



**Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda**

Meeting held at 7.30pm on 19 January 2005

at

the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mr Geoff Marlow – Chairman
Mrs Valery Tinney- Vice Chairman
Cllr Peter Ankers
Cllr Bryan Cross
Cllr Philip Goldenberg
Cllr James Palmer
Mrs Diana Smith
Mrs Elizabeth Compton
Cllr Peter Ford
Cllr John Kingsbury
Mr David Rousell

Part One – In Public

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

01/05 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Sheila Gruselle gave her apologies for absence.

02/05 Minutes of last meeting held on 14 October 2004 [Item 2]

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14th October 2004 be confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

03/05 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

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

04/05 Petitions [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

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

This question was received from Ms Julie Lewis:

With reference to the £96,000 paid to Woking BC by Thirlstone Homes in 2001-02 as part of the legal agreement to develop Bracken Hill, why, if any part of this money still remains, has it not been utilised to provide the agreed off-site highway traffic calming measures for Heathside Crescent, including pedestrian crossings between Park Road, Heathside Crescent and Oriental Road, before the expiry date is reached, and before a major accident is caused due to the ever increasing level of traffic speeding around the one-way system, endangering the lives of pedestrians, added to which is the new problem of vehicles inadvertently turning right into oncoming traffic while exiting Bracken Hill, as is being witnessed by local residents on a weekly basis?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

Firstly, I must point out that the Section 106 Planning Agreement (legal agreement) associated with the development at Bracken Hill, Heathside Crescent included £50,000, not £96,000 for off-site highway works. The S106 Planning Agreement is between Woking Borough Council and the Bracken Hill Developer. Woking Borough Council currently holds the Developer's £50,000 payment. The original proposals, to which neighbours objected, comprised:

1. Providing an advisory cycle lane on one side of Heathside Crescent
2. Providing a raised pedestrian crossing at the Oriental Road/Heathside Crescent junction
3. Raising the existing pedestrian crossing at White Rose Lane/Heathside Crescent junction
4. Providing traffic calming in Heathside Crescent between Oriental Road and White Rose Lane

Delivery of the off-site highway works is not time constrained by the legal agreement and I have asked officers to programme a local public consultation based on the above, this is likely to occur around April to May with proposals being submitted to the July Local Committee.

The issue of why the money has not been spent to date is primarily one of communication and procedure. It is my understanding that SCC Transportation Development Control agreed a procedure with Woking Borough Council for such monies and their release in May 2003. In November 2004 WBC are stating that money cannot be released until invoice from Surrey has been received. In other words Surrey must do all the work and pay for it before invoicing WBC. This needs to be resolved in respect of this site and various others and I shall be seeking a meeting between the various parties at an early opportunity.

In response to a supplementary question, Mr Child commented that there would be a public consultation meeting to discuss plans for traffic calming in April/May and a report would come back to the July Committee meeting

This question was received from Cllr Richard Sanderson:

According to a report in the Woking Review, a review of car parking in the Arthurs Bridge Road area has been undertaken and additional waiting restrictions are proposed to be submitted to the Local Committee in April. What are the proposed restrictions and why have local Woking Borough Councillors (or Woking Borough Council) not been consulted on them?

Has the County Council looked at possible solutions such as residents parking schemes or extension of the controlled parking zone and has it consulted residents on any of their proposals? Further have Council officers spoken to the Police about the better enforcement of existing parking restrictions, particularly those against parking on corners?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

A review has been commenced but is not yet complete. Residents and Borough Councillors will be consulted as part of the process. We will also explore with the Borough Council the possibility of extending the CPZ, this will be considered as a separate issue to the current parking problems that initiated this review. We will consult with the Police and also liaise with them on the question of enforcement. A full report on this matter will be submitted to the Local Committee in April 2005.

In response to a supplementary question Mr child responded that work had started in August/September last year but officers had not been out to see members of the public yet.

This question was received from Mr Anthony Branagan:

Regarding Arthurs Bridge Road could the Local Transportation Director indicate whether or not he has any proposals to prevent illegal right turns in from Well Lane as safety is compromised (going against the flow of traffic and Arthurs Bridge Road is very narrow with parking on both sides) and it is illegal (performed by at least 50% of drivers mostly going to LA Fitness) and what remedial action is proposed to deal with parking, particularly at the junction with Horsell Moor (turning right from Horsell Moor is often blind because of the parking), as cars are parking on the corner, the footway and both sides of Arthurs Bridge Road totally disregarding local residents?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

Officers have reviewed the Arthurs Bridge Road/Well Lane junction and there is a draft proposal that needs to be sent for safety audit prior to informing the Divisional Member of the alteration. No additional traffic orders are required and works can be implemented once agreed.

Regarding the parking review, this has been commenced but is not yet complete. Residents and Borough Councillors will be consulted as part of the process. We will also explore with the Borough Council the possibility of extending the CPZ, this will be considered as a separate issue to the current parking problems that initiated this review. We will consult with the Police and also liaise with them on the question of enforcement. A full report on this matter will be submitted to the Local Committee in April 2005.

This question was received from Mr John Doran:

Could the Committee please consider urgently the need for changes to traffic management in Horsell village? Following a number of accidents and concern expressed by residents and parents of local schools, Horsell Liberal Democrats have been inundated with requests to do something about traffic in Horsell village and especially near the schools.

It is only a matter of time before a pedestrian is seriously injured at the High Street shops. There is no separation of pedestrians and traffic. It is chaos at busy times with mothers with kids being reversed at by motorists leaving the shops. Can the parking be moved to road side separating it from pedestrians?

In early December yet another car crashed on the corner of Arthurs Bridge Road and Church Hill. There is growing support for a 20 mph limit from Brewery Road, at the junction with Horsell Park, Church Hill (past the village school), along the High Street and along Meadway Drive (past the C of E school) to the High School. Is this possible?

There is a strong feeling that a limit is not enough as enforcement is non-existent. Many people are in favour of narrowing the road, having the dual advantage of giving more pedestrian space and slowing the traffic. I believe (also supported in an email) that some form of alternate one-way system as seen in places like Kingston would work. What can be done to improve enforcement? Residents' concerns are increased by the very strong feeling that all these problems will get worse if County Hall goes ahead. Could the Committee please ask officers to look at possible solutions to these concerns?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Committee can certainly request that Woking Local Transportation Service includes "changes to traffic management in Horsell Village" on the work programme. As a first step I have asked officers to contact Mr Doran and arrange a meeting to discuss all the issues that he has raised.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child reported that the Vehicle Activated signs on Brewery road and Church Hill were very useful and can be used to plot vehicle speeds.

This question was received from Adrian Adcock:

At your meeting of 14th October 2004 you resolved to not proceed with a scheme for the provision of a footway along the section of Old Woking Road between Roundhill and Maybury Hill on the grounds of cost. You did however, instruct the Director to write to Members before Christmas with any further information regarding the cost of a scheme.

A meeting between the Petitioner, Mr Norman Johns, the Woking for Pedestrians group and your officers was held on 9th December 2004 with further correspondence immediately following which showed a considerable consensus as to the cost of a scheme to provide a basic footway or an alternative scheme which included a significantly improved carriageway width.

Is the Local Transportation Director able to confirm whether or not he is he is able to recommend to members that they reconsider their decision of 14th October 2004 and seek the necessary funds to carry out a suitable topographical survey as soon as possible to enable an appropriate project to progress to design stage?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

I can confirm that a report was issued to Members before Christmas as agreed with options to do nothing or request survey work be undertaken. Following Members response I have informed Members of the outcome, that is to undertake the survey, however at this time no funding is available to progress this work. Item 15 on today's agenda includes a report for information on this matter.

This question was received from Cllr Elizabeth Evans:

Parking Space for Sheltered Housing - The elderly residents of 27-31 Princess Gardens Maybury Estate have nowhere for emergency services, health works and the mobile library to park as others in the road are using space previously allocated, which was surfaced with cobbles to mark it out for this. Can the Highway Services please investigate other ways of protecting this essential space?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

There are no Highway parking restrictions in Princess Gardens and no proposals for any to be introduced.

The origin of two cobbled areas is unknown and although they do not prevent vehicle parking this device would not have been used to indicate reserved parking.

Resident parking does not appear to cause a problem during the daytime. The library visits alternate Tuesdays for 15 minutes and there would be spaces available for health workers. Emergency Services would not be prevented from access by resident parking.

06/05 Written member questions on transportation matters [Item 6]

These questions were received from Cllr Peter Ford:

1. When will the promised resurfacing of the Coniston Road and Winston Way link Roads on Rydens Way now be completed? Woking LTS first committed to this work in a letter dated 26 September 2003; next, in response to a petition from residents presented to this Committee on 26 April 2004 and most recently at a meeting on 15 July 2004. The latest date promised for completion was September 2004 – three months ago.
2. The condition of the surface of many roads in Old Woking is poor and getting worse. When will a proper road resurfacing programme be instigated?
3. Research has shown that crime levels can be reduced by up to 20% as a result of improving the quality of lighting. Many roads in Old Woking are badly lit and visibility is poor. When will a programme to improve the quality of street lighting in Old Woking be introduced?
4. When will the agreements of the current contractors to Surrey County Council for road repairs and street lighting come up for renewal and what input will be allowed from Members of this Committee to ensure that the service is improved and council tax payers get value for money?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. An order for this work was placed in July 2004. Regrettably we have been let down by our Constructors on a number of occasions for a variety of reasons and now with the wet winter weather upon us, I do not anticipate seeing any change in the current situation. I am pressing the Constructor for a realistic work programme.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child agreed to discuss the delays in completing the micro surfacing work with the Contracts Director.

2. Officers can only provide a response if specifics are given and will happily investigate any specific locations that Councillor wishes to supply. I can also inform you that SCC undertakes highway condition surveys on a regular basis and highway safety inspections at specified intervals on various categories of road. All the data, together with local knowledge, is used to assess the need for treatment and the priorities.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child clarified that customer queries and complaints about resurfacing are considered but the outcome of any work is dictated by funding.

3. SCC has recently been successful in a PFI bid for funding to improve and manage the street lighting stock for the next 25 years. This includes a major improvement programme in the next 5 years. The proposal includes for some improvements and Local Transportation Directors are currently consulting with the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership to determine those areas locally that would benefit from improved lighting in relation to crime. I cannot say at this time whether or not any roads in Old Woking will be included.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child agreed to circulate a list of outstanding EDF jobs to the committee members.

4. The Surrey Highway Partnership contract is a 4 year contract extendable to 10 years in 1 year or 2 year amounts. Any extension to the 4 years is based on performance measured by the KPIs. The process is described in the Best and Final Offer document as follows:

At the end of year 2 of the Order Term, the performance of each Constructor over years 1 and 2 will be measured and evaluated. Dependent on the level against KPIs of performance achieved the following action will be taken:

- (a) No extension, the Partnering Contract being determined at the end of the Order Term, ie year 4;
- (b) No extension granted but one considered the following year;
- (c) 1-year extension beyond year 4;
- (d) 2-year extension beyond year 4;
- (e) Shortening of the Order Term, only if performance falls below any agreed basic minimum standard

At the end of each subsequent year of the Order Term a further evaluation of the Constructors performance against the KPIs will take place and the following action will be taken:

- (a) No further extension will be granted;
- (b) 1 further year extension will be granted to the Order Term;
- (c) Shortening of the Order Term, only if performance falls below any agreed basic minimum standard.

The Transportation Select Committee will consider detailed information in the Spring and the Executive is expected to take a decision on the contract at a subsequent meeting.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child confirmed that we were at the end of year two of the contract.

Cllr Goldenberg and Cllr Kingsbury agreed to collate any queries from members and submit to the Transportation Select Committee in writing in advance of the 24th February meeting.

This question was received from Cllr Peter Ankers:

What is planned to be done about the pathway between Pyrford Cricket Ground and Pyrford Primary School? This is, I understand, a Surrey CC maintained pathway and the tree roots have so uprooted the path that they are a positive danger, especially for elderly people and children?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

The footpath in question is a highway maintained path and was visited on 17 January by the local Highway Steward. The damage occurring is from trees on adjacent land hence the roots cannot be removed however local areas will be overlaid to even out the surface although it must be recognised that with time further damage is likely to occur.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child informed the committee that an order was in place and work would be completed in 28 days if not sooner.

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg

1. Are the traffic signals along Victoria Way linked? If not why not?
2. Please give dates by which the following will be completed:
 - (a) All the traffic-calming proposals for rural Brookwood;
 - (b) The part-cowling of the belisha beacons, and the lowering and shading of the arc lights, at the zebra crossings in Connaught Road;
 - (c) The advance "Right Turn First" signing north and south of the Brookwood crossroads.

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. Yes with the exception of the pelican from Brewery Road Car Park.
2.
 - (a) Still aiming for end of this financial year (electrical connections etc may drag over into April and am awaiting decision from DfT re STOP signs)
 - (b) Spotlights shielded 16.1.05. Belisha beacon cowling to be fitted 18.1.05.
 - (c) Before mid-February 2005.

These questions were received from Cllr John Kingsbury:

1. Fosters Lane Knaphill

Despite repeated assurances that a proposal was under consideration to improve the surface on a more permanent basis, of this Private Lane but busy Public Right of Way, little progress seems to have taken place and parts of the lane are again dangerous to pedestrians.

What is the current position please?

2. Hook Heath Road.

When will the outstanding re-surfacing of the area from around Pond Road to the junction with Saunders Lane be undertaken, which work was not included with the earlier works?

3. Railway Bridge linking St Johns Lye with Pond Road, Hook Heath

This bridge has been closed for some months causing inconvenience to local residents! When is it likely to re-open?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. My Principal Engineer has obtained an estimate from the Constructor and has passed this information to the local resident however Cllr Kingsbury was not included in error for which I apologise. The works required to make safe the public right of way can be implemented at the earliest to ensure public safety however it is understood that the local community may wish to consider improving the condition of the whole lane. I will ask my Principal Engineer to discuss this further with Cllr Kingsbury with a view to resolving the right of way problem or indeed the whole problem.

2. This work was not part of the 2004/05 programme however officers are currently preparing the 2005/06 and beyond programme. This will be based on need and priorities, the amount achievable will depend on the funding available.

3. This footway is a right of way however the bridge over the railway is maintained by Network Rail. The current information indicates that it will be replaced in February 2005. Surrey County Council has written requesting that they consider a temporary structure but no reply has been received.

This question was received from Cllr Diana Smith:

The consultation about Brookwood Hospital Bus Gate reported to this meeting on 14th October showed twice as many respondents dissatisfied with the current arrangements as satisfied. What plans does the LTS have to lessen this dissatisfaction?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Committee's consideration and debate leading to its decision to keep the bus gate operationally buses only, was taken in full knowledge of the results obtained having requested the public consultation within the Knaphill local area. In resolving to keep the bus gate operationally buses only the Committee erred for safety over convenience. Therefore Local Transportation Service is not actively undertaking further works at this location.

In response to a supplementary question Mr Child responded that access and safety issues needed to be looked at separately and that the access issue could be added to the work programme if approved by the Committee.

These questions were received from Cllr Bryan Cross:

1. Would the Local Transportation manager please advise me of the outcome of his review of the parking of vehicles in the Broadway from Alldays to the Private Hire office which he promised to undertake at the last meeting of this committee?
2. Would the Local Transportation manager please advise me as to the amount that Surrey County Council expect to receive annually from O2 for the mobile mast that is under construction in Lockfield Drive (adjacent to Caradon Close)? Would he also please advise to where Surrey County Council will spend these funds?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

1. At the last meeting I agreed to look at double yellow lines in part of this area. Officers consider this to be a worthwhile solution however, as Members are aware, this will not be implemented until DPE commences in July 2005.
2. The O2 operator is a statutory body with a right to put certain items on the Highway, similar to telegraph poles. Surrey County Council will receive no income for such installations.

This question was received from Cllr James Palmer:

Is the Local Transportation Director aware of local residents' deep concerns about speed and volume of traffic in Westfield Avenue, Westfield? Could he please arrange for a speed survey to be undertaken on that, and nearby roads, as soon as possible, bearing in mind the proximity of Westfield Primary School, and report back to the Local Committee?

Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Transportation Director is aware of residents' concerns regarding Westfield Avenue and will arrange for a speed survey to be undertaken. I can

also inform you that an officer is attending a local meeting of residents, WBC and others on Thursday 20 January to discuss this location. In response to a supplementary question Mr Child confirmed that a survey would be carried out by the end of February.

Executive Functions

07/05 Surrey Safety Camera Partnership [Item 9]

Duncan Knox introduced the report which described the benefits of forming a Safety Camera Partnership in Surrey, and the implications for Woking. He explained that the creation of a Safety Camera Partnership would allow partners to recoup costs from fines generated from offenders.

Duncan Knox agreed to investigate the implications of removing the camera on Pyrford Road that had been funded via a section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED

That

- (i) the benefits of the creation of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership be noted;
- (ii) that the existing red light violation camera housing located on the A320 Victoria Way junction with Chobham Road be retained and minor improvements undertaken to improve access for operatives, paid for by Surrey Safety Camera Partnership;
- (iii) a vehicle-activated sign be installed to replace the existing fixed speed camera housing on Pyrford Road; and
- (iv) it be noted that the above proposals are subject to approval by central government.

08/05 Woking Cycle Network [Item 7]

John Masson introduced the report and informed the Committee of various proposals to enhance the Woking Cycle Network.

In response to a question from Mrs Tinney it was stated that the Canal authority allow cycles to use the canal path but signs to promote it as a cycleway are not allowed.

Members raised concerns about safety issues and discussed routes listed in the report. Mr Masson asked Members to put any suggestions about the proposed routes to him outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED

That the proposals outlined in paragraphs 4 - 21 be accepted for implementation.

09/05 Woking Town centre Access Study - Progress [Item 8]

RESOLVED

That

- (i) the list of short-term measures shown at Annex A to this report be approved for construction during the 2005/06 financial year; and
- (ii) initial survey, consultation and design work be undertaken on the long-term proposals described in paragraphs 7 to 11, for reporting back to a future meeting of this Committee.

10/05 Hart Road – Provision of Parking Spaces [Item 10]

RESOLVED

that the grass verges be removed in Hart Road and the carriageway widened as shown in Drawings 11860 A & B.

11/05 Local Transport Plan Implementation Programme for Woking 2005/06 & LTP2- 2006/07 to 2010/11 [Item 11]

Geoff Wallace introduced the report which informed the Committee of the bid for funding its integrated transportation programme for Woking 2005/06, together with the outline LTP2 programme 2006/07 to 2010/11.

Geoff Wallace explained that the budget for 2005/06 implementation programme had been adjusted and was now £440,000 which is a reduction of £110,000 i.e 20%.

Members were informed that the proposed programme for 2005/06 will be reported to the April Local Committee and the 2006/07 programme reported to the October Local Committee.

RESOLVED

That

- (i) the contents of the report be noted; and
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman, to adjust the 2005/06 Implementation Programme in accordance with the budget and report back to the April Committee.

12/05 Verge Parking in Sheerwater and Maybury Estates [Item 12]

David Durrant introduced the report and showed a number of photographs highlighting the current problems.

Mr Durrant explained that there were no funds set aside for parking bays. Members discussed whether a survey should be undertaken if no monies were available and they agreed that the issue had to be addressed as this was a Borough wide problem. They agreed to produce outside of the meeting a list of areas in the borough where verge parking was a problem and send this to Mr Child. The Local Transport Service would use this information to produce a work programme for the future..

RESOLVED

That the Local Transportation Service receive from Members details of areas within the Borough where verge parking is problematic.

13/05 Decriminalised Parking Enforcement [Item 13]

The Local Transportation Director introduced this item and highlighted the success of the Member Task Group in persuading the County Council to increase the allocation of Parking Attendants for Woking from two to three. However, the Task Group had been clear that the parking scheme would work very much better with the provision of a fourth Attendant. The report proposed a means of securing a fourth post to be funded jointly by the County and the Borough using local allocations.

Councillor Kingsbury pointed out that the Local Committee could not agree funding commitments from the Borough Council and that approval of the proposed way forward would not constitute a joint funding agreement. On the basis that approval of the proposal for a fourth attendant would represent a request to the Borough Council to consider funding, it was

RESOLVED

That

- (i) a additional fourth Parking Attendant be jointly funded between Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council from local allocations, if approved by Woking Borough Council; and
- (ii) that it be noted that;
 - a) funding has been agreed for three additional Parking Attendants;
 - b) lawyers from Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council are currently working on the Agency Agreement; and
 - c) an interim Parking Officer will be trained to enforce waiting restrictions in advance of the introduction of DPE

14/05 Variable Message Signs Town Centre Car Parks [Item 14]

The Local Transportation Director introduced the report which set out proposals to introduce six variable message signs around the town centre, most of them replacing existing signs to avoid creating excessive signage. They will be in Guildford Road, Chertsey Road, Chobham Road, Lockfield Drive, Brewery Road and Oriental Road and each sign will show the availability of car park spaces in the town centre car parks relevant to the sign location.

Mr Wallace reported that the system was highly sophisticated and it estimated how long it would take a driver to get from the variable message sign to the car park with allowances made for possible changes to availability in that time, to avoid drivers being disappointed.

In response to a question from Cllr Kingsbury, Mr Child agreed to investigate the scope for an additional sign at Church Street West.

RESOLVED

That

- (i) the proposal to install variable message signs around the town to indicate car parks availability be approved and implemented by April 2005;
- (ii) Surrey County Council funding for the project is on a 50:50 partnership basis with WBC and will be from a central improvement fund; and
- (iii) officers investigate the need and scope for an additional sign at Church Street West

15/05 Items for Information (previously circulated to members) [Item 15]

The following item was noted:

2004/05 LTP Works Programme Update

Old Woking Road Update:

Since the last meeting of the Committee, a briefing note had been circulated outlining the options for further investigations. The note had included the estimated costs of works proposed by the petitioner together with comments of the County Council's Geotechnical Engineer advising that the proposals might require alteration to make them safe. Members had been asked to indicate whether, in the light of the discussions with the petitioner and the comments of the Geotechnical Engineer, no further action should be taken or, alternatively, a topographical survey should be undertaken to inform a revised design.

Members had given inconclusive views on this issue in response to a briefing note circulated late last year.

In debate, all Members recognised the force of the case put by the petitioners but a number of Members balanced that case against the costs of finding a solution. In view of the technical advice presented in the briefing note, it seemed clear that the estimate of £342,000 would be the minimum expenditure necessary and that the requirement to seek additional carriageway width as part of any scheme would certainly increase costs to a minimum of £424,000. Any additional works arising from a topographical survey would only add to the costs.

Members then considered the LTP Implementation budget for 2005/06 which stood at £440,000 in total. A number of Members put forward the view that the costs of the proposals for Old Woking Road could not be met in 2005/06 and that resources were unlikely to be available at any foreseeable time in the future. Accordingly, it would not be prudent to spend £16,000 on a survey for a scheme for which there was little prospect of identifying implementation funding.

The Local Transportation Director advised Members that the results of any topographical survey would remain useable for only about 5 years, after which the work would need to be repeated if a scheme were to be taken forward at a later date.

It was then **MOVED** by Mr Rousell, seconded by Mrs Tinney and

RESOLVED (by 6 votes to 5)

That no further action be taken to investigate the potential for installing a footway in Old Woking Road in view of the technical difficulties and associated costs of all potential schemes.

16/05 **Forward Programme** [Item 16]

Approved as in the report subject to addition of items relating to Chertsey Road, Arthur's Bridge Road and traffic management for the next meeting.

17/05 **Exclusion of Press and Public** [Item 17]

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