



Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda
Meeting held at 7.30 pm on 28 January 2004
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

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

Part One – In Public

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

01/04 **Apologies for absence** [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Peter Ankers, Mrs Sheila Gruselle and Cllr John Pattison.

02/04 **Minutes of last meeting held on 22 October 2003** [Item 2]

Confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

Mr Marlow updated the Committee on decriminalised parking enforcement and explained that Woking is on target for introduction in July 2005.

03/04 **Declarations of interests** [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 58, Mrs Tinney declared a personal interest in relation to Item 7 on the new County Hall.

04/04 **Petitions** [Item 4]

Petition 1

In accordance with Standing Order 62, the Committee received a petition on unrestricted access from Redding Way to Broadway. Mr Raynes introduced the petition which was signed by over 250 local residents. The petitioners would like a formal review of traffic in the area and a traffic impact assessment of the effects of opening the spur road. Redding Way could provide a safe route for Knaphill residents and provide better access to and from the village centre.

Mr Rousell thanked the petitioner for his presentation. It was agreed that the Local Transportation Service would undertake a comprehensive consultation in the Knaphill local area and report back to a future meeting.

Petition 2

In accordance with Standing Order 62, the Committee received a petition on road improvements to Old Woking Road. Mr Johns introduced the petition which was signed by over 1000 local people. It was explained that local people are desperate for a pavement along this stretch of road, which among other things would make drivers feel less stressed at the likelihood of coming across a pedestrian, and give local school children a safe route to the local schools.

Mr Rousell thanked the petitioner for his presentation. It was agreed that the Local Transportation Service would review what could be done to improve the situation and report back to a future meeting.

05/04 **Written public questions on transportation matters** [Item 5]

There were no written public questions.

06/04 **Written Members' questions on transportation matters** [Item 6]

These questions were received from Cllr Bryan Cross:

With regard to Goldsworth Road, in the vicinity of the Goldsworth Arms pub house, would the Local Transportation Director please let me know:

1. Whether he has any plans that would improve the traffic flow along this stretch of road especially bearing in mind the number of large vehicles (HGVs and buses) that use this narrow stretch of road.
2. Whether he feels that a good opportunity to improve this stretch of road was lost when the Borough's planning committee refused to ask for parking bays to be

included in the a widened path, that is to be constructed as part of the redevelopment of number of properties in this stretch of Goldsworth Road.

3. Would he also advise the extent to which his officers have an input into the reports that are prepared on local planning applications for consideration by the Borough's planning committee.

Stephen Child Local Transportation Director responded:

1. There are currently no plans to make alterations to this section of Goldsworth Road. However, as reported to Local Committee on 23 July, "it is accepted that this section of Goldsworth Road can be busy, given the numbers of shops, offices and cafes in the area, and the high demand for on-street parking. Goldsworth Road, however, is no longer the A324."
2. In highway terms it appears that very little benefit was lost as a consequence of not providing the lay-by. I understand the concern about on-street parking and the availability of remaining road width for other highway users, but the parking here contributes significantly to calming the speed and potentially the flow of vehicles along Goldsworth Road. The potential benefit of moving any restricted width away from the Safeway roundabout is acknowledged, however, exit/entry speed from/to the roundabout could correspondingly increase raising other highway concerns connected with non-car users.
3. The Local Transportation Service does not have any direct input into the reports that are prepared on local planning applications by the Planning Authority Woking Borough Council.

However, representatives of the Local Transportation Service meet weekly with the County Council's Transportation Development Control team; our Transportation Development Control colleagues are charged with responding to all planning applications on behalf of the County Council, as Highway Authority, to the Planning Authority Woking Borough Council. At the meeting, Transportation Development Control brief the Local Transportation Service about the comments they will be making to the Planning Authority about planning applications.

These questions were received from Cllr Anthony Branagan

1. **Traffic lights - Lockfield Drive:** Please advise date of completion of this contract. If not the March 2004 stated date, please state reasons for overrun. Will Ringway be subject to penalty clauses for the overrun?
2. **Goldsworth road car parking:** At a previous meeting I expressed concern at traffic flow problems caused by parked vehicles where buses and articulated vehicles were concerned and suggested routing from the town centre via Poole Road. The same evening a member of the public suggested something similar. It was agreed a meeting be arranged to investigate these concerns further. Has a date been arranged yet?

3. **Pavement outside vacant offices Church Street West:** My wife fell over outside these premises because of the very poor state of the pavement on 1 August 2003. The matter was raised with officers on at least 3 occasions and yet it took several months before any attempt was made to rectify the problem. It is fortunate an elderly member of the public was not seriously injured. May an explanation for the shortcomings be provided?
4. **Pedestrian crossing outside The Surrey History Centre:** The flashing beacons have been out of operation for weeks now. Much taller poles have replaced the small poles but they have not worked since the changeover. May I have an explanation?
5. **Widening of footpath on Church Hill:** Please can the Local Transportation Director advise as to the current plans for improvements at Church Hill and whether or not this will provide ready access to the Church and a footway from Lych Way to Wilson Way.

Stephen Child Local Transportation Director responded:

1. Representatives from the Local Transportation Service met with the Contractor, Ringway and Woking Borough Council at a project meeting on 22 January 2004, where the Contractor confirmed that the project was on schedule and will be complete as per the programme, i.e. early March 2004. However, if Ringway should overrun the programme and any agreed extension of time, they will not meet their key performance indicators, which will affect their ability to fulfil their overall contract obligations for the County Council.
2. I am aware Councillor Branagan asked a question about Goldsworth Road at the Local Committee meeting on 23 July 2003. However, the minutes do not record an intention to arrange a meeting afterwards. May I reiterate that it would not be practical to introduce a gyratory system for the reasons stated on 23 July 2003: "There is a compulsory left turn out of the western end of Poole Road, and this means that all westbound traffic would have to turn left into the Safeway's access road and then double back at the roundabout to regain Goldsworth Road." Notwithstanding the above I will arrange to meet with Councillor Branagan if he so wishes at a mutually convenient date and time.
3. Firstly I trust that all is well with your wife following the fall she experienced. Church Street West should be inspected on a monthly basis and any defects against the standard criteria reported. No defects were reported at the July 2003 inspection prior to the date of the incident. Although conversation may have occurred following the incident, the first record Woking Local Transportation service has of the problem is a report by Mrs Branagan at the Local Transportation Service roadshow at Woking Library on 24 October 2003. This was investigated and then reported to our constructor for attention. Unfortunately on at least two occasions an incorrect location was attended to and made safe. Eventually after repeated calls from both Mrs Branagan to Local

Transportation Service and Local Transportation Service to constructor the repair was undertaken at the end of November. We are seeking to improve the process by which the constructor ensures that urgent works that are reported are made safe and remedial work is then implemented.

4. The small poles were replaced with larger poles in an attempt to reduce repeated vandalism. This work was undertaken in November 2003 and requires a change of electricity supply from old to new pole. This is still awaited despite repeated chasers to Seaboard.
5. Item 9 on this agenda refers to the Local Transport Plan programme for 2004 – 2005 and includes Church Hill, Horsell (no. 8.) The proposal states “the existing footway provision along the length of Church Hill from Arthurs Bridge Road to St Mary’s Church is limited in width”. The proposal seeks to provide a wider footway from Arthurs Bridge Road to Waldens Park Road to enhance pedestrian safety. There is no proposal for improvement to the church side of Church Hill between Lych Way and Wilson Way at present.

These questions were received from Cllr John Kingsbury

1. Fosters Lane in Knaphill is a private lane with a public right of way. The lower end of the lane, adjacent to Highclere Road, is full of deep potholes and dangerous to pedestrians.

Despite assurances from the Local Transport Office that repairs will be undertaken, and consideration given to a longer solution to this continuing problem, to date nothing has been done!

When do you expect interim repairs to be carried out, and what longer-term proposals are being considered?

2. Following the appointment last year of Ringway to undertake highway maintenance and associated work, it was understood that work would be carried out faster and more efficiently than under the previous arrangements! It appears contrary to these expectations; areas of the Borough are looking neglected and unsightly, following work not being carried out by the contractor. What action is being taken to see outstanding work is completed, with an improvement in future performance?
3. Following approval by the Committee for 4 parking bays and double yellow lines to be added in Broadway and Queens Road Knaphill, when is this work likely to be carried out?
4. Can you please inform me whether Surrey County Council was legally entitled to divert the bus route 34/35 hourly Sunday service to a two hourly service on route 28 through Goldsworth Park and a two hourly service on the existing 34/35 route through Hermitage and St. John’s, as the Deed of Variation of Planning Obligation relating to land at Brookwood Hospital dated 29 August 2002 states:-

1.3 Public Transport Improvements the improvements to bus routes 34/35 will provide for all buses on those routes to be diverted to serve the Sainsbury's store and thereby link St John's, Hermitage, Bisley, West End and Lightwater with the store and will aim to provide:-

(i) bus operation to a timetable based on a service of four buses per hour between Woking and Lightwater on Mondays to Saturdays during the daytime

ii) on Monday to Saturday an evening service operating at hourly intervals with an hourly service on Sundays during the daytime...."

If so why the same cannot be applied to divert the 34/35 bus to its original route through High Street Knaphill and Limecroft Road?"

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. Fosters Lane in Knaphill is a right of way matter and is being dealt with locally by the Rights of Way Officer. I am aware that ideally a major improvement is required but there is no funding. I can confirm that repairs are required and on behalf of Rights of Way our constructor has been instructed to undertake the repair using road planings. Work will commence this week.
2. I would agree that some areas of the highway service are looking neglected and unsightly; however some areas have been undertaken efficiently and effectively. There is no doubt that the Surrey Highways Partnership is taking longer than expected to settle down and we are not there yet. To that end my staff are becoming more involved as they have felt disenfranchised and unable to provide excellent customer service. We are currently reviewing outstanding work orders and are programming with the constructor to prioritise work. We need to be more involved in "making it happen." The Head of Transportation Service has initiated a review of the contract thus far in order to determine the improvements required, and will report to the Transportation Select Committee in June. Locally we are seeking to work much more closely with colleagues in the Surrey Highways Partnership to ensure satisfactory delivery of service. I take this opportunity to highlight the next Local Committee meeting in April where a presentation will be received from Ringway/Surrey County Council on the first year of the Partnership.
3. As a result of a misunderstanding at Woking Local Transportation Service the Traffic Order has only just been issued so works will not commence before 15 March 2004. I can only apologise to the local Member and the residents for this oversight and would assure him that works will be implemented as soon after 15 March as weather permits. Local office procedures have been reviewed to ensure that a repeat does not occur.
4. My colleague from Passenger Transport Group has kindly provided a response as follows:

Draft minutes to be agreed on 26 April 2004

Bus service 28 (Woking-Knaphill-Guildford) was withdrawn on Sundays from 11 January 2004, as part of a package of contracted service reductions due to budgetary constraints, the decision for which was made by the Executive on 30 September 2003 and ratified at full Council on 21 October 2003.

In order to lessen the impact of this withdrawal in the Goldsworth Park area (from where a substantial number of the passengers on service 28 previously boarded), it was felt appropriate to divert alternate journeys on service 34, at no additional cost to the Council, so that between Woking and Knaphill they run via Goldsworth Park instead of St. Johns.

Overall, service 34 continues to run hourly on Sundays between Woking and Knaphill, Bisley, West End and Lightwater and continues to serve the Sainsbury store on the former Brookwood Hospital site. In respect of the latter, it is considered that the new arrangements still fulfil the requirement to provide an hourly daytime service to the site on Sundays as detailed in the Deed of Variation of Planning Obligation.

The new arrangements maintain the ability of those resident in both St. Johns and Goldsworth Park to access Woking and Knaphill on a Sunday, and have been welcomed locally.

The question of the diversion of service 34 (or 35) to run again via Knaphill High Street and Limecroft Road, having also served the former hospital site (to fulfil the obligation of four buses per hour on routes 34/35 through the site), has been previously considered, in consultation with Arriva. During the day on Mondays to Saturdays, service 34 in the Knaphill area is actually operated on a commercial basis by Arriva.

Having met the requirement for all 34s and 35s to serve the site, Arriva found that it would not be feasible to double-back along The Broadway to run via High Street and Limecroft Road without incurring additional resources to maintain reliability and service frequency, i.e. an extra vehicle and driver. Neither Arriva nor the County Council are in a position to fund that requirement. The bus company consider that even the modest diversion of the services away from the Bagshot Road to run via, say, Chobham Road and Limecroft Road would jeopardise service reliability and would compromise work they have done in the last 18 months to improve timekeeping. From the perspective of marketing and passenger growth, it is felt that the current single route between Knaphill and Lightwater is the best that resources can provide for sustaining the service and growing usage.

Prior to November 2002 and the introduction of the current route under the Quality Partnership agreement, service 34 was experiencing 407,000 passenger journeys per year. This has now increased to 788,000. This level of growth in such a short period of time is somewhat exceptional in Surrey and could only be achieved with the assistance of the external funding derived from the agreement with the developer of the Brookwood hospital site. Arriva are keen to consolidate

the product in its current form, to aid further growth, and to offer the best chance of making it commercially sustainable in the longer term.

In a supplementary question, Cllr Kingsbury asked whether it would be possible to invite the transport portfolio holder to the meeting in April 2004 to hear the discussion with Ringway. In relation to question 4, Cllr Kingsbury stated that the 2 hourly service is regrettable, and queried whether this met the Deed of Variation. Stephen Child agreed to refer this to a colleague in the Passenger Transport Group and get back to Cllr Kingsbury.

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg

1. What is the proposed route for the cycle track north up the A322 from Brookwood Crossroads? What is the anticipated timetable to completion?
2. Following the ban on right turns out of Cemetery Pales, when will signs be erected at appropriate locations in Cemetery Pales indicating that the route to Guildford is via Pirbright?
3. When will the proposed revised traffic movements and signage at Brookwood Crossroads come into effect?
4. Is there any progress on proposals for fast small-scale improvements for pedestrians through Pirbright Rail Arch?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. The proposed route is on the east side of the A322 from the crossroads and runs behind the roadside vegetation up to a point level with Hunters Lodge. This was completed as part of the recent scheme. The original plan was for the cycleway to extend to Redding Way; however the length alongside properties in Percheron Drive is jointly owned by those properties and Surrey has not been able to obtain permission to use the land for highway purposes. There are no proposals for extending this to the borough boundary near Limecroft Road, as there is restricted availability of existing highway.
2. The site has been visited and it is proposed to erect a sign on the north side of the road at the cemetery entrance. This will be double sided and indicate the route to Guildford from the exit on each side of the road. This has been ordered and it is anticipated that this will be erected within the next month.
3. Following the comments at the Brookwood Community forum and various letters to the Local Transportation Service the phasing of the signals was discussed with Traffic Signals Team. Phasing can be changed; however it will not provide the "best" timings for the lights. It was recommended that all safety audit works and signage be completed before reviewing the phasing and considering further changes.

4. Pirbright Rail Arch, although just over the border, is an issue for the Guildford Local Committee and I am aware that Councillor Goldenberg and the Guildford Local Transportation Director are communicating on this matter.

In a supplementary question, Cllr Goldenberg noted that he had yet to hear from the Guildford Local Transportation Director and Stephen Child agreed to chase this.

Executive Functions

07/04 Future Location of County Hall [Item 7]

In accordance with Standing Order 58, Mrs Tinney declared a personal interest in relation to Item 7 on the new County Hall.

Rhian Taylor gave a presentation on the plans for the new County Hall. It was explained that the County Council was looking at entering into a 30 year contract with Equion, a subsidiary of Laing, to relocate County Hall to Woking, to provide fully serviced accommodation and to continue to develop new ways of working for the County Council.

A public consultation on the impact of moving County Hall to Woking was carried out in autumn 2003. It showed that 42% of respondents were in support, 34% were broadly in favour and 24% opposed. The biggest concern of local people was added congestion to the local area and the impact on parking in the town centre. It was noted there would be the same number of public parking places on the site as now.

Timing:

- Plans will be submitted to Woking Borough Council on Friday 30 January 2004
- Quadrant House in Woking will be refurbished by January 2005
- Woking Borough Council Planning Committee should make a decision on 20 April 2004
- Judicial Review should be complete by 27 August 2004
- Contract with Equion should be signed on 24 September 2004
- Construction will start in November 2004
- New County Hall will be ready end 2006/beginning of 2007.

In response to a question from Cllr Branagan it was noted that the traffic impact assessment is being undertaken by an independent company. A staff travel plan is also being drawn up to help reduce the traffic impact of the relocation.

In response to a further question from Cllr Branagan it was noted that survey work to existing properties adjoining the site would be carried out.

In response to a question from Cllr Cross regarding whether the planning application would address traffic problems in Chobham Road at peak times, it was noted that the traffic impact assessment would look at all the local infrastructure, and the effects would be monitored once the new building was functional.

It was further noted that enhancements would be made to the canalside where possible, avoiding local rare plants that have been identified.

Mr Rousell thanked Rhian Taylor and Ian Boast for attending.

08/04 Local Transportation Plan and Implementation Programme for Woking 2004/05 [Item 8]

A revised report was circulated at the meeting which had corrected figures and revised recommendations. The report updated the Local Committee on progress with schemes on the Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation programmes for 2003/04.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed that:

- a) The Local Transport Plan programme for 2003-04 be progressed; and
- b) The Brewery Road project is changed from Local Allocation to Local Transport Plan Programme.

09/04 Local Transportation Plan Implementation Programme for Woking 2004/05 [Item 9]

Geoff Wallace introduced the report which noted that following the funding bid in, November 2003, Woking had received a 40% uplift, an improvement on this year's 30%. Unfortunately, with the County Council's financial constraints only one Intermediate Scheme received funding for 2004/05. Therefore Woking's intermediate scheme for Barnsbury Farm Estate is not funded again in 2004/05. However, it was noted that it is necessary to do some work on improving the Almond Avenue junction with the A320.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed that the Integrated Transportation Programme for Woking 2004/05 be approved.

10/04 Local Transportation Service Analysis of Customer Contacts [Item 10]

The report provided information about the nature and volume of customer reports, observations and complaints received during the period July – December 2003. The committee noted the report.

11/04 Town Centre Environment – Progress Report on Joint Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council Project [Item 11]

Christine Holloway introduced the report which specified details of the joint project to improve the street scene and the environment in the town centre.

Cllr Kingsbury welcomed the report on behalf of the Woking Borough Council Executive, and it was confirmed that Douglas Spinks was taking it through the relevant mechanisms at the Borough Council.

RESOLVED

The committee noted the report and agreed the recommendations including to allocate £25,000 in principle to the project subject to the Local Transportation Director confirming that this can be found from the budget delegated to the Local Committee by Surrey County Council.

12/04 Smarts Heath Road Railway Bridge – Pedestrian Facility [Item 12]

David Durrant introduced the report which considered points raised in the petition presented to Committee on 23 July 2003 expressing concerns about pedestrian safety on Smarts Heath Road Railway Bridge.

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chairman adjourned the meeting to allow Cllr Palmer, who presented the petition on Smarts Heath Road, to speak. He asked whether it was possible to consider a modified pedestrian crossing for the bridge, and whether it was possible for the proposed option to have a trial period. Stephen Child explained that such a pedestrian crossing would need GOSE approval, which may not be forthcoming, and it would not achieve the desired traffic calming measures. It was also explained that it would not be possible to put in a trial scheme due to the building work involved. The meeting was then reconvened.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed:

- a) That the results of the resident survey reveal a need to provide a safe pedestrian crossing facility over the bridge
- b) That option a to provide a footpath and incorporate traffic calming is taken to detailed design and brought back to committee for final approval.

13/04 A324 Connaught Road, Brookwood [Item 13]

Stephen Child explained that this has been an ongoing issue raised by borough and county councillors, the Brookwood Community Forum, the petition to the Local Committee and the Brookwood Village Association.

Ted Stevens introduced the report which highlighted the local concerns about excessive speed of vehicles in the road and access and egress problems at Brookwood Station. The proposal is to introduce pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the school and the village centre and speed reduction measures at various points along its length.

Concern was raised about the placing of speed cushions and their subsequent removal. Ted Stevens explained that these were needed as an interim measure to address speeding. It was noted that the station improvements were likely to take 3-5 years so it would not be a short term measure.

Cllr Goldenberg suggested that the right time to start the scheme would be during the school summer holidays.

In response to a question from Mrs Tinney it was confirmed that although the bus lay-by was being taken away, the bus stop would remain.

Cllr Kingsbury explained that he had received a letter from the head of Brookwood School asking for a pelican crossing rather than a zebra crossing. It was noted that the zebra crossing was the best option and a road safety officer would go into the school to educate the children how to use the crossing.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed:

- a) That the proposals shown on drawing numbers 11661 and 11662 in relation to traffic calming at the western end of Brookwood Village be approved for construction.
- b) That the proposals shown on drawing no 11671 in relation to improvements in the centre of Brookwood village, be approved for construction.
- c) That the proposals shown on drawing 11652 and 11661A in relation to improvements in the vicinity of the Primary School, be approved for construction.

14/04 Blackhorse Road/Berry Lane/Heath House Road [Item 14]

Kevin Patching introduced the report which set out proposals for traffic management measures, in response to a petition, to improve safety along Blackhorse Road, in particular at its crossroads junction with Heath House Road and Saunders Lane and for changes in the local speed limits. At the meeting a paper was circulated with revised recommendations following an objection by Surrey Police to the change in speed limit along Berry Lane and Smarts Heath Road. The new recommendation was that no alteration to the existing speed limit along Berry Lane and Smarts Heath Road should be made.

Mr Rousell adjourned the meeting to enable Mrs Riddy, who presented the petition on Blackhorse Road, to speak. She confirmed that she would like to see the 40mph speed limit regardless of police objections. The meeting was then reconvened.

Cllr Goldenberg commended the proposals, but would like a 40mph speed limit along both Berry Lane and Smarts Heath Road. Cllr Branagan would like to see a 30mph speed limit. Cllr Kingsbury would like to see a 40mph speed limit.

Stephen Child confirmed that although the funding for this proposal has not yet been identified, he would come back with proposals to get the measures done, either in whole or part.

Cllr Goldenberg moved an amendment to the recommendation asking for a 40mph speed limit along Berry Lane and Smarts Heath Road. This was seconded by Mrs Compton.

RESOLVED

- a) The revised recommendation to alter the speed limit along Berry Lane and Smarts Heath Road to 40mph was agreed by 5 votes to 3.
- b) Members agreed that the proposals shown on drawings No 11668, 11669 and 11670 be approved for construction.

15/04 St Johns Road, Woking – proposed speed reducing measures [Item 15]

Geoff Wallace introduced the report which set out proposals to encourage lower vehicle speeds throughout the length of St Johns Road, Woking, following receipt of a petition from local residents.

Cllr Kingsbury asked whether the Committee would be willing to get a quote and pay for the wall referred to in the report, which inhibits sight lines, to be modified. There was concern about whether the Committee should pay for work to private dwellings.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed that:

- a) The mobile actuated signs and road safety posters be introduced in St Johns Road, and their effect on vehicle speeds monitored.
- b) Residents' views are sought on the effectiveness of the measures.
- c) The Local Transportation Service consult the legal department on whether the Local Committee would be allowed to fund revisions to the wall referred to in the report, and report to the Chairman.

16/04 **Additional Roads for On-Street (CPZ) Parking** [Item 16]

Stephen Child introduced the report which set out proposals for additional roads to be added to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme in Woking.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed that:

- a) Lydele Close be added to the Woking Borough Council (various roads) Order 1992
- b) Elphinstone Close be added to the Woking Borough Council (various roads in Brookwood) Order 1997

17/04 **Forward Programme** [Item 17]

Members noted the forward programme and added reports on street lighting, public transport, and a review of Martyrs Lane road and road surfaces.

18/04 **Exclusion of Press and Public** [Item 18]

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 9.50pm]

Chairman