



Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda
Meeting held at 7.00pm on 18 July 2005
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mrs Val Tinney - Chairman	
Mrs Elizabeth Compton – Vice Chairman	
Mr John Doran	Cllr Peter Ankers
Mrs Diana Smith	Cllr Catherine Fisher
Mr Geoff Marlow	Cllr Peter Ford
Mr Shamas Tabrez	Cllr Neville Hinks
	Cllr Philip Goldenberg
	Cllr John Kingsbury

Part One – In Public

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

39/05 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Andrew Crisp and Bryan Cross gave their apologies for absence.

40/05 Minutes of last meeting held on 6 April 2005 [Item 2]

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2005 were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

41/05 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

John Doran declared an interest as a non-executive Director of the Highways Agency.

42/05 **Petitions** [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

43/05 **Written public questions on transportation matters** [Item 5]

A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 1.

44/05 **Written member questions on transportation matters** [Item 6]

A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 2.

Cllr Goldenberg asked a supplementary question to Question 1. Regarding if the Committee would accept that there had been no consultation about the new arrangements with the Borough Council.

Geoff Wallace responded that the new arrangements are an internal Surrey County Council matter which could not be influenced by the Borough Council.

Cllr Goldenberg asked the following supplementary question to Question 2. What happens to Pirbright Bridge is of interest to both Woking and Guildford. Can local Borough Councillors be kept informed?

Geoff Wallace responded that Woking members will be informed and also invited to a meeting to discuss future proposals.

Cllr Ankers asked the following supplementary question to Question 4. What is the criteria for a single raised table in Coldharbour Road?

Geoff Wallace responded that he would supply Cllr Ankers with these details.

John Doran asked the following supplementary question to Question 5. Is it a fair assumption that the time scales for the Secretary of State to make a decision regarding the County Hall project could be longer than anticipated?

Geoff Wallace responded that the secretary of State could take longer. However, the time scales given are based on the best information available at present.

Executive Functions

45/05 Surrey Highways Partnerships Two years on [Item 7]

The Committee received a presentation from Steve Lee, Surrey County Council's Head of Transportation.

Mr Lee pointed out that lessons had been learnt from the operation of the contract over the last two years. Performance management being the key to a successful partnership as demonstrated by the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) to deliver service; - right first time; - to agreed price; - to agreed programme; and – without injury. The culture of partnership is also to deliver user satisfaction and deliver innovation to enhance Best Value efficiency savings of 2%.

The contract has an Improvement Plan and the Transportation Select Committee is keen to see output delivered against the action points in the Plan. Specifically the Transportation Select Committee want:

- a) Communication improved particularly with Members and with regular reporting to Local Committees,
- b) Enhanced programme delivery via improved project management and use of KPI's; and
- c) A more robust reporting and financial monitoring process put in place.

Mr Lee indicated that the restructuring currently underway within the Transportation service is also targeted to deliver the outcomes identified in the Improvement Plan.

Mr Lee emphasised that market testing showed Surrey County Council's contract costs were comparable with other similar Authorities, accepting that estimation for schemes must be improved and both Constructors were aware that financial information was a key issue within the Improvement Plan.

Mr Lee stressed that the quality of work undertaken by the contractors for major maintenance and similar elements of work needed greater attention.

In conclusion the County Council is addressing deficiencies that had been recognised, would publicise its achievements more widely and achieve service delivery that was – right first time; - on time; and – on budget.

Members voiced the view that this had been a year of frustrations, especially in contacting Ringway. Work was not being done when it was supposed to be done. Steve Lee asked for specific examples to be sent to him. If Ringway fall below Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) then financial penalties are incurred, after that there are restrictions and then loss of contract.

Members noted that the Transportation Select Committee had lively discussions on the partnership. A group has been set up to look at the way the partnership has been running. Steve Lee will ensure that the strength of feeling is reflected in the Transportation Select Committee minutes in future.

Members also noted that the constructor is responsible for the coordination and management of projects and that project management could be improved.

In reply to a question about reporting on contract costs, Mr Lee responded that contract costs were commercially sensitive and confidentiality had to be maintained. The Committee would however, receive a report on the Contractors performance at its meeting in October and in April as part of the Improvement Plan.

In response to a question about road markings, Mr Lee stated it was for the local office, and not the Contractor, to determine a programme for replacement road markings within budgetary limitations, which often meant a phased replacement so not all roads can be relined at once. Mr Wallace added that local highway stewards are keen to ensure road signs and markings are kept refreshed.

Cllr Goldenberg proposed, and after a debate the Committee accepted an amendment to the Officer recommendations in the report.

RESOLVED

That:

The Committee noted the report but very much regrets the decision of the Executive to disregard representations made to it on behalf of Woking residents relating to the poor performance of Ringway. It further calls for this Committee to receive at its next meeting a report on the differential costs effectively borne by local residents as between (a) Ringway and (b) the previous arrangements."

46/05 C141/1798 St Johns Hill Railway Bridge [Item 8]

Geoff Wallace reminded the Committee that the Department for Transport guidance followed the vehicle / rail accident at Great Heck, that the Committee deferred a decision at its meeting on 6 April 2005 and results from bridge strength assessments were awaited. Mr Wallace further explained the additional work undertaken since the 6 April 2005 Committee meeting and summarised the public evening meeting held in St John's Memorial Hall on 15 June 2005. Mr Wallace reported that a public consultation questionnaire had been circulated to 2,200 addresses in the vicinity of the bridge, with a return rate of 25%. Of those responding, 301 were in favour of the traffic signals and 257 were against. The respondents gave various reasons for their decisions:

In favour of Traffic signals:
Safer, controlled flows, obvious right of way, would be effective.

Not in favour of traffic signals:
unnecessary delays, priority works already, waste of money, speeding at lights.

Mr Wallace explained how the traffic signal and junction layout had been adjusted to reflect many of the comments received at the public meeting on 15 June 2005.

In response to questions Geoff Wallace reported that there had been personal injury accidents at this location with the vehicle priority system in place. Recorded speed with and without the traffic signals, showed the 85th percentile speed to be similar although the maximum speed was marginally higher with traffic signals. However, speed detector loops in the final layout would better control both speed and flow of vehicles across the bridge.

Network Rail had indicated by letter that they believed traffic signals were important to prevent incursion of vehicles onto the railway at this location.

Members noted that there are varying views locally. Safety was seen to be an important factor but Members noted that convenience also has to be taken into account. Members requested further consultation with Network Rail.

Extending the bridge walls is not an option as they are weak and would not act as an effective barrier. Geoff Wallace will hold discussions outside the meeting to determine what would happen if Surrey County Council chose to progress a different scheme to that favoured by Network Rail.

RESOLVED

That:

Members welcomed the proposed modifications to the scheme and broadly supported the scheme as modified with a strong preference to have no traffic signals: Officers were requested to have further consultation on this basis.

47/05 Albion Square Canopy [Item 9]

Geoff Wallace outlined the report and the work undertaken since the Committees meeting on 6 April 2005. The culmination being the Developer had confirmed that the pelican crossing outside the station entrance will remain as part of the final scheme when this is implemented later this year.

Mr Wallace also drew the Committee's attention to a change in restrictions to allow for the "kiss and ride" layby in Chertsey Road.

RESOLVED

That:

- a) the notice advertised under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to remove the existing pelican crossing be cancelled, and;
- b) the existing pelican crossing be retained as shown in the report, and;
- c) the raised table be conformed as shown in the report, and;
- d) authority be given to advertise Traffic regulation Orders under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, for the amended 'kiss and ride' facility as shown in figure 4c in the report and that authority be delegated to the Acting Local Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional member to consider and determine any objections and to make the orders.

48/05 Boundary Road- Response to Petition [Item 10]

David Durrant outlined the report, which was in response to a petition to the Committee to curb the number and speed of vehicles in Boundary Road. The report contained proposals following vehicle surveys in the local area and discussions with petitioners. Making Boundary Road one-way would tend to increase vehicle speed and would not meet the objections of the petition. Residents did not want physical traffic calming measures or anything which reduced the current number of on-street parking places.

RESOLVED

That:

- a) the proposals are sent to all residents of Boundary Road for consideration, and;
- b) subject to the majority of the respondents being in favour the traffic calming measures shown in diagram's 11978 to 11980 be approved for construction.

49/05 Proposed waiting restrictions -Park Road Woking [Item 14a]

This item was taken out of sequence to allow attending members of the public to observe the item.

David Durrant presented a report to potentially introduce further double yellow line waiting restrictions in Park Road, Woking. Members

debated the viability of extending the existing Controlled Parking Zone further along Park Road. There is no need for double yellow lines on the bend.

RESOLVED

That :

If by 5 September the residents of Park Road, not currently within the CPZ, obtain a consensus for the introduction of the CPZ from the existing terminal point to it's junction with Maybury Hill, then authority be delegated to the Acting Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to progress an extension of the CPZ in Park Road.

If by 5 September the residents have not obtained a consensus the Committee agreed:

To advertise a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce a waiting restriction in Park Road, Woking as shown in Drawing 11969 that authority be delegated to the Acting Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

50/05 Proposed waiting restrictions- Highclere Road, Knaphill [Item 14b]

This item was taken out of sequence to allow attending members of the public to observe the item.

John Masson presented the report. Members commented that problems in Highclere Road are compounded by the lack of road marking action.

RESOLVED

That:

- a) Authority be given to advertise as Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Act 1984 to extend the waiting restriction at the western end of Highclere Road, as shown on drawing number 11967, and;
- 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, and;
- c) Authority to introduce new waiting restrictions in the future be delegated to the Local Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member.

51/05 Woking Town Centre – Joint initiative on enhancement [Item 11]

Geoff Wallace presented the report. Officers from the Borough Council and Surrey County Council will meet to discuss pedestrian arrangements in Commercial Way.

RESOLVED

That the committee noted the report

52/05 Decriminalised Parking Enforcement [Item 12]

Kevin Patching presented the report and outlined its contents, which culminated in recommendations that are acceptable to both the Borough Council and Surrey County Council. One additional objection, received after the preparation of the report, had been resolved. Ringway have allocated a gang to signing and lining works and they should be finished within a few weeks. Four additional parking attendants have been recruited and are undergoing training. The Chairman offered her thanks to the task group that have been working on this. Residents will get a contact number to call to report parking issues. Members asked for more detail on the beats of the attendants and voiced concern over the attendants focusing on the town centre over the rural areas. The Police will still be involved where parking is dangerous.

A review of DPE will be brought to the Committee in April 2006. Members asked for an update at the next meeting in October 2005.

RESOLVED

That:

The committee approved the decriminalised parking enforcement agency agreement for final signing and sealing

53/05 Local Transport Plan Implementation Programme for Woking 2005-06 [Item 13]

Geoff Wallace updated the Committee on this issue. Deferred schemes will need to be re-established as priorities for the next budget. The Woodham Lane junction with Martyrs Lane scheme was moved to later in the year to allow the Trinity Road, Knaphill scheme to go ahead this financial year.

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report

54/05 Items for Information [Item 15]

Cllr Ford enquired about markings on pavements to show how far up a pavement a car could park. Geoff Wallace responded that these could only be done in conjunction with engineering works to strengthen the pavements. Surrey's pavements are generally not wide enough to ensure accessibility.

55/05 Forward Programme [Item 16]

RESOLVED

That the Committee agreed the Forward Programme contained in this report.

Cllr Kingsbury offered his thanks to Mike Howes, the Local Director. Carolyn Rowe the new Area Director will pass on those thanks.

56/05 Exclusion of Press and Public [Item 17]

There was no business that 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

Annex1

18 July 2005

Public questions on transportation matters

This question was received from Anthony Branagan:

1. a) The Local Transportation Committee approved a proposal at the April 2005 meeting to take measures to prevent a right turn from Well Lane into Arthurs Bridge Road. The present no right turn is ignored by a significant number of motorists. It is requested that start and finish dates for this project be advised to the meeting.

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Our Partnership Constructor Ringway Highway Services has been asked to provide a cost estimate of the works, together with a start and finish date. This is currently awaited.

1. b) It is requested that wooden posts similar to those installed outside the Winston Churchill school be installed on Horsell Moor to prevent commuters' vehicles mounting the grass verge.

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Officers will assess the extent of the problem, the cost and feasibility of providing post and rail fencing, and consult with residents as appropriate.

1. c) Is the performance of Ringway sufficiently satisfactory to merit an extension to the present contract?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The County Council has assessed the performance of both partnership constructors and awarded extensions to both contracts. The Committee will receive a presentation under Item 7 on the Agenda entitled 'Surrey Highways Partnership Two Years On'.

18 July 2005

Member questions on transportation matters

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg:

1. Given that my request to put on the agenda an item relating to the dismemberment of the Local Office was ignored, may the Committee please have a statement on this crucial matter?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The restructuring of the Transportation Service remains very fluid. Although the four Area Transportation Directors have been selected, many key decisions about the operational structure and personnel remain undetermined as of today. It is anticipated that the restructuring will be substantially complete by October 2005. Therefore, it is proposed to bring a full report to the Local Committee at its meeting on 20 October 2005, to explain how the Transportation Service will be delivered locally within Woking. The County Council has determined that there will be four transportation areas within Surrey, each will have an Area Director.

Woking, Surrey Heath & Runnymede
Guildford & Waverley
Spelthorne, Elmbridge and Epsom & Ewell
Mole Valley, Tandridge and Reigate & Banstead

2. How many people have to be killed before the County Council takes action to improve pedestrian safety through the Pirbright Rail Arch?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Guildford LTS are planning to improve the lighting under the bridge, and to clean and paint it. They are also looking at improvements to signing on approaches to the bridge. This work is scheduled to start at the end of August. They are also looking at providing a delineated area for pedestrians to walk in.

This question was received from Cllr Peter Ankers:

3. Some time ago the question of 20 mph speed limits outside schools was considered. What is the position on these, particularly in relation to Pyrford Primary School on Coldharbour Road, Pyrford?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Committee received a report about 20mph limits and zones associated with schools at its meeting on 22 January 2003. The report acknowledged

that traffic calming associated with effective 20mph zones would be resource hungry and outside school times the existing 30mph speed limit may be entirely appropriate. The County Council's trials with variable speed limits were shown to be unsuccessful and have not been pursued.

Investigation to provide a raised table for the zebra crossing near Pyrford Primary School is underway and consideration is also being given to trial a new variable message sign near schools which alerts drivers to the school, at school times, and functions as a speed limit variable message sign at all other times.

These questions were received from Cllr John Doran

4. What is the new timetable for the County Hall building? When will Brewery Road Car Park be closed? For how long? When will the new car park be opened?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Committee will have received an item for information (Item 15a) on the Agenda that gives an update on the County Hall project. The County Council's Project Manager has also provided the following dates, which are subject to change, for information.

Land Exchange:

Secretary of State Decision	-	end of July 05
Allowing for judicial review, land exchange	-	end of October 05

County Hall:

Mobilisation of Contractors	-	late Sept/early Oct 05
Brewery Road Car Park closure	-	mid/late Jan 06
Construction	-	up to end of March 08
Decant from site	-	June 08

5. Many schemes for Horsell have been discussed in recent local committees and are due to be reported back on. None is on today's agenda, why not?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Committee's Forward Programme Item 16 on the Agenda contains some of the schemes scheduled for Horsell, others are under consideration as shown within the LTP Work Programmes distributed to Members as items for information Item 15b & c.

The Committee's Implementation Programme for Woking 2005/06, Item 13 on the Agenda contains at Annex B those schemes currently programmed with the available funding during 2005/06.