



Minutes of the Local Committee for Woking
Transportation Agenda
Meeting held at 7.00pm on 20 October 2005
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mrs Val Tinney - Chairman	
Mrs Elizabeth Compton – Vice Chairman	
Mr Andrew Crisp	Cllr Peter Ankers
Mrs Diana Smith	Cllr Bryan Cross
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]

57/05 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

John Doran and Catherine Fisher gave their apologies for absence.

58/05 Minutes of last meeting held on 18 July 2005 [Item 2]

Agreed and signed.

59/05 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Cllr Cross declared a personal interest in Item 10 on Woking Town Centre Joint Initiative, and Cllr Ankers declared a personal interest in Item 12 on Old Woking Road Pedestrian Facilities.

60/05 Petitions [Item 4]

There were three petitions received.

Petition 1

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition on limited parking in the Broadway, Knaphill. Mr Sharp presented the petition signed by 279 people, which said: 'As we have two free car parks near to the shops is this limited parking required. It is found that it is creating tail backs from the High Street into The Broadway. Traffic coming out of Queens Road have to go into the middle of the road before they have a clear view. It is a danger to people going over the crossing as traffic have not got a clear view. Buses find it sometimes a hazard (do you).'

Mr Sharp asked for the limited parking to be removed over concerns for safety and for the zig zag and yellow lines to be extended. He would like a review to be carried out and further proposals made. He stated that he was organising an open public meeting on 22 November at the Vyne on the issue.

Mrs Tinney thanked the petitioner for his presentation. The Chairman used her discretion to respond to the petition at the meeting. The Acting Local Transportation Director gave the following response.

Prior to July 2003 Broadway at its junction with Queens Road had a parking restriction indicated with a single yellow line. Drivers ignored the restriction and concerns were expressed that this affected sight lines for drivers leaving Queens Road.

A proposal to replace the restriction with double yellow lines was rejected after consultation with local businesses that felt it would affect their trade and residents including a meeting of the Knaphill Residents' Association. The current restrictions limit parking to 20 minutes in any hour and protect sight lines with double yellow lines at the junction of Queens Road. One reason for retention of parking at this location was that parked vehicles reduced speed adopted by other drivers. The Local Committee approved these proposals on 23 July 2003. Since the new restrictions were introduced two injury accidents are recorded up to July 2005 neither attributable to on-street parking. The contents of the petition and alternative restrictions have been discussed with Councillors Smith and Kingsbury. Further change would require consent of the Committee, residents and the traders directly affected.

The Committee agreed that further consultation would take place and an item be brought to the 1 February 2006 meeting of the Local Committee.

Petition 2

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition on the dangerous state of the Jack and Jill Steps, White Rose

Lane. Rob Carter and Hayley Garland presented the petition signed by 280 people, which said:

We have signed this petition to urge you to act on a very important issue. We feel the Jack & Jill steps on Whiterose Lane, Old Woking are a danger to many people who use them.

At SJB a large number of students use them on their journey to school. The key issues are:

- They are very steep
- There are few steps
- The ground is very uneven
- They are poorly lit

Mr Carter explained that he wants the students of SJB to be responsible and involved in the democratic process. Miss Garland from the student council explained that a lot of the students cycle or walk to school and use the footpath, as do local residents including the elderly and those with prams. There is no handrail and the steps are poorly lit. She urged the committee to review the situation immediately.

Mrs Tinney thanked the petitioners for their presentation. The Chairman used her discretion to respond to the petition at the meeting. The Acting Local Transportation Director gave the following response.

Jack and Jills steps are part of Footpath 59 from White Rose Lane north linking to Barrens Brae then Ashwood Road. It has become practice for parents to drop off and collect their children in Ashwood Road. The children walk to or from SJB school. A survey over 3 days during the 30 minute period when children were collected in Ashwood Road recorded 79 to 98 pupils and 28 to 33 vehicles during the period.

From White Rose Lane to Ashwood Road is a distance of 224 metres. The initial section, 53 metres in length, comprises 18 steps of varying lengths from 1.3 metres to 4.45 metres. The path at this point is steep with an incline of 1 in 3 enclosed by property boundary fences on both sides. The next 40 metres are not stepped and the incline lessens to 1 in 5.5. The path continues through a flat section to Ashwood Road.

At a meeting of the Local Committee held in Old Woking on 2 March 2005 the following issue was raised:

“3. Jack and Jill Steps

Pupils from St John the Baptist school drew attention to the state of these steps, which were inadequately lit, in need of maintenance and increased cleaning.

(The LTS response was)

A new lamppost was due to be installed in the vicinity of the steps before the end of the week. Increased sweeping particularly to keep the stairs free of leaves in the autumn would be provided and pruning where necessary would be done. An investigation into the extent of the

work needed to reinstate steps from the current slopes would be carried out.”

A new lamppost has been installed at White Rose Lane. The vegetation, in particular the thick canopy existing at White Rose Lane, has been cut back and the steps dug back to their full width. The path was on this occasion cleared of litter and leaf fall. Woking Borough Council contractors, Serco, clean the steps every 12 weeks and they are next due for treatment during the week commencing 7 November 2005.

The steep rise up from White Rose Lane cannot be reduced and precludes any action to beneficially alter the step arrangement. Placing conventional steps in strategic positions, with flat sections between, would involve the building of retaining walls. The effect on bordering properties some with high walls and fences has not been tested. The necessary steepness of those steps would pose a danger in themselves. The current long stepped sections following the contours of the slope offer a safer option. The Transportation Service will investigate having the edges of the path treated in a non slip surface. The tarmac surfacing is inspected as part of the street inspection regime and defects rectified.

The path is not lit throughout its length but this is common on Public Footpaths even where they are surfaced. Cutting back the canopy has opened the path to daylight but it remains dark at night. Installing lighting would require a cable to be run throughout its length and a number of street lights installed to take account of the bends in the path. There would be a need to consult with the residents bordering the path before any action was taken to install lighting.

The Committee agreed that the Local Transportation Service would investigate having the edges of the path treated in a non slip surface. They would also carry out a consultation on improved lighting and report back to a future meeting of the Committee.

Petition 3

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition on proposed changes to the parking at Oriental Road. David Bittleston presented the petition signed by 362 people, which said:

Whilst we welcome the traffic calming measures and the proposed installation of the new crossings, we are unhappy about the proposals for the parking and cycle path in front of the parade of shops in Oriental Road. We, the undersigned, are concerned residents and ratepayers of Surrey County Council and ask the Local Committee to reconsider these plans in order that the parking arrangements remain as present and that the cycle path is located somewhere other than between the proposed parking and the footpath.

Mr Bittleston noted the short consultation period on the proposed changes. Local residents have been waiting a long time for the proposals to come forward and are happy with the proposed changes

to the road and crossings. The petition was about the proposals for the parking and cycle path in front of the parade of shops. He felt that a much wider consultation should have been undertaken as the road is a main access route to Woking. In response to the tabled petition response, the petitioner noted he was happy with the revised proposal.

Mrs Tinney thanked the petitioner for his presentation. The Chairman used her discretion to respond to the petition at the meeting. The Acting Local Transportation Director gave the following response.

Item 11 on the agenda gives details of a proposed package of measures in the Oriental Road/Heathside Crescent area. Part of the original proposal was to change the parking arrangement outside the parade of shops in Oriental Road so that drivers parked parallel to the kerb, rather than in echelon fashion as at present. This would have enabled the footway to be widened to accommodate an off-road cycle route running from the easternmost junction of Oriental Road and Heathside Crescent to the shops and Woking Station, together with a cycle lane on the carriageway for eastbound cyclists. This would have resulted in a loss of approximately four parking spaces immediately outside the shops, although additional free short-term parking bays were proposed nearby, on the north side of Oriental Road, west of White Rose Lane.

However, as a result of the consultation exercise, and the concerns of the shopkeepers and their customers, this part of the package will not be progressed. The parking arrangements outside the shops will remain as they are, the off-road cycle route will stop short of the shops and eastbound cyclists will continue to use the carriageway as at present.

61/05 Written public questions on transportation matters [Item 5]

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

62/05 Written member questions on transportation matters [Item 6]

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

In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Goldenberg on minute 45/05 it was agreed that this would be available at a future meeting under part 2 of the agenda.

In response to a supplementary question from Bryan Cross regarding flyposting, Mr Wallace agreed to arrange for the removal of fly postings on Parley Drive roundabout.

Executive Functions

63/05 St Johns Hill Road Railway Bridge [Item 7]

Geoff Wallace introduced the report. The Committee considered proposals for this railway bridge at its meetings on 6 April 2005 and 18 July 2005. Following further consultations and assessments, Mr Wallace confirmed that officers could not justify or recommend anything other than the traffic signal proposal as recommended in the report.

In response to questions and comments received, Geoff Wallace noted that barriers alone are not enough to get the safety assessment scores low enough. Geoff Wallace explained that the standard traffic lights proposed would include many more features than the temporary traffic lights currently in place. They will be able to sense the number and speed of vehicles and they will have detailed control over the number of cars that get through on each green light. The lights will both show red when there is minimum traffic flow. The new traffic lights will be managed remotely from the County Council's Network Management Centre in Leatherhead. In the event of power failure, the bridge will revert to a priority system.

In response to a question from Mrs Compton, it was noted that due to the new traffic light controls and phasing, delays on the network should be negligible, although very local residents may feel as if they have been held up on their journey.

In response to comments from Cllrs Kingsbury and Goldenberg regarding the feeling from residents that the proposals are over the top given the low number of historical accidents and the fact that the risk seems to be based on numerical basis rather than evidence, it was highlighted that the public consultation showed that people were generally in favour of the scheme and preventative action should be taken with regard to potential accidents.

Geoff Wallace confirmed to Mr Crisp that the Local Transportation Service concluded that traffic signals should be implemented at this bridge.

Mrs Tinney asked for a recorded vote on the recommendation and the following votes were cast:

In favour of the
recommendation (10
Councillors):

Mrs Tinney
Mrs Compton
Cllr Ankers
Cllr Cross
Cllr Hinks
Cllr Ford
Mrs Smith
Mr Tabrez
Mr Crisp

Against (2 councillors): Mr Marlow
 Cllr Goldenberg
 Cllr Kingsbury

RESOLVED

That the proposals shown on drawing 3386/318B be implemented in accordance with Government guidance to mitigate the potential for vehicular incursion onto the railway.

64/05 Surrey County Council's Second Local Transport Plan 2006/2011
[Item 8]

In response to a question from Cllr Goldenberg it was noted that the Transport Innovation Fund provides some opportunities to bring resources to transport hubs. The County Council will find out whether its bid has been successful in December 2006.

The Committee noted the report.

65/05 Quality Bus Partnership and Bus Services in the Woking Local Area [Item 9]

Cllr Hinks commented that recently installed raised kerbs, including the one by Toys R Us, appear to be of a lower height than before and he was finding it hard to get on to buses. In response officers agreed to look at it and report back to Cllr Hinks outside of the meeting.

The Committee noted the report.

66/05 Woking Town Centre Joint Initiative [Item 10]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Cllr Cross declared a personal interest in this item.

Geoff Wallace introduced the report. Woking Borough Council has approved £25,000 for 2005/06 for this initiative, and although the Local Committee identified funds for use during 2004/05, this has not been carried forward and £25,000 is needed for 2005/06.

In response to a comment from Cllr Cross, Geoff Wallace confirmed that if the recommendations were approved then detailed costings for the schemes would be carried out.

RESOLVED

That:

- i. The Local Committee supports the aim of jointly funding, with Woking Borough Council, improvements:
 - a) at the junction of Goldsworth Road and Church Street West;
 - b) the seating in Commercial Way; and
 - c) town centre maps; and,
- ii. that £25,000 be found from the Committees Transportation budgets delegated to the Committee for 2005/06, as the Committee's contribution towards joint working with the Borough Council.

67/05 Heathside Crescent, White Rose Lane and Oriental Road: Proposed Pedestrian and Cycle Improvements and Speed Reduction Measures [Item 11]

John Masson introduced the report and circulated a revised proposal in which no changes had been proposed to the parking outside the shops.

Members commented that they would have liked wider consultation to take place on the proposed scheme, especially as many commuters use this area.

In response to a question from Cllr Goldenberg on whether large vehicles would still be able to manoeuvre and whether the single lane may cause additional delay, Mr Masson agreed to do further surveys.

In response to a question from Mr Crisp it was confirmed that the parking bays would be Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ).

In response to a suggestion from Cllr Goldenberg, Mr Wallace agreed to organise a meeting to discuss the scheme and results from further surveys to which the Committee plus the Borough ward councillor would be invited.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) the proposals shown on Drawing No. 12020 (Revision A) be approved for construction; and,
- (ii) the necessary traffic regulation orders be advertised; and,
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

68/05 Old Woking Road Pedestrian Facilities [Item 12]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Cllr Ankers declared a personal interest in this item.

Cllr Ankers stated that he was getting continued pressure from residents for an additional crossing and thanked Mr Masson for the study.

RESOLVED

That the pedestrian refuge shown on Drawing No. 12018 be approved for construction.

69/05 Church Hill/Arthurs Bridge Road/Brewery Road [Item 13]

RESOLVED

That the roundabout and pedestrian facilities shown on Drawing 11465-1 be approved for construction.

70/05 Church Hill, Horsell [Item 14]

RESOLVED

That the footway shown on Drawing 13037 be approved for construction.

71/05 Carhouse Lane 7.5t HGV Restriction [Item 15]

RESOLVED

- (i) to advertise the necessary amendment to The Surrey County Council (Various roads in Surrey Heath and Woking) (Revocation of weight restriction and weight restriction) Order 2002 enabling the current boundary of the 7.5 tonne weight restriction in Carhouse Lane to be moved from Littlewick Road west to a point immediately west of Greenbays Park as shown at Annex A Drawing 12004
- (ii) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

72/05 Albert Drive, Sheerwater: Improved Traffic Calming Measures [Item 16]

Mr Masson confirmed that the bus companies had been consulted. In response to a comment from Cllr Goldenberg regarding the recently approved planning application for a sports centre at Bishop David Brown School, Mr Wallace said that there was currently no time scale for this so the traffic calming should go ahead as recommended.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) the proposals shown on Drawings 12010,12011,12012 and 12013 be approved for construction
- (ii) the necessary Notices be published
- (iii) authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections.

73/05 Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet: Introduction of Bus Priority Measures [Item 17]

Mr Masson introduced the report and explained that some residents expressed concerns in the consultation regarding pollution and noise. Mr Masson confirmed to the Committee that this should not cause a problem with the new buses.

Mr Marlow raised a concern regarding buses turning out of Lavender Park Road in to Camphill Road. In response Mr Masson explained that he had been liaising with traffic control, and with increased road markings and a give way sign he was confident that buses would be able to emerge safely. Mr Masson agreed to talk to Mr Marlow outside the meeting to discuss minor changes to the detail.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed:

- (i) the installation of a contra-flow bus lane in Lavender Park Road, West Byfleet, as shown in Drawing No. 12014, Annexe B; and,
- (ii) that the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised; and,
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Director, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member, to consider and determine any objections received and to make the new orders.

74/05 Disposal of Highway Land at Brookwood Cross Roads [Item 18]

In response to a comment from Cllr Goldenberg, Mr Wallace explained that he is trying to get the land on the south east side of Brookwood Crossroads released. The Local Transportation Service is still in discussion regarding a possible left slip, but the land could still be released if a strip was protected.

In response to a comment from Cllr Hinks, Mr Wallace stated that there was a newly constructed ramp down to the towpath, which was constructed at the same time as the cross roads redevelopment, it has the appropriate handrails and is at the right gradient.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) the hatched area shown on plan number CM685A be declared unnecessary and surplus to highway requirements; and,
- (ii) County Property Services be instructed to proceed with a competitive sale of the surplus land shown on plan number CM685A; and, to retain access for future maintenance purposes to the retaining wall along the A322 Bagshot Road and A324 Brookwood Lye Road although the wall will not be for sale.

75/05 Woodham Lane / Martyrs Lane Interim Improvements [Item 19]

Mr Masson introduced the report. In response to comments Mr Masson confirmed that permanent interactive signs have proved successful and cycle lanes were not being suggested just as a traffic calming measure.

RESOLVED

That the proposals set out in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the report be implemented, subject to consultation with residents of Woodham Lane.

76/05 Half Yearly Review of the Highway Maintenance and LTP Work Programmes 2005/06 [Item 20]

Mr Sapsed stated that the Local Transportation Service has continued to work closely with the Partnership and completed to a high standard a lot of the work set out in the programme. It was confirmed that as much work as possible is carried out by the Community Gangs, and that all speed ramps proposed will conform to the UK standards.

The Chairman congratulated the Local Transportation Service and the Partnership on the work that they have done to date.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the contents of the report and the current status of work programmes reported in Appendices A to F.

77/05 Decriminalised Parking Enforcement [Item 21]

In response to comments Mr Wallace confirmed that information on signing and lining amendments was now with the constructor, and the

Local Transportation Service would look at the reported problem of taxis in the Broadway, Woking.

RESOLVED

That:

- (i) the Committee noted the contents of this report; and
- (ii) the Member Task Group remain in existence up to and including the DPE 2-year review to discuss points of operational detail.

78/05 Items for Information [Item 22]

County Hall Update:

An information sheet was tabled.

Area Transportation Structure:

The revised structure was tabled. Geoff Wallace introduced Mr Ward, the Area Transportation Director and Mr Alexander, the Senior Local Transportation Manager to the Committee. Mr Ward explained that Mr Wallace had been promoted and would take up a post in Mole Valley.

The Committee expressed their sincere thanks for all the work that Geoff has done and wished him all the best in his new role.

79/05 Forward Programme [Item 23]

RESOLVED

That the Committee agreed the Forward Programme.

80/05 Exclusion of Press and Public [Item 24]

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 9.25pm]

Chairman

Annex1

20 October 2005

Public questions on transportation matters

These questions were received from Anthony Branagan:

1. a) When will the work on the no right turn from Well Lane into Arthur's Bridge Road be completed? Motorists are still turning right and mounting the pavement.

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Transportation Service is aware that additional bollards are required to prevent the manoeuvre described by Mr Branagan. These have been ordered and should be erected by the end of the month.

1. b) Update progress on:
- Traffic calming on Arthur's Bridge Road between Abbey Road and Horsell Moor
 - Measures to prevent vehicles mounting the curb on Horsell Moor similar to those adjacent to Winston Churchill School.

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

I believe Mr Branagan is referring to alterations to the waiting restrictions within Arthurs Bridge Road; these should be complete this week.

The Local Transportation Service has within its future work programme an item to consider preventing vehicles encroaching onto Horsell Moor. I cannot give a definitive timetable for this work at the present time.

1. c) Allocation/expenditure for Highways Repairs/Maintenance:
- 2003/04 £M13
 - 2004/05 £M18

What was Woking's share and how much actually spent?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

I do not recognise the £13m and £18m figures quoted by Mr Branagan, however, the maintenance and repairs budgets can be sliced any number of ways.

Looking at the whole revenue maintenance budget:

2003/04

Total revenue maintenance budget: £24.3m

Woking budget: £1.4m

Woking spend: £1.5m

2004/05

Total revenue maintenance budget: £25.1m

Woking budget: £1.3m

Woking spend: £1.4m

1. d) Village Forums. When is it proposed to action outstanding items raised by residents?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Having clarified the question with Mr Branagan it relates to vehicle movement around 27 to 47 Brewery Road, i.e. making it one-way. The LTS does not currently have this item on the future work programme, I will write to Mr Branagan directly about this issue.

This question was received from Sue Kittelsen:

1. Is it correct that trees from Hart Road, Byfleet will be removed as part of the proposed new road layout? If this is correct will they be replaced and if not why?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

In January 2005 the Local Committee accepted proposals removing grass verges and widening the carriageway in Hart Road. Residents had for some time parked on the verges, which became unsightly. The scheme would allow vehicle parking on the carriageway and improve the appearance of Hart Road.

A number of trees currently on the grass verges and in poor condition would be removed. It is proposed to plant a similar number of trees on the area of grass between and 84 Hart Road. The scheme is currently on the future work programme waiting funding.

Annex 2

20 October 2005

Member questions on transportation matters

These questions were received from Mr Geoff Marlow:

1. The Chertsey Road roundabout at Byfleet has for some years had signs upon it indicating that it is sponsored by Austin Wyatt.
 - a. What does this company pay for this sponsorship?
 - b. Who gets the sponsorship money?

Further, this is a most unattractive roundabout. Can we persuade Austin Wyatt to improve its appearance?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Woking Borough Council undertakes maintenance and sponsorship of the County Council's roundabouts within the Woking local area as part an agency agreement.

Woking Borough Council is actively engaged in updating and reviewing existing sponsorships and is seeking alternative promotional arrangements to enhance the quality and provision of planting schemes on roundabouts.

Sponsorship revenue is used to provide the planting scheme and the maintenance thereof, with any surplus being used on other landscaping projects, normally within the same area.

Therefore, Austin Wyatt would have paid a sum, under the old arrangements, towards Woking Borough Council organising and maintaining a scheme on the Chertsey Road roundabout.

The new sponsorship arrangements should regularise the annual payments and ensure these sums are reflected in the planting schemes on roundabouts.

However, in this transitional period between the operation of the old and new sponsorship arrangements there may be locations, which require the specific attention of Woking Borough Council's landscape contractor. I have made Officers at Woking Borough Council aware of your concerns.

2. a) The Broadoaks Development was given permission to go ahead over five years ago. Is this planning consent still valid

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The time limits usually attached to planning consents refer to implementation of the consent. The development on the site is part implemented, therefore the 5 year rule no longer has any effect; the planning consent is valid.

2. b) This development included a section 106 which would have consisted of many improvements to the A245 from the Sheerwater Roundabout in the West, to the Oyster Lane Roundabout, Byfleet in the East. As a result of no visible action on the A245 by the Broadoaks development this road has been blighted, yet many of the planned improvements need to be made.

How much longer is Surrey County Council going to wait for this development to take place before deciding that it is probably never going to happen?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The A245 corridor improvements associated with Broadoaks are directly linked to the completion and occupation of the site. I understand that a phased development is likely to deliver a completed development. The County Council's Transportation Development Control Officers have therefore accepted the principle of a phased introduction of the off-site highway works commensurate with the amount of development completed in each phase.

However, future progress and programming of the off-site highway works is dependent on the developer meeting obligations and finalising commitments to comply with the terms of the County Council's phased implementation.

2. c) When will Surrey County Council decide that it should start making the required improvements itself?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Broadoaks off-site highway works comprise significant alterations to existing junctions along the A245. The Committee will be aware that funding for this type of scheme is severely limited. The Committee's LTP Intermediate Scheme (£560,000) for the A320 has competed unsuccessfully for funds since 2003. Therefore, whilst smaller interim measures have been introduced, it is unlikely that the Committee will have sufficient funds to progress the major junction alterations.

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg:

1. Given the crowded nature of tonight's agenda, could there please be a more appropriate pattern of meetings?

The Chairman responded:

With the introduction of the new Area Transportation structure there is an opportunity to review the forward programme of all local committees and ways

to enable a more even flow of appropriate decision and information items. The Governance review carried out recently also identified that the number of formal Committee meetings held in some areas to consider transportation and other items needs to be reduced. The implications of these changes will be considered as part of the local committee forward planning arrangements.

2. With reference to the last paragraph of Minute 45/05, Why is there no report on this topic to this meeting?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Steve Lee, Surrey County Council's Head of Transportation, in reply to a question about reporting on contract costs following his presentation to the Committee on 18 July 2005, about Surrey Highways Partnership two years on, said that contract costs were commercially sensitive and that confidentiality had to be maintained. However, he also indicated a report on the Contractors (Ringway) performance would be presented to the Committee in October and April as part of the Improvement Plan.

Agenda item 20 'Half Yearly Review of the Highway Maintenance and CTP Work Programme 2005/06', includes additional information on the progress being made within the Surrey Highways Partnership to improve service delivery and quality.

These questions were received from Mr John Doran:

1. In the Local Transport Plan much is made of 20MPH zones as contributing to road safety and village development. Could officers tell me what benefits have been identified and what criteria are used to approve the zones?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

Benefits derived from traffic management measures to improve road safety and security are recognised throughout the County.

The Provisional Second Local Transport Plan acknowledges that selective use of Home Zones and 20mph Zone schemes in locations where there is a good case on safety grounds, combined with strong support from the local community, can help meet the safety concerns of residents and vulnerable road users.

A major contributory factor to collisions is excessive vehicle speed. Where appropriate, reducing speeds in urban and rural areas through measures such as 20mph Zones can help reduce collisions; accident figures have been cut by as much as 50%.

A 20mph Zone comprises use of terminal signs together with suitable traffic calming measures to provide a self-enforcing environment. 20mph Zones would be particularly appropriate where there is an existing record of accidents to children occurring over an area, or where concentrations of pedestrians and or cyclists exist or are anticipated.

2. What is the trend in Killed and Serious Injury (KSI) accidents in Woking? What figures do we have for 2005? What measures will be taken locally to meet the target of a 40% reduction by 2010?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Killed and Seriously Injured accidents in Surrey and for the Woking local area, fluctuates year on year. The numbers recorded in the local area are small (38 – 2003 & 37 - 2004) and these are particularly susceptible to the random fluctuations that occur in road statistics year on year.

However, the County is on track to meet its targets up to 2006; Woking's figures fluctuate around the target profile year on year.

Currently there have been 22 KSI in Woking this year (to the end of August), but this figure cannot be taken as an indication of final figures for 2005.

The 40% reduction by 2010 is the Government's minimum target; Surrey is aiming to achieve a 50% reduction, a significantly more ambitious target.

The County's overall LTP implementation programme to 2006 and projected programme (LTP2) up to 2011, reflects the overall aims and objectives contained in the LTP, i.e. 50% reduction target. The Committee's LTP implementation programme, considered annually, is compiled to address local circumstances and help achieve delivery of the County's overall programme as expressed in LTP targets.

This question was received from Mrs Diana Smith:

1. How long ago was light number 9 on the path between Highclere Road and Waterers Rise in Knaphill notified to the Local Transport Office as being defective? When will it be repaired?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The footpath light between Highclere Road and Waterers Rise is unusual with respect to its power supply. LTS office became aware that this light has not been working during early summer 2005.

However, since then LTS officers have worked diligently with representatives from the Community Hall and service providers to rectify the problem and re-commission the light. Unforeseen difficulties have delayed the completion of the work, which should be finalised by mid-November 2005.

These questions were received from Cllr Bryan Cross:

1. Would the Acting Local Transport Manager please advise me of the arrangements for County staff to remove fly postings around the Borough and is satisfied that these arrangements are working

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Transportation Service Highway Stewards remove fly posting when they can do so safely, as part of their normal daily duties. The Highway Stewards also utilize the services of the County Council's Constructor Ringway if necessary. This procedure ensures costs associated with the removal of fly posting are kept at a reasonable level.

Where possible LTS attempt to contact the organiser or promoter of the fly posted event, although it is difficult to prosecute. They are often unaware of the problems being caused by their event.

The LTS is aware that there has been a spate of fly posting recently and some 30 posters were removed on one day alone this week. Therefore, I am satisfied the procedure is working albeit with regular monitoring and review.

2. Can the Acting Local Transport Manager please advise why there appears to be an excessive number of street lamps in the Goldsworth Park area of Woking which do not appear to be working. Would he please advise me how long it currently takes to get a street lamp in Lockfield Drive repaired from the time it is reported to his office?

Geoff Wallace, Acting Local Transportation Director responded:

The Local Transportation Service is aware that a number of streetlights on footpaths around the Woking local area require attention. Recent alterations in working practices to ensure compliance with health and safety regulations have put pressure on available human resources. Two person gangs are required to maintain street light units where operatives need to use ladders to access them. Consequently footpath lighting is being maintained in batches when two person gangs are available. Delays are being experienced as a result.

The normal response time by the street lighting contractor is 3 days from the contractor being notified. However, special maintenance work can take up to 30 days, batched footpath repairs are taking considerably longer.

With respect to Lockfield Drive, LTS is aware that street light number 57 was damaged, required a replacement column and a transferred power supply; this work is complete and the old damaged column can now be removed.