offer of an induction session being organised.

39/03 Apologies for absence [Item 2]

Mrs Sheila Gruselle and Cllr John Pattison sent their apologies for absence.

40/03 Minutes of last meeting held on 19 March 2003 [Item 3]

Confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

41/03 **Declarations of interests** [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 58, Councillor Goldenberg declared a personal interest in Item 10 on the agenda on traffic calming in White Rose Lane.

42/03 **Petitions** [Item 5]

In accordance with Standing Order 62, the Committee received a petition on the Lockfield Drive Junction with Arthur's Bridge Road, Woking. Mr Jackson, the petitioner, was invited to present the petition to the Committee. Mr Jackson went through the main points in his letter dated 21 May 2003 and asked the Committee to reconsider its decision on 19 March 2003 due to the overwhelming opposition by the local community.

The Chairman used his discretion to take the petition at this meeting with the petitioner's agreement. The following officer response was tabled.

Officer response to petition by Mr Stephen Child

Woking Borough Council developed a proposal to install traffic signal controls at the Lockfield Drive junction with Arthur's Bridge Road. After 1 April 2002, Surrey County Council completed the design and advertised the appropriate Traffic Regulation Order to enable the scheme to proceed.

At its meeting on 19 March 2003, residents asked questions of the Committee related to the scheme. The Committee also received a report that outlined the background to the proposal, detailed an objection from Surrey Police to the Traffic Regulation Order and presented the results from the public consultation undertaken to assess if there was community support for the scheme.

The Committee in receiving the report debated the issues before it and considered supplementary matters that arose in association with the proposal. Having concluded the discussion about the risk of accidents arising at this location, the impact and amenity of the proposal on the surrounding local area, along with the desires of local residents based on the survey, the Committee resolved to confirm the Traffic Regulation Order, notwithstanding the Police objection, and implement the limited movement traffic signal control junction.

It is my considered opinion that the Committee, at its meeting on 19 March 2003, has already debated all the issues raised within the petition and the petitioners' letter dated 21 May 2003. Therefore, there is no evidence to support a change in the Committee's resolution to progress the scheme to a completion.

For the Committee's information, I detail below a comparison between the responses received from the public consultation survey with those of the petition:

Table Comparing Property Responses

Road Name	Public Consultation					Petition
	Number of Properties Consulted	Total Returned	Support for Scheme			Property Totals
			Yes	No	Abstain	
Well Lane	52	24	8	16	0	29
Authors Bridge Road	45	34	19	14	1	22
Bullbeggars Lane	51	30	14	13	3	4
Abbey Road	53	22	14	7	1	1
Harelands Lane	8	3	2	1	0	1
Horsell Moor	75	30	25	3	2	1
Outside Consultation Area						
Coley Avenue						1
Langton Close						1

RESOLVED

That under Standing Order 13.1 it was agreed that there was no case for the decision to be reconsidered, therefore the decision stands as agreed on 19 March 2003.

Mr Child assured the petitioner that the Local Transportation Service will carry out a study after the work has been completed to monitor the impact, and if necessary will bring a report to the Committee.

43/03 Public questions on transportation matters [Item 6]

This question was received from Mr Geoffrey Weddell

Is the Committee aware that the footpath on Church Hill, Horsell is too narrow to allow individuals to pass one another, or for mothers to wheel their prams, or for any form of disabled access? Is the Committee further aware that this path is a route to school for those living on the south side of Horsell village? Are there any firm proposals to do anything to improve safety at this site before an accident occurs?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

The Chairman of the Committee is aware of the situation that exists regarding the footway along part of Church Hill, Horsell having attended a locally organised meeting in the Parish Hall on 30 May 2003. Although there is currently no programmed work to improve the footway, investigation is in hand to explore

whether alterations are feasible. It must be highlighted at the outset that the width at this location is very constrained and solutions are not easy.

This question was received from Mr Justin Boorman

What traffic calming measures can be applied to Connaught Road in Brookwood in view of the excessive speeds currently being experienced by residents? I am particularly interested in the distinction between schemes that are possible on roads that are classified and schemes that might only occur if Connaught Road were declassified.

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

'Traffic calming' is the term used for engineering solutions used to reduce speeds. These include the following:

- round-topped road humps
- flat-topped road humps
- thumps
- speed cushions
- junction tables
- kerb build-outs at junctions
- pedestrian refuges
- road narrowings
- chicanes
- 20 mph zone
- gateways
- road surface changes
- rumble strips
- rumble areas
- white lining
- mini roundabouts
- interactive signs
- safety cameras

Each of the above has benefits and disadvantages. If there is a need to develop a solution the most appropriate scheme will be produced. Any of the solutions can be used on any classification of highway.

With regard to "excessive" speed a speed assessment was undertaken near the school in Autumn 2002 and reported to this Committee in January 2003.

The following repeats the content of the report on 22 January 2003:

A324 CONNAUGHT ROAD

The speed survey in Connaught Road was located outside Brookwood Primary School, and the 85th percentile speed recorded was 39.4 mph. This is at a point where the road is widest; further to the west, where the road is narrower and there is more on-street parking, it is likely that 85th percentile speeds will be lower. Further surveys will be needed to provide this information. However, it is suggested that these should not be carried out until after the major junction reconstruction at the Brookwood Crossroads has been completed and road users have had a chance to get used to the new layout."

Further surveys highlighted above will be undertaken in Autumn 2003, the outcome of which will be reported to this Committee.

These questions were received from Mr David Robinson (Planning & Environment Committee, Woking Chamber of Trade & Commerce)

1. Further to my letter of 11.01.03 and reply from Stephen Child of 31.01.03 would you please comment on the following: -
 - a. Is the cost of the work at the junction of South Road, Horsell and High Street still £18,000 and is it appreciated that the job is still not complete?
 - b. Work was advertised for 27.04.03 and a diversion was mentioned. In the event the diversion was not signed and one carriageway of Thornash Road was closed with spoil.
 - c. A large road miller was used with a driving platform. A young child (10yrs?) was on the platform during operations. Does not the SCC have an obligation under Health and Safety?
 - d. There is still ponding on the pavement.

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

1. (a) The work is complete at South Road, Horsell pending a final Stage 3 safety audit. The outturn cost is £28,000 and includes all Statutory Undertakers work and Officer time. The significant extra costs being renewals to the Street lighting, including disconnections and reconnections, bollards and costs associated with the restrictive working environment.
- (b) I apologise if the Sunday diversion using Russell Road was not signed and that Thornash Road was partially blocked. I will be contacting the contractor accordingly, however, two alternatives could have been used, Russell Road and Thornash Road. Sunday working was selected to minimise disruption to local traffic.

(c) All contractors working for the County Council are required to comply with national safety standards and codes of good practice. I will be contacting the contractor about the reported incident.

(d) The ponding that was evident has been rectified, however the site will be inspected again when it rains.

Mr Robinson was not satisfied, and will pursue the matter outside the meeting with Steve Child.

This question was received from Mr Terry Fabb

Are there any plans to end the ridiculous situation in West Byfleet (and presumably elsewhere) whereby people may be fined for infringing the CPZ, controlled by Woking BC, but may park with complete impunity on double yellow lines, not enforced by the police?

I draw particular attention to the western end of Rosemount Parade, where the road narrows beyond the end of the CPZ, at the location where there are double yellow lines.

I believe that these yellow lines were painted some years ago with the intention stopping vehicles parking on this narrowed part of Old Woking Road and thereby improving the sight line to the right of traffic emerging from Rosemount Avenue.

This, I believe, followed an accident in which a motorcyclist was seriously injured. I do not know if he was emerging from Rosemount Avenue and was hit by a vehicle traveling west on Old Woking Road, or the reverse.

Some time ago I suggested via my local Borough Councillors that a possible solution was to paint hatched white lines around the Old Woking Road/Rosemount Avenue corner. In other places these hatched areas seem to be respected whereas double yellow lines are a waste of paint.

The reply I received from a Woking BC officer was that the problem was one of enforcement of the double yellow lines. Not a very useful reply; I cannot see the police suddenly finding the time to enforce double yellow lines. Meanwhile the hazard remains.

I have been motivated to raise this again by the tragic death of a motorcyclist in an accident last week in West Byfleet.

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

The Police enforce all waiting and loading restrictions not contained within the three controlled parking zones. There are proposals being discussed to introduce Decriminalised Parking Enforcement throughout Surrey following the notification by

Surrey Police that they intend to transfer enforcement to the County Council. A report on this matter is included elsewhere on the agenda. However until Decriminalised Parking Enforcement becomes operational, Surrey Police remain responsible for enforcement. With respect to white hatching, these markings are not enforceable and would not be appropriate in these circumstances.

This question was received from Cllr. Elizabeth Evans

The Village Centre standard such as in Knaphill should be employed where possible in streets which have a high pedestrian use and which are important access roads into Woking to increase a sense of pride of place.

Can the SCC Transportation Committee employ some differentiation in quality of footway surfaces?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

The Highway Authority does not have a standard footway solution for specific locations and each scheme is designed based on differing factors relevant to each location. Current practice is to use a bituminous surface as it generally creates the minimum maintenance cost and is easy to maintain. The proliferation of different types of surfaces can create a maintenance problem and is likely to be more expensive at the outset. SCC operates within the policy framework of the Surrey Highway Network Maintenance Management Plan, which states that "local offices are encouraged to replace traditional slabs with bituminous surfacing to achieve safer surfaces", MaPs and HIMCAR (Highway Maintenance in Conservation Areas). In addition the relevant elements of the Woking Borough Council Conservation Area documents are included as appropriate in schemes.

44/03 Members' Questions [Item 7]

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg:

Following the Brookwood Crossroads saga:

1. When will the initial snagging works (top soiling the south-east corner and removing the temporary traffic lights base from the south side of Lye Road) be completed?
2. When the first set of parking bays on the south side of Connaught Road west of the crossroads will be suspended?
3. When the repair works to the sewerage piping system will be completed
4. When it is intended to re-phase the traffic signals to diminish the southward flow and to reflect differential traffic flows in the morning and evening rush hours?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

1. The initial "snagging" works associated with this scheme are now complete.
2. This matter is being discussed with Woking Borough Council however the preferred solution is that an alternative location is found for the parking bay.
3. A programme is being sought from Thames Water.
4. The re-phasing of the traffic lights has been determined and will be implemented by end of June.

Cllr Goldenberg asked a supplementary question regarding question 4 asking whether the reply covered both parts of the question. Mr Child will confirm this and respond to Councillor Goldenberg outside of the meeting.

These questions were received from Cllr Peter Ankers:

1. I understand that there are safety guidelines as to when uneven paving stones are considered a danger. What are the guidelines when tree roots disrupt a tarmac footpath or sidewalk so that they become a hazard to pedestrians, and what action is taken?
2. What is the programme to ensure growth encroachment is controlled so as to ensure that the space on pavements for pedestrians is not narrowed to an extent that it becomes potentially dangerous, particularly in rural areas (eg Church Hill, Pyrford).

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Manager, responded:

1. The guidelines for defects are contained in the Manual of Policies & Standards and the Highway Safety and Detailed Inspection handbook. With effect from the 28 April 2003 defects are classified as Category 1a, 1b or 2. Category 1a defects present the highest risk to the public and should either be repaired at the time of inspection or made safe, with a permanent repair being undertaken within 28 days. Category 1b present less risk to the public, however if the Inspectors risk assessment indicated that the defect would be expected to become a Category 1a defect before the next scheduled inspection then they should be repaired or made safe within 28 days. Category 2 defects should be repaired as part of locally determined work programmes and programmed in accordance with their relative priority.

The guidelines on the severity of defects indicate that where tree roots disturb the surface of the footway in excess of 20mm they should be classified as Category 1 and repaired within 24 hours. However, in deciding on the severity of

the defect and the response time for repair, an assessment of the risk to the public needs to be made. This should include considering the character of the highway concerned and the location of the defect, together with the amount of pedestrian usage. Where the tree roots of mature highway trees are causing structural damage to the highway they should be inspected with a qualified arboriculturist and if appropriate felled and replaced with new trees.

2. The County Council carries out regular safety inspections to the highway network in Surrey. The scope of the inspections include all aspects of the public highway including vegetation encroachment from land adjacent to the highway. The inspection frequencies are currently based on those set out in the Manual of Policies & Standards and the Highway Safety and Detailed Inspection handbook. In the case of Church Hill, Pyrford this is inspected at 6 monthly intervals.

Where a hedge, tree or shrub overhangs, obstructs or endangers the passage of vehicles or pedestrians using the highway, the Highway Authority has powers to serve notice under Section 154 of The Highways Act 1980. Notices are served on the owner or occupier of the land on which it is growing requiring them to cut back the vegetation within 14 days. If the owner fails to comply within the specified period then the Highway Authority can undertake the work required by the notice and recover the expenses reasonably incurred by them.

This question was received from Mr Geoff Marlow

Woking Borough Council, the planning authority, granted consent for re-development of the Broadoaks site in West Byfleet. I understand this permission required a significant amount of highway work be undertaken starting at A245 Old Woking Road junction with Sheerwater Road, passing through West Byfleet and continuing along the A245 Parvis Road, finishing near the Parvis Road junction with Oyster Lane in Byfleet.

I believe development of the Broadoaks site has commenced with refurbishment and demolition of buildings. Could I please be advised what action Woking Borough Council will be taking and when, to ensure the developer commences and completes the agreed work along the A245 highway corridor?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

I have discussed the situation with colleagues at Woking Borough Council and can report that Woking Borough Council has cautioned the developer that they are in breach of conditions and that any further development is at their own risk.

Woking Borough Council say that only a limited amount of work has taken place (demolition of existing buildings, landscaping gardening and refurbishment of the Listed Buildings) and all other work has ceased. Therefore, no harm is being caused to any interest of acknowledged importance.

Woking Borough Council believes there is less traffic generation from the site than the Lawful Use of the Land (I would agree with this analysis), therefore, the lack of agreed highway works associated with the development is not detrimental to highway safety.

Therefore, with respect to timescale, neither authority can currently predict when the developer may commence development in earnest and trigger the conditions related to highway work along the A245 corridor.

I will continue to monitor the situation together with my colleagues at Woking Borough Council and if the current situation changes and action is proposed I will inform the Committee.

These questions were received from Cllr Anthony Branagan

1. Traffic lights at the junction of Lockfield Drive and Arthur's Bridge Road. The project was approved at this committee's last meeting. I understand legal matters at SCC and WBC are holding up the start of construction. With each month that passes the cost to WBC increase. Please advise a firm date for the start of this project.
2. Carhouse Lane as it approaches the junction with Guildford Road. Residents experience difficulty accessing Carhouse Lane principally because of the speed of traffic. Could a 30 mph limit be considered as a remedy for this concern?
3. Street Lighting. When is the programme of new lighting scheduled to start in Woking, particularly in Horsell West?
4. During the recent election campaign, the following topics were raised consistently:
 - a. The speed of traffic along Church Hill, Horsell in particular, but Brewery Road and Horsell High Street in general.
 - b. Overgrowing/overhanging vegetation on footpaths and bridleways is causing the matter to be raised as a safety issue.

Could a programme to deal with these concerns be investigated and implemented?

5. Car parking outside 170 to 184 Goldsworth Road was advised to this committee some 12 months ago, proposed action was indicated 6 months later. Please advise a firm date for starting the necessary work and likely duration of the works.

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

1. Lockfield Drive

The intricacies of the legal agreement between the two Councils is being finalised by our respective legal departments. The County Council's constructor has been acquainted with the work and a current work estimate is being prepared. A definitive work programme and start date will not be known until the above are complete.

2. Carthouse Lane

I have carried out a review of the speed limit on Carthouse Lane. This showed that the appropriate limit is 40 mph, which is in fact the signed limit. A 30 mph speed limit would not be appropriate on Carthouse Lane.

3. Lighting

There is currently no programme or funding allocated for lighting improvements in Woking for 2003/4.

4. (a) Speed of traffic in Horsell

The Chairman is aware of residents concerns about Church Hill, Brewery Road and High Street, Horsell, having attended a locally organised meeting in the Parish Hall on 30 May 2003. These matters will be investigated as resources permit.

(b) Overgrowing/overhanging vegetation

An annual programme of vegetation clearance commenced on the 10 June 2003 on approximately 16.2km of public rights of way. The specification includes for the clearance of all side and surface growing vegetation, grass, nettles, brambles, including around finger posts to ensure that they are clearly visible. This work is funded and managed through SCC Countryside Management. A programme of weed spray is also in progress in Woking, which is funded and managed by the Woking Local Transportation Service (LTS) and includes approximately 10.6 km of surfaced urban town paths. This does not however include overhanging vegetation from private land adjacent to the public footpath.

Under the current regime town paths are only inspected annually. As from the 28 April 2003 Safety Inspections are the responsibility of Ringway Highway Services. The Woking LTS is therefore reliant on receiving information on overhanging vegetation from Ringway in line with their programmed inspections, or through complaints from the general public, which are followed up by ad-hoc inspections by the two Highway Stewards

There is no specific funding allocated to the clearance of overgrown vegetation encroaching from adjacent land, as this is the responsibility of the owner/occupier to maintain. Under Section 154 of the Highways Act 1980 there are powers to serve notice where a private hedge, tree or shrub overhangs a highway, or any other road or footpath to which the public has access. This requires that the vegetation causing a danger, obstruction or interference is lopped or cut back within 14 days. If the owner fails to respond within this period then the Highway Authority may carry out the work and recover the expenses reasonably incurred.

This process can be time consuming, especially with current staffing levels, as this often involves land searches through the Land Registry and follow up inspections by a Highway Steward. In an effort to be more proactive, Woking LTS, in conjunction with Joy Ridley, have produced an article on vegetation for publication in local newspapers. It is hoped that this will encourage owners to respond and therefore reduce the number of occasions when the LTS needs to intervene. To supplement this further an inspection is due to be carried out shortly on all town paths to assess their condition, in terms of vegetation, lighting and surfacing with a view to including any works on future programmes.

5. Car parking outside 170 to 184 Goldsworth Road

At the meeting on 13 November 2002 the Verge Parking Policy was approved by Local Committee. It was agreed that two sites would be deferred and that various solutions would be considered with a view to trialling options. There are various sites that have been brought to the attention of the Local Transportation Service and I anticipate officers reporting on the proposals for Greenvale Road and Goldsworth Road in July 2003. By-laws do exist to prohibit vehicles parking on grass verges but this Authority does not undertake enforcement.

Mr Branagan commented that he would be interested in looking at the situation regarding street lighting as it develops.

These questions were received from Cllr Bryan Cross

Is the Chairman aware of the large amount of fly posting that is currently taking place in the borough? If he is, he may be aware that this seems to have recently increased significantly.

Can the Chairman please let me know:

1. What action is being taken to remove the fly posting throughout the Borough as soon as it found?
2. What action is being taken against individuals and organizations that habitually offend in fly posting?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

1. The LTS Woking is responsible for the removal of all illegal signs on the highway in Woking. An instruction was given recently to Ringway Highway Services to remove all illegal signs on a designated route throughout the borough. Following inspection on the 11 June it would appear that the situation has improved.
2. In terms of what action is being taken against individuals and organisations in respect of fly posting the legal position is that there are powers under Section 132 of the Highways Act 1980 (Unauthorised Marks on the Highway) as set out below.

- a. " A person who, without either the consent of the highway authority for the highway in question or an authorisation given by or under an enactment or a reasonable excuse, paints or otherwise inscribes or affixes any picture, letter, sign or other mark upon the surface of a highway or upon any tree, structure or works on or in a highway is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding £100 or, in the case of a second or subsequent conviction under this subsection to a fine not exceeding £200.
- b. The highway authority for a highway may, without prejudice to their powers apart from this subsection and whether or not proceedings in respect of the matter have been taken in pursuance of subsection (a) above, remove any picture, letter, sign or mark which has, without either the consent of the authority or an authorisation given by or under enactment, been painted or otherwise inscribed or affixed upon the surface of the highway or upon any tree, structure or works on or in the highway ".

In terms of subsection (a) it has proved difficult in the past to prosecute the persons holding the event being advertised as the legislation relies on prosecuting the person responsible for erecting the illegal sign. This evidence has proved difficult to obtain, as it is very unlikely to be able to catch persons 'in the act', with the volume of illegal fly posting being erected and the current resource levels. The preferred route is therefore through the powers granted in subsection (b).

Clearly there is a cost implication to removing these signs on a regular basis. On the last occasion prior to the start of the new Highway Services & Works Partnering Contract with Ringway TJ Hunt undertook the work at a cost of £700, which amounted to two days work. To keep on top of this work any more frequently than once a month would have serious cost implications on the Residual Cleaning budget of £21,500 which also includes the following safety activities:

- Fly tipping
- Leaf Clearance
- Removal of Debris on the highway, including fallen branches
- Road Traffic Accidents/oil spillages/paint
- Dead Animals

It is proposed that the way forward might be through a 'find & fix' arrangement with Ringway whereby they are instructed to remove illegal signs when carrying out other repairs in the vicinity. Highway Inspectors/Highway Stewards/Streetworks Officer removing some signs whilst they are going about their daily work could further supplement this arrangement. This would help to minimise fly posting and keep costs at a reasonable level.

In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Cross regarding the rights of members of the public removing signs, officers explained that care would need to be taken regarding the legal position because Surrey County Council do license some banners and posters around the Borough. Advice should be sought before any posters are removed.

These questions were received from Cllr John Kingsbury

1. St Johns Road

In view of the answer to my question at the last meeting on 19 March 2003, please confirm that the work has now been ordered and can he indicate when it may be completed, as residents of St John's Road urgently require this speed reducing measure introduced before a major accident occurs?

2. White lining.

There are areas around the Borough where white lining is almost non-existent and stop lines can barely be seen, which I am sure he agrees is dangerous. Do we have a programme of renewing white lines on a regular basis, and is it possible to have a faster response time in renewing lining in areas of heavy usage?

3. Illegal Advertising on Street Furniture.

What can be done about the ever-increasing use of street furniture for advertising purposes? Last week 32 Posters adorned the route between the Mayford and Wych Hill roundabouts. What is the legal position, could we prosecute, who is responsible for their removal and can it be done faster?

4. Car Parking on Grass Verges

This increasing practice is unsightly, and is destroying the verges by turning them into mud patches. In view of the discussion last November which failed to reach a decision on an appropriate policy, when can we expect a further report outlining all the various options, and do existing powers exist where persistent offenders could be prosecuted?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director, responded:

1. St Johns Road

I can confirm that the additional hatch markings have been ordered. I would expect the work to have been completed within 4 weeks.

2. White lining

Lining in the Borough is refreshed on a cyclic basis each year. In 2002-2003 principal and non-principal roads were treated and currently unclassified roads are being relined to a value of £15,000.

Our contractor, Ringway, has 28 days to complete any order for lining. In an emergency they can be requested to reduce that period. Refreshing lines on the roundabout at Hermitage Road/Amstell Way was ordered from our previous contractor Prismo but they have now refused to complete the work. The order has been re-issued to Ringway with a request for completion as soon as possible.

3. Illegal Advertising on Street Furniture

In terms of the legal position there are powers under Section 132 of the Highways Act 1980 (Unauthorised Marks on the Highway) as set out below.

- a. " A person who, without either the consent of the highway authority for the highway in question or an authorisation given by or under an enactment or a reasonable excuse, paints or otherwise inscribes or affixes any picture, letter, sign or other mark upon the surface of a highway or upon any tree, structure or works on or in a highway is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding £100 or, in the case of a second or subsequent conviction under this subsection to a fine not exceeding £200.
- b. The highway authority for a highway may, without prejudice to their powers apart from this subsection and whether or not proceedings in respect of the matter have been taken in pursuance of subsection (a) above, remove any picture, letter, sign or mark which has, without either the consent of the authority or an authorisation given by or under enactment, been painted or otherwise inscribed or affixed upon the surface of the highway or upon any tree, structure or works on or in the highway ".

In terms of subsection (a) it has proved difficult in the past to prosecute the persons holding the event being advertised as the legislation relies on prosecuting the person responsible for erecting the illegal sign. This evidence has proved difficult to obtain, as it is very unlikely to be able to catch persons 'in the act', with the volume of illegal fly posting being erected and the current resource levels. The preferred route is therefore through the powers granted in subsection (b).

The LTS Woking is responsible for the removal of all illegal signs on the highway in Woking. An instruction was given recently to Ringway Highway Services to remove all illegal signs on a designated route, which included the A320 between Mayford and Turnoak roundabouts. On inspection on the 11 June it was observed that there were only two illegal signs on this section of highway and the situation has also improved elsewhere.

Clearly there is a cost implication to removing these signs on a regular basis. On the last occasion prior to the start of the new Highway Services & Works Partnering Contract with Ringway the work was undertaken by TJ Hunt at a cost of £700, which amounted to two days work. To keep on top of this work any more frequently than once a month would have serious cost implications on the Residual Cleaning budget of £21,500 which also includes the following safety activities:

- Fly tipping
- Leaf Clearance
- Removal of Debris on the highway, including fallen branches
- Road Traffic Accidents/oil spillages/paint
- Dead Animals

It is proposed that the way forward might be through a 'find & fix' arrangement with Ringway whereby they are instructed to remove illegal signs when carrying out other repairs in the vicinity. This arrangement could be further supplemented by Highway Inspectors/Highway Stewards/Streetworks Officer removing some signs whilst they are going about their daily work. This would help to minimise fly posting and keep costs at a reasonable level.

4. Car Parking on Grass Verges

At the meeting on 13 November 2002 the Verge Parking Policy was approved by Local Committee. It was agreed that two sites would be deferred and that various solutions would be considered with a view to trialling options. There are various sites that have been brought to the attention of the Local Transportation Service and I anticipate officers reporting on the proposals for Greenvale Road and Goldsworth Road in July 2003. By-laws do exist to prohibit vehicles parking on grass verges but this Authority does not undertake enforcement.

In response to supplementary questions from Cllr Kingsbury:

1. Mr Child confirmed that they were looking at white lining both in Horsell and across the borough
2. The Local Transportation Service are talking to Ringway regarding a solution for fly posting.

Executive Functions

45/03 Update on the use of Section 106 funds on the A322 and other projects [Item 8]

Callum Findlay, Head of Transportation, was welcomed to the meeting and gave the following update on Brookwood Crossroads and Route 34.

The purpose of the work was to improve safety, not to improve traffic flow. Brookwood Crossroads previously had the highest personal injury accidents in the County; the traffic conflict has been removed and excellent pedestrian and cycling facilities have now been installed. Although the scheme is almost complete there are one or two points outstanding. These include:

- Fine tuning the traffic lights as there is currently too much time on green going southbound. This should be complete by the end of June.
- The sewer piping needs to be removed and moved to a better location. It is the responsibility of Thames Water to bring forward a solution which does not cause a problem to the canal. It is not likely to be complete before September.
- Landscaping – the area has been top soiled and seeded on the south. The other areas will be planted with shrubs in the appropriate growing season.

Regarding Route 34, it was noted that there had been a 42% increase in usage over the first 3 months. Arriva has played a big part in this locally.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that he had received many positive comments from parents of children at Brookwood School.

In response to a question from Cllr Kingsbury regarding whether it would be possible to divert Route 34 to the High Street, Mr James, Principal Transport Officer, explained that a survey would be carried out along the route to look at take-up. This

will help inform a possible diversion. Arriva is a stakeholder partner in this route, so whatever is proposed or adopted needs to ensure that use is kept high.

In response to a comment from Mrs Tinney, Mr James explained that profit made in the Route 34 service is put back into a central fund.

The Chairman thanked Mr Findlay for attending and updating the Committee.

46/03 **Bus Services to Fullbrook School** [Item 9]

Mr Masson introduced the report which looked at the possibility of extending existing bus services from the Woking area to Fullbrook School. Following investigations it was concluded that this would not be possible without adversely affecting other bus services or without considerable funding from Surrey County Council. It was recommended that an open forum be established to explore how these difficulties could be overcome.

Mr Marlow was not happy with the conclusions of the report and would like to discuss it further with officers. He reminded the Committee that the path along the canal between Woodham Lock and West Byfleet Station was a particular area of local crime. In addition, Runnymede children get to school by a yellow bus, and it seems unfair that children from Woking do not have the same opportunity.

Cllr Ankers noted that there was a bus route from Pyrford to Fullbrook School which encounters many of the problems identified in the report. He would welcome an open forum that addressed this route as well.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. an open forum of interested parties be established to seek a positive solution regarding providing a bus service to the school
- b. improvements to the lighting of the footpath between West Byfleet station and Fullbrook School be carried out, following consultation with the Local Transportation Director, Runnymede.

47/03 **Decriminalised Parking Enforcement and 'A Parking Strategy for Surrey'** [Item 14]

With the agreement of the Committee, this item was brought forward on the agenda to enable Mr Findlay to be present during discussions.

Mr Wallace introduced this report and explained that from 1 April 2004 Surrey Police will transfer the enforcement of all waiting and loading restrictions throughout Surrey to the County Council. In Woking, it is unlikely that the County Council will be in a

position to take action on this responsibility on until January 2005 and it may not be operational until July 2005.

Discussions have started with Woking Borough Council on a new agency agreement for the Borough Council to undertake the day-to-day management and enforcement of on-street parking on behalf of the County Council, and to report to the Local Committee.

Mr Findlay explained that decriminalised parking has been in operation in London since the 1990s. Central London makes money out of it, but the outer Boroughs make losses. It is estimated that the scheme will cost the County Council £600,000 a year, which is why a business-like approach is required. The Borough Council has a lot of knowledge in this area to build upon, and will be able to help minimise the loss.

Cllr Kingsbury proposed the following amendment to recommendation b:

That a Member Task Group, with officer participation, consisting of County and Borough Councillors, be set up to examine the potential for decriminalised parking enforcement for the Woking local area on behalf of the Local Committee and to report back to the Local Transportation Committee on 22 October 2003.

This was seconded by Cllr Ankers.

In response to a question from Cllr Kingsbury regarding whether the Police can withdraw without any alternative arrangements in place, Mr Findlay explained that it is a Police power not a duty. The Police will continue to enforce safety matters.

It was noted in reference to paragraph 28 e (performance worse than the target surplus or deficit would be funded by the district/borough) that this element of the framework is totally negotiable and could be addressed by the new recommendation.

It was suggested that the Committee ask the Police to be considerate regarding timing.

RESOLVED

That a Member Task Group, with officer participation, consisting of County and Borough Councillors, be set up to examine the potential for decriminalised parking enforcement for the Woking local area on behalf of the Local Committee and to report back to the Local Transportation Committee on 22 October 2003.

It was agreed that Mr Marlow and Cllr Kingsbury be members of this group and would agree outside the meeting other Members to be involved.

48/03 **White Rose Lane Traffic Calming** [Item 10]

In accordance with Standing Order 58, Councillor Goldenberg declared a personal interest in this item.

Mr Durrant introduced this report which outlined the results of a public consultation exercise on traffic calming measures in White Rose Lane.

Members asked whether officers could undertake a traffic count at school starting and finishing times to verify the position of the narrowing.

Officers were also asked to consider traffic calming on the bends on White Rose Lane at a later date. It was noted that this could be a site where the vehicle activated sign could be deployed.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. the traffic calming measures proposed for White Rose Lane be approved
- b. officers undertake a traffic count at the junction at school starting and finishing times to verify the position of the narrowing
- c. traffic calming on the bends on White Rose Lane may be considered at a later date.

49/03 **Pyrford Area Road Safety Scheme; Results of Consultation and Final Proposals** [Item 11]

Ms Hunt introduced this report which set out the results of the Pyrford area public consultation on road safety measures.

It was noted that there had been a positive public reaction to the proposals, which had been enhanced by comments from the Police. In some instances respondents would like more positive measures.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. the scheme and changes are approved for implementation
- b. in addition officers will carry out a speed assessment on Pyrford Common Road and will look at safety of junctions with Boltons Lane and Warren Lane
- c. Surrey Police be kept informed of all proposals
- d. Residents be informed of the final decision via a circular from the Local Transportation Service, Woking, in collaboration with the Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association.

50/03 **Sutton Green Area Speed Reducing Measures – Results of Public Consultation** [Item 12]

Mr Masson introduced the report and explained that the consultation on the Sutton Green area speed reducing measures showed that 87% of respondents support the proposals.

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chairman invited local Borough Cllr Palmer to say a few words in the absence of Mrs Gruselle.

Cllr Palmer asked whether it would be possible to site the gateway further north of the junction with Robin Hood Lane; and whether it would be possible to provide a new footway between the village hall and the junction with New Lane and Sutton Green Road.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. the package of speed reducing measures for the Sutton Green area be approved for detailed design, followed by implementation in autumn 2003
- b. officers consider the possibility of siting the gateway further north of the junction with Robin Hood Lane if the landowner is agreeable
- c. the provision of a new footway between the village hall and junction with New Lane and Sutton Green Road be added to the work programme for investigation.

51/03 **Maybury Arch, Maybury – Proposed Pedestrian Improvements and Results of Consultation** [Item 13]

Mr Masson introduced the report which outlined a package of improvements for pedestrians in the vicinity of Maybury Arch which have recently been consulted on.

Members of the Committee welcomed the proposals, which follow the tragic death of a young child in summer 2001.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. the proposals for pedestrian improvements in Monument Road, Maybury Hill and Maybury Road, as shown on Plan No. 114771, be approved for detailed design, followed by construction in the summer of 2003
- b. authority is delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, to progress the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities at the existing traffic signal controlled junctions.

52/03 Integrated Transportation and Highway Maintenance Programmes for Woking 2002/03 [Item 15]

Mr Wallace introduced this report which detailed the completion of both the Integrated Transportation and Highway Maintenance Programmes for 2002/03.

Members congratulated officers on the work done.

In response to a question from Cllr Kingsbury regarding landscaping and poles at the Hermitage Road roundabout, Mr Wallace explained that the landscaping had been ordered, and officers would look at signage to see if the number of poles could be reduced.

Members noted the report.

53/03 Consultation and Customer Care [Item 16]

Mr Child apologised for the lateness of this report. The Chairman agreed to take the report at this meeting.

Mr Child introduced the report which comes in response to a request from the Local Committee. The Local Transportation Service (LTS) and the Local Committee will monitor the action plan contained within the report. The aim of the action plan is to raise the profile of the LTS locally and to get more engagement with customers. The LTS recognise the need to discuss possible solutions with the local community and keep them involved at all stages.

Regarding the community forums referred to in Annex F, it was noted that St Johns, Mount Herman and the business community in the Town Centre, Kingsway and Goldsworth Road should be added to the list of suggested locations. The one for the business community could be held at lunchtime. It was suggested that the Maybury Centre could be used to help reach out to the local Asian community.

Members discussed the telephone service of the LTS. It was noted that the call centre approach for the LTS was a pilot which will be reviewed shortly. However, it was noted that the County Council is moving towards call centres in all areas of operation. This is important to help monitor what happens to an enquiry.

Mr Child agreed to circulate officer's responsibilities and direct dial numbers within the LTS to all members of the Committee.

Mr Child asked members of the Committee to let him know outside of the meeting what they would like to see in a newsletter. An example from other areas can be found in Annex G.

The Committee commended Mr Child on this report.

RESOLVED

That the Local Transportation Service Action Plan at paragraph 2.7 is agreed, noting that additional forums catering for St Johns, Mount Herman, Kingsway, Goldsworth Road and the business community in the Town Centre should held.

54/03 Chobham Road, Knaphill/Guildford Road, Chobham – Proposed Amendment to Speed Limit [Item 17]

Mr Durrant introduced the report which seeks to change the existing 60mph speed limit along this stretch to 40 mph to improve road safety.

Cllr Kingsbury asked whether it would be possible to build out the junction with Barrs Lane. Mr Child agreed to discuss this outside of the meeting.

In response to a question from Mrs Compton regarding sight lines on the junction of Carhouse Lane and Chobham Road, Mr Child explained that there would be some vegetation trimming in this area.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to change the existing 60 mph in Chobham Road, Knaphill and Guildford Road, Chobham to 40 mph is advertised;
- b. 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.

55/03 Disabled Persons Parking Bays in Sappho Court, Woking – Proposed Traffic Regulation Order [Item 18]

Mr Masson introduced the report which sought approval for a Traffic Regulation Order which would enable the Police to enforce two disabled persons' parking bays in Sappho Court, Woking.

It was noted that the whole area is congested, and it is important that the previously proposed general bays are put in place at the same time if possible. It is also important to consider the position of the disabled bays. It was agreed that Mr Masson would talk to Cllr Eastwood outside the meeting regarding the placing of the bays.

RESOLVED

That:

- a. that a Traffic Regulation Order be advertised, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, to make two disabled persons' parking bays in Sappho Court, Woking, enforceable, and that, if no objections are received, the order be made;
- b. that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Ward Members, to consider and determine any objections and to make the order;
- c. that two additional parking places are constructed (at the same time if possible), for the use of able-bodied drivers, as shown on Plan No. 11487, when funding is made available.

56/03 Forward Programme [Item 19]

Members noted additional reports for 23 July would cover:

Parking bays

Disposal of surplus highway land

Highway maintenance programme

Waiting restrictions

The Woking College report would now go in October.

Cllr Goldenberg asked and it was agreed, that an item on speed in Brookwood could go on the forward programme for January 2004.

The Chairman asked that any other topics be submitted to the Chairman for decision, with copies to Stephen Child and Christine Holloway.

RESOLVED

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

57/03 Exclusion of Press and Public [Item 20]

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 9.40pm]

Chairman