



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 15 June 2006
at
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mrs Val Tinney - Chairman	
Mrs Elizabeth Compton – Vice Chairman	
Mr Andrew Crisp	Cllr Peter Ankers
Mr John Doran	Cllr Bryan Cross
Mrs Diana Smith	Cllr Peter Ford
Mr Geoff Marlow	Cllr Neville Hinks
Mr Shamas Tabrez	Cllr Philip Goldenberg
	Cllr Ian Johnson

Part One – In Public

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

17/06 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Graham Cundy gave his apologies for absence.

18/06 Minutes of last meetings held on 1 February 2006 [Item 2]

Local Committee (Woking) General Agenda - agreed and signed.
Local Committee (Woking) Transportation Agenda – agreed and signed.

19/06 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

20/06 **Standing Orders: Local Protocol** [Item 14]

This item was brought forward. In response to Mr Doran, the Chairman confirmed that she could use her discretion to accept more than eight written public questions if this was required.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed to adopt the arrangements set out in this report for handling questions from the public and petitions and, specifically:

Public Questions:

- (i) that in addition to the electorate, any young person under 18 who lives within the Woking Borough area is allowed to ask one question at the discretion of the Chairman, within the total allowable number which may be asked at the meeting
- (ii) that written public questions are accepted up to 12.00pm two working days before the day of the meeting
- (iii) that the committee will accept up to eight written public questions
- (iv) that members of the public may ask one brief supplementary question relevant to the subject of the original at the discretion of the chairman

Petitions

- (v) that the committee will accept a petition containing 50 or more signatures, although in exceptional circumstances the Chairman may use his/her discretion to accept petitions with fewer signatures in cases where it would not be appropriate to get 50 signatures, for example where a proposed scheme affects fewer than 50 properties.
- (vi) that Members of the committee will be allowed, at the discretion of the chairman, to briefly clarify points with petitioners when petitions are presented. If the petition refers to an item on the agenda then Members discussion on the item needs to take place at the relevant part of the agenda.

21/06 **Petitions** [Item 4]

There were two petitions received.

Petition 1

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition on traffic calming on Station Road, West Byfleet. Mrs Mitchell presented the petition which was signed by 176 people. The petitioner stated that a two and a half year old girl was recently knocked down by a car. In this case the driver was not speeding, but if they had have been the accident could have been fatal. Station Road is a long straight road which is used as a rat run between West Byfleet and New Haw. Lots of families live along the road, it is on a school route and there are parking bays on both sides. It was acknowledged that traffic calming is on the agenda for 2009/10, but they would like it done

sooner. Petitioners would like to see interactive signs combined with road changes.

In response to Mr Marlow it was stated that residents are not really in favour of speed humps but would like something to warn drivers to slow down.

In response to Mrs Tinney, Mrs Mitchell confirmed that the Residents Association would like to be involved in any consultation that takes place.

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

The petition was prompted by a collision involving a child, which took place on Sunday 14 May 2006, although speeding was not a factor in this accident.

Station Road links the north side of West Byfleet railway station at its western end with Camphill Road at its eastern end, a distance of approximately 570 metres. The road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. Apart from a bend at its western end, the road is straight, and the opportunity for speeding does exist, although the presence of cars parked on-street tends to act as a traffic calming measure.

The collision history for the road shows that there have been three 'slight' injury accidents in the road over the past five years. One involved a vehicle emerging from the railway station car park into the path of a passing car, one involved a driver swerving to miss a cat and one involved a driver reversing out of her driveway, again into the path of a passing car. None of these collisions involved vehicles travelling at excess speed.

However, because representations have been received in the past from residents concerned about the speed of traffic in the road, a proposal to provide traffic calming measures has already been included in the Local Transport Plan Scheme Programme. (See item 8 on this agenda). Feasibility and design are currently programmed for the 2009/10 financial year, with construction in 2010/11.

The petitioner has also requested vehicle-activated signs, to remind drivers of the speed at which they are travelling. Such signs are shortly to be erected in Station Road, and will be in place for a period of four weeks and will also provide Council officers with data on the pattern of vehicle speeds in the road.

The Committee agreed to take Item 8 on the agenda next which refers to a traffic calming scheme in West Byfleet.

[Andrew Crisp arrived at 6.50pm]

22/06 Local Transport Plan Programme for 2006/07 [Item 8]

Peter Alexander introduced the report which set out the provisional programme for 2006/07 to 2010/2011 and recommended a list of schemes for implementation in 2006/07. It was noted that traffic calming in Station Road, West Byfleet is currently number 48 on the list. It was noted that the carry forward referred to in paragraph 9 will be decided on by the Executive at its meeting on 20 June 2006.

In response to Cllr Johnson it was noted that the detail of the schemes is discussed in the Member Sub-Group which next meets at the end of July 2006.

In response to Cllr Ford, Peter Alexander agreed to provide costings for non LTP schemes referred to at the bottom of Annex B.

It was agreed that the need for a traffic survey in Redding Way and the Brookwood hospital estate would be discussed at the next sub-group meeting.

In response to Mr Doran it was confirmed that the £100,000 Local Capital Allocation in the past has been used to top up LTP schemes, but it could be used in other ways.

In response to Mr Doran it was agreed to discuss the detail of schemes in Horsell outside the meeting.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed:

- (i) That the committee sub-group recommendations for the 2006/07 programme as set out in Annex A be approved for implementation.
- (ii) That officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.
- (iii) That the committee sub-group meet again to consider the prioritisation of the remaining schemes shown in Annex B, and that a further report be brought to the Committee in due course.
- (iv) That the Local Capital Allocation be used to assist delivery of the Integrated Transport Capital schemes.

23/06 Petitions [Item 4]

Petition 2

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition on residents parking along Albert Drive, Sheerwater. The petition was signed by 16 people and was presented to the Committee by Cllr Evans on behalf of Mr Hutchins.

Cllr Evans explained that the parking bays in the area are very narrow. There are 80 bays further on but these are fully occupied. Petitioners are not after a similar scheme as they like the grass verge. They would like the existing bays to be made a few feet wider. They also thought it may be possible to put in a few more spaces when the hatched area becomes surplus to requirements when the traffic calming is put in place.

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

The petition originates from 13 properties on both sides of Albert Drive spread over 100 metres. Three of the signatories have off road parking, two being on the southern side with long driveways leading to the house each able to accommodate a number of vehicles. On the northern side close to 303 Albert Drive is a car park in front of houses, which has capacity for 20 vehicles and allows 10 further vehicle accesses into the front of properties. On Albert Drive there is a lay by 1.8 metres wide and drivers park slightly off tarmac on the grass verge to avoid damage from passing vehicles.

Item 17 of this agenda, Forward Programme, includes an item "Maybury and Sheerwater estates – To report on proposals for additional parking bays" for the Committee meeting on 28 February 2007. The concerns raised in the petition will be included in this review.

[Cllr Hinks arrived at 7.15pm]

24/06 Written public questions on transportation matters [Item 5]

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

Public question 1 was taken alongside Member question 3. In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Goldenberg, it was noted that the proposed changes were an operational issue not a policy one. It was agreed that county and borough officers would discuss this further outside the meeting.

25/06 Written member questions on transportation matters [Item 6]

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

Question 1 – In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Ankers it was confirmed that the Cricket Club could put a bid in for Members Allocations for the fence and if it fitted the criteria then it would be considered alongside other bids received at the next meeting of the Local Committee.

Question 5 – In response to a supplementary question from Mrs Smith regarding the length of time the report back would take, it was noted that this was due to time needed for consultation as well as prioritisation amongst a heavy workload.

Executive Functions

26/06 Jack and Jill Steps, White Rose Lane [Item 7]

David Durrant introduced the report which responded to the petition presented to Committee on 20 October 2005. It was noted that the pupils from SJB had undertaken their own survey with local residents and as a result had withdrawn their request for lighting.

Mrs Tinney and Dave Durrant are due to visit the school. They will emphasise the schools own responsibility for keeping the path clear and reporting any problems.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed

- (i) that the contents of this report be noted as to the works already completed by the Local Transportation Service and the withdrawal of the petitioners request for lighting
- (ii) that the resurfacing of the lower 93 metre steep section be placed on the work programme to await funding.

27/06 Sheerwater Road Pedestrian Crossing [Item 9]

Kevin Patching introduced the report which set out proposals for a controlled pedestrian crossing on A245 Sheerwater Road and improved pedestrian facilities at the signalised junction of Sheerwater Road and Albert Drive. It was stated that the consultation also included the divisional and ward members and that it was intended to construct the crossing this financial year.

Officers noted Members and residents concerns about the potential sounds that would be emitted from the crossing. Residents would prefer for it to be silent, but then that raises issues around increased risk of pedestrian accidents. Officers noted the comments and agreed to see what could be done to address the concerns.

Cllr Ankers asked whether it would be possible to put extra signage for drivers warning them that there may be pedestrians crossing. Kevin Patching explained that they would consider markings for pedestrians, but road signage may be confusing.

In response to Mr Tabrez it was noted that there was already dropped kerbs on the island and there would be a tactile crossing on the other part of Albert Drive.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed;

- (i) to construct a pelican crossing on A245 Sheerwater Road near its junction with Silver Birch Close as shown on Drawing No. 12190,
- (ii) that the necessary Notice under Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertising the Council's intent to construct the crossing, be published, and
- (iii) to provide additional pedestrian facilities at the existing signalised junction of A245 Sheerwater Road and Albert Drive as shown on Drawing No. 12191.

28/06 Post Business Delivery Review Transportation Structure for Woking [Item 10]

In response to Mr Doran's concerns about the management of the contract, Bob Moodie explained that officers were aware of the difficulties and work is going on centrally to improve the partnership and service to the public. The Area Maintenance Team and Area Contract Team are working together on the contract locally.

Bob Moodie stated that the new working base for the West Area Transportation Group would be AO3 in Guildford.

Cllr Goldenberg proposed the following amendment.

That the Recommend be amended to read:

"In receiving this Report, the Committee notes that, so far as the Woking area is concerned:

- (a) the number of Transport Engineers has been reduced from five to three; and
- (b) it no longer has any other dedicated operational resources, and its notional allocation of both Maintenance Engineers and Highway Stewards has been reduced to one;

and expresses its alarm at both the increased stresses on staff and reduced services to local residents that will flow from this damaging reduction in front-line services."

This was seconded by Cllr Ford.

Some Councillors had strong views on whether the statement in the amendment was factually correct. The Chairman took a vote on whether the amendment should become the substantive motion. The result was:

7 votes for

1 vote against

5 councillors abstaining

The Chairman then took a vote on the new motion. This was agreed by 7 votes for and 6 votes against.

RESOLVED

In receiving this Report, the Committee notes that, so far as the Woking area is concerned:

(a) the number of Transport Engineers has been reduced from five to three; and

(b) it no longer has any other dedicated operational resources, and its notional allocation of both Maintenance Engineers and Highway Stewards has been reduced to one;

and expresses its alarm at both the increased stresses on staff and reduced services to local residents that will flow from this damaging reduction in front-line services.

29/06 Old Woking Road Footpath [Item 11]

David Durrant introduced the report which asked the Committee to correct a misconception given by a previous recommendation to Committee regarding a decision to 'Clear vegetation encroachment and widen existing footway'. It was noted to widen the footway would require land acquisition and costly engineering work. The author had intended to write 'Clear vegetation to widen existing footway'.

Mrs Smith reported that the petitioner believes that the intention was to widen the footpath. In response David Durrant stated that this would require cutting into a bank that Surrey County Council does not own.

In response to Members queries, Peter Alexander confirmed that legal advice had been sought regarding the best way to deal with correcting the decision which is as set out in the recommendation.

Cllr Cross suggested adding the word 'have' into the recommendation so that the recommendation would read 'That the short terms measure for Maybury Hill to Hockering Road contained in the Local Committee report of 14 October 2004, Old Woking Road, should have read – "Clear vegetation encroachment to widen existing footway". This was supported by the Committee.

The new recommendation was agreed by a vote of 9 votes for and 4 votes against.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed that the short term measure for Maybury Hill to Hockering Road contained in the Local Committee report of 14 October 2004, Old Woking Road, should have read – “Clear vegetation encroachment to widen existing footway.”

30/06 Annual Highway Maintenance Management Plan 2006/07 [Item 12]

Andy Lobban introduced the report which set out the Highway Maintenance Management Plan for Woking for 1 April 2006 – 31 March 2007.

In response to a question from Cllr Ford regarding how the maintenance decisions were made, Peter Alexander offered Members a workshop in the Autumn to explain how the maintenance plan is put together. Members welcomed this.

[8.40pm - Cllr Goldenberg left the meeting]

In response to Mr Doran regarding works along Victoria Way, Andy Lobban confirmed that work is co-ordinated with utilities where possible and bus companies are advised of the diversion route.

In response to comments from Mr Doran and Mr Crisp it was agreed to put a standing item on each agenda covering current spend and performance of the contractor.

In response to Cllr Cross regarding reporting highway problems, Peter Alexander stated that it is best to go via the contact centre or to report them directly through the website.

[8.45pm - Cllr Ford left the meeting]

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed;

- (i) to approve the initial Woking Annual Highway Maintenance Management Plan for the year 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2007.
- (ii) that the West Area Transportation Group Manager be authorised to make any necessary changes to the plan or to agree virement of funds between cost headings in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee.

31/06 Decriminalised Parking Enforcement [Item 13]

Kevin Patching introduced the report which set out proposals to amend the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Traffic Regulation Order to take account various changes to restrictions that have occurred since 25 July 2005.

Two additional drawings covering Bonsey Lane and Hoebridge Close (Numbers 12158-12159) were tabled.

In response to Mr Doran's request, the Committee agreed to add an additional recommendation that authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Manager in consultation with the Chairman and relevant divisional member to consider and determine any objections and to make the order.

Members commented that they would like to see the lines in Commercial Way in place as soon as possible.

RESOLVED

- (i) The Committee agreed to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order under the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the changes to existing restrictions and the proposed new restrictions as shown on drawings 12155 to 12157 inclusive, 12193 to 12218 inclusive and 12221 to 12224 inclusive and drawings 12158 and 12159.
- (ii) That authority be delegated to the Local Transportation Manager in consultation with the Chairman and relevant divisional member to consider and determine any objections and to make the order

[9.05pm - Cllr Ankers and Cllr Johnson left the meeting]

32/06 Allocating Local Committee Funding [Item 15]

The Committee agreed to amend the wording at the start of paragraph 6 to read 'Criteria to be considered should include whether projects:'

Mr Marlow raised the issue of whether Members would potentially be supportive of a bid from Surrey Air Ambulance if other Local Committee also supported it. The Committee were supportive of bringing the bid forward to the next meeting for consideration.

RESOLVED

- i) The Criteria in paragraphs 6-10 were agreed with the following change of words at the beginning of paragraph 6 'Criteria to be considered should include whether projects:'

- ii) The following allocations were approved:
- | | |
|--|--------|
| a. Holiday classes for Muslim Girls | £1,500 |
| b. Lakeview Play Scheme | £2,690 |
| c. The Generation Centre: Guide and Scout HQ | £4,000 |
| d. Marjorie Richardson Centre – Carpet | £3,500 |
| e. Woking Dance Festival: Radiance Glow | £5,000 |
| f. Chill and Chat | £2,800 |
| g. Brookwood Centre Restoration | £625 |
| h. Outside Area for Orchard Centre | £1,700 |
| i. Attitude Youth Group | £1,300 |
| j. Woking Sea Cadets – 4 Pico dinghys | £3,100 |
| k. Birchmere Campsite Digester Sewage Treatment Tank | £850 |
| l. Vehicle Activate Sign for Horsell High Street | £5,000 |
| m. Community Speedwatch Programme | £1,200 |

33/06 Members' Allocations 2005/06 Overview [Item 16a]

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the report

34/06 Forward Programme [Item 17]

RESOLVED

Agreed as in report with the addition of the following reports:

- a. An update on the Broadoaks Agreement
- b. a standing item on each agenda on highways maintenance issues, to include budget spent and budget remaining as well as the performance of the contractor
- c. a report on how SCC is keeping track of the effects of BDR on staff and workload.
- d. A report on Education
- e. In addition Members would like to consider additional items on public transport including the renewal of bus contracts, South West trains franchise which is up for renewal, youth and local government review.

[The meeting ended at 9.15pm]

Chairman

Annex1

Public questions

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)

15 June 2006

This question was received from Mr Clive Wood, Director of North West Surrey Association of Disabled People:

QUESTION 1

I understand that the automatic barriers at the junction of Chertsey Road with Commercial Way and Chapel Street with Commercial Way, in Woking will no longer be raised to restrict access of vehicles entering Commercial Way.

As you may know, Woking has a limited number of larger disabled parking bays, which are of great help to disabled people who have larger vehicles and/or need additional space to leave or enter their vehicles. Also having a safe environment to do this is imperative, not only for the safety of the disabled vehicle owners but that of other road users and pedestrians.

The disabled parking bays in this part of Commercial Way fit within these requirements; there is plenty of space for larger vehicles and they are located in a safe environment, with no through traffic.

In light of this, does the Committee feel it would be of great benefit to reinstate the existing disabled parking bays, which are located at the Chertsey Road end of Commercial Way in addition to adding further disabled parking bays to be used by Blue Badge holders on a 24 hour, 7 day per week basis? The existing and additional bays in this area would be ideally located in the town centre and would help disabled people access the shops and services that are in this area.

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

There are two existing disabled bays in Chobham Road close to its junction with Chertsey Road. These are placed inside the prohibition of driving that exists over Commercial Way and part of Chobham Road. They have always been and continue to be available for use by vehicles displaying a blue badge but access is subject to the 10.30am to 4pm prohibition of driving.

The prohibition effectively makes this part of Commercial Way and Chobham Road a pedestrianised area, even though the misuse of exit cards given to businesses in the area and the physical appearance of the roads does not reinforce this. A measure of physical control was introduced by the installation of rising bollards.

There is sufficient space in this part of Commercial Way to provide several additional disabled bays. Physically accommodating them would require an

amendment to the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement Traffic Order and the lowering of some kerbs to allow wheelchair access from the bays onto the footway.

However, there is a fundamental issue to address before more bays can be provided and that is whether there is a desire to retain this part of Commercial Way and Chobham Road as a pedestrianised area. Only if this is not the case can the prohibition of driving be revoked to legally permit access to this area by all classes of vehicles, including those displaying a blue badge wishing to use the disabled bays.

Officers wrote to Woking Borough Council in early 2006 proposing to temporarily lower the bollards at the junction of Chobham Road and Chertsey Road. In the short term, this would have allowed vehicles displaying blue badges to park on the existing waiting restrictions. Any vehicles parking on the restrictions and not displaying such a badge would be subject to enforcement by Parking Attendants. The response from Woking Borough Council stated that the proposal, "...would go against the Council's current policy to increase / maintain the area of pedestrianisation in the town centre and, as such, I could not support the proposal or recommend it to Members".

It should be noted that this suggestion was made before the recent decision to discontinue the use the bollards.

Without revoking the prohibition of driving and allowing additional disabled parking in Commercial Way, there will be little opportunity to provide similar bays so close to the town centre.

This question was received from Tony Branagan, Horsell Residents Association:

QUESTION 2

a. Carhouse Lane

At both ends of this thoroughfare the highway is in a deplorable condition. Please advise when the necessary maintenance will be carried out, sooner rather than later.

b. Minor Road connecting Guildford Road/ Scotts Grove Road

There is no footpath for pedestrians to use and are in grave danger of being knocked down by fast traffic turning left off Guildford Road. This is surely a safety issue. Could not a land exchange be arranged? What is the feasibility of this issue being resolved by f/y end 2006/07.

c. Parking - Arthur's Bridge Road/ Horsell Moor

The issue of parking by commuters and users of LA Fitness has been raised a number of times over the past 2 years. No satisfactory outcome has yet been achieved. May an explanation be provided as to why a resolution has taken so long.

- d. Traffic calming Lockfield Drive/ Kirkland Avenue
Please advise the total cost of all the works undertaken at this junction.

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

- a. The renewal of the carriageway surface at each end of Carhouse Lane was submitted as a bid proposal for the 2006-7 Major Maintenance Programme, but did not quite achieve a high enough priority rating to secure funding.

Nevertheless, we were aware of the significant deterioration in condition this year, particularly after the prolonged cold spell in February, so requested a reassessment, including core samples.

As a result, the rating has been raised to merit inclusion in this year's programme, but we have to see what resources are available on completion of those schemes already approved before committing the works.

We have previously carried out extensive patching, and will continue to undertake localised repairs to meet the County's safety standards. However, it remains our intention to carry out full width resurfacing in the affected areas, as patching does not provide the best long term solution in terms of engineering or cost.

We are pressing to get at least one end done this year, and anything not done this year will be programmed in 2007.

- b. This road links Scotts Grove Road in Surrey Heath and Guildford Road in Woking. It is approximately 120 metres long, and four metres wide.

To construct a footway, it would be necessary to acquire a strip of common land on one side of the road. This in turn would necessitate the provision of replacement common land elsewhere.

There are only two properties within the road, so pedestrian usage is likely to be very low. The Local Transportation Service has limited funding and human resources available, and it would be difficult to justify the cost of constructing a footway along this road, particularly as there is an existing public Right of Way, linking Scotts Grove Road and Guildford Road, some 300 metres to the south.

- c. The issue of additional waiting restrictions in Arthurs Bridge Road and other roads in Horsell is addressed elsewhere on this agenda. (See Item 13, Decriminalised Parking Enforcement, paras. 9 and 13).
- d. The works undertaken at Lockfield Drive / Kirkland Avenue were budgeted at £180,000. Works orders have so far been placed totalling £147,000.

The works have yet to finish in the sense that remedial work is to be undertaken on the traffic calming and as a result, we do not currently have a final figure for the amount spent on the scheme.

This question was received from Pauline Chapman:

QUESTION 3

As the resident of this Borough who is now severely affected by the traffic calming measures at the junction of Lockfield Drive and Kirkland Avenue and the junctions of Creston Avenue and Lockfield Drive I would like the committee to consider the following questions.

Will you provide me with the full reasons as to the necessity of employing such severe traffic calming devices at this location?

Will you commission an independent assessment and measurement of the height and placement of the speed cushions?

Will you refer all future plans for traffic calming measures to Woking Access Group for their comment advice and approval?

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

The scheme in Lockfield Drive originated from an undertaking given to the Beaufort Primary School to replace the pedestrian refuge island on Lockfield Drive, between Kirkland Avenue and Creston Avenue, with a signal controlled crossing. The adjacent junction with Kirkland Avenue had been the location of many slight and serious injury collisions over the years and had been the subject of low cost remedial measures, which were only ever partially successful. It was decided, therefore, to incorporate the junction into the scheme and provide a mini-roundabout as well as the controlled crossing.

Mini-roundabouts should only be used in 30mph speed limits and where actual vehicle speeds are appropriate for that limit. Unfortunately, although the posted speed limit along this stretch of road is 30mph, the recorded vehicle speeds were much higher and too high to allow the mini-roundabout to be constructed without some form of speed reducing measures on each approach.

We opted to use speed cushions since they are generally more acceptable to motorists than full width speed tables. The existence of the cycle lanes in the road and its use by buses and emergency service vehicles also influenced our decision.

From past experience, we know that the precise height and shape of speed cushions are crucial to their performance. Consequently, we decided to use a pre-formed cushion so that we could be confident that they would be of an accurate shape and height. The cushions that we used conform to specified criteria but there appears to be some characteristics of them that in this

application give a less than ideal ride and create a level of noise that is unacceptable to nearby residents.

We have received complaints from approximately 40 individuals and the local Councillors have received a similar number, if not more. In response to these, we have decided to modify the traffic calming and will be removing completely the two cushions between the mini-roundabout and the crossing. All other cushions will be replaced by tarmac ones and will be slightly lower (65mm rather than 75mm) and have shallower side gradients (1 in 5 rather than 1 in 4).

These modifications should provide a much smoother and more comfortable ride. Although vehicle speeds are expected to increase, they should remain appropriate for a 30mph limit. We do not have a date, yet, when these modifications will be undertaken but we are working with our Constructor Partner to implement them as soon as possible.

The decision to modify the layout was taken jointly by Officers from Surrey County Council and Surrey Police and impartial Safety Auditors. No additional independent assessment will be undertaken.

Future schemes will be discussed with the Woking Access Group. However, approval for construction can only be given by the Local Committee (Woking).

Annex 2

Member Questions

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING) 15 June 2006

This question was received from Cllr Peter Ankers:

QUESTION 1

The paved footpath path running to the east and north of the land owned by the Charities Commission and occupied by Pyrford Cricket Club is highway property. It is historically unclear but the fence dividing the highway property and the cricket club land was probably installed at public expense by either the County or Borough Council.

For a variety of reasons the state of the fence is deteriorating. Pyrford Cricket Club, which makes a substantial contribution to community leisure, does not have the funds to maintain this fence. What can be done?

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

The footpath is a Right of Way referred to as FP 137. The Countryside Access Officer, Anne Woods, is responsible for the maintenance and protection of Rights of Way/ Access to the countryside in this part of the County. I have checked with officers in the County Estates team and their records indicate that the land to the north and east of the footpath is owned by the County (Pyrford C of E Primary School) but not the footpath itself. Pending the return of Anne Woods from annual leave I have received the following response from her manager.

“Our area Countryside Access Officer, Anne Woods is currently on annual leave, so I am unclear on the exact situation regarding liability for the fence adjoining the path. I have checked our files, and we did write to the Cricket Club at the end of 2005 requesting that the vegetation be cut back and the fence repaired. At present, I am afraid I do not know whether the work was carried out or not. I have copied this message to Anne, so that she can contact you on her return.

On the assumption that the fence is the responsibility of the Cricket Club, we would normally always ask the adjoining landowner to carry out the works. I do appreciate that in some cases, individuals or organisations find it difficult to find the resources to maintain things like boundary fences, but under normal circumstances, we would not pay for the work ourselves. I will however ask Anne to look at the situation on her return.”

This question was received from Cllr Peter Ford:

QUESTION 2

- a. When will the road markings be replaced in the resurfaced Shackleford and Gloster Roads?
- b. When will road markings be put in place on the resurfaced link roads on Rydens Way?
- c. The junction of Selwood Road with Coniston Road has road markings; can similar markings be provided at the junction of Fairfax Road with Coniston Road please? It is an equally dangerous junction.

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

- a. The lining was carried out last week (5 - 9 June), with the exception of two access protection markings in Shackleford Road that will be installed very shortly.

There is always a short time delay between surface dressing and line marking, to allow for curing and removal of loose material that would prevent good adhesion.

Regrettably the delay was longer than it should have been, because the contractor had some queries regarding the layout, so missed the original scheduled dates.

For further general information, relining of eight roads resurfaced between 16 and 31 May is being carried out this week.

- b. Give way markings on the two strips of carriageway across the eastern end of the green still have not been done.

This has been picked up on a survey of outstanding works, and we have requested completion by 7 July.

- c. The junction of Fairfax Road and Coniston Road has been inspected.

There are currently no roadmarkings at this junction. Arrangements have been made for "Give way" markings to be laid. The junction markings will then be similar to the markings at the nearby junction of Selwood Road and Coniston Road, which is identical in layout.

The new roadmarkings should be laid within the next six weeks.

These questions were received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg:

QUESTION 3

To ask whether a purported decision by the County Council that the Borough Council should cease operating the pedestrianisation bollards at the junctions of (a) Commercial Way and Chapel Street and (b) Chobham Road and Chertsey Road requires the consent of this Committee as a change in policy?

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

Commercial Way has been pedestrianised between 10.30 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday to Saturday since 1994. Two sets of rising bollards have been deployed to prevent vehicle entry. Following a recent case at Guildford County Court and the comments of the Judge regarding the operation of the bollard systems Surrey County Council has made a risk management decision to discontinue their use. This does not involve any change in policy or enforcement as the restrictions introduced in 1994 are still in place and are enforceable by the Police.

QUESTION 4

To ask whether, following the decision by the County Council to sell the land at the NE corner of Brookwood Crossroads, any similar decision has been taken in relation to the land at the SE corner; and in any event to arrange for the present jungle at this location to be tamed?

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

Land was acquired to facilitate the widening of the A322 Bagshot Road at Brookwood Crossroads to aid the construction of the Southern Extension to the West End/ Bisley/ Knaphill Bypass. Although the Bypass was abandoned, alterations progressed at Brookwood Crossroads to reduce the number of personal injury accidents. Residual land at the NE corner of the crossroads has been declared unnecessary and surplus to highway requirements.

A request to investigate the installation of a left turn lane from the A324 (Brookwood Lye Road) to the A322 (Bagshot Road) at the SE corner of the crossroads has been received and is being investigated. Whilst there are merits in terms of the operation of the traffic signals there are concerns about the cost implications.

Pending determination of this investigation it is not possible to accurately identify the area of land for highway purposes and hence any surplus land which would be appropriate to release for sale.

In the meantime, Ringway will be instructed to tidy up the plot of land on a regular basis. The first application of weedkiller will be at the end of July.

These questions were received from Cllr Diana Smith:

QUESTION 5

What progress has been made in implementing this Committee's resolutions agreed the first of February relating to waiting restrictions at the Broadway, Knaphill, ie:

- a. To ask the bus companies to divert some of their buses down the High Street instead of the Broadway.
- b. To carry out a wide consultation with Knaphill residents on options for changes to the waiting restrictions in Broadway, Knaphill, and to report back to the committee.

When will there be a report back to this committee?

Peter Alexander, Local Transportation Manager responded:

a. Arriva were approached and their views sought on rerouting some of the 91 services through Bagshot Road, Chobham Road and High Street. Their response is:-

"As you are aware, we had a number of issues in this area that caused a rerouting of this service recently. We have therefore been looking closely at alternatives.

However, I have to conclude that the suggestion of running via Bagshot Road, Chobham Road and the High Street would add 0.6 miles and up to 4 minutes to every journey bearing in mind the need to negotiate the traffic signals on the A322. As we only have 6 minutes in recovery time on route 91, this would put an unacceptable strain on the schedule and give a very high risk of poor timekeeping on the service. The alternative would be to add a further bus into the cycle but this would clearly not be covered by additional users given past performance on this Chobham Road/High Street section.

I would also have concerns in making passengers travelling towards Woking from The Broadway and Sainsbury's go the long way round rather than via the more direct bus gate.

I therefore have to conclude that this proposal would worsen the performance of route 91 and can not support its adoption."

b. On 1st February 2006 the Committee received an Officers report in response to a petition from Knaphill Residents Association asking that the waiting restrictions at the north eastern end of Broadway Knaphill be changed. The current restrictions were introduced following local consultation during 2003.

Officers recommended partial changes to the scheme but members were concerned that the proposal may not represent the views of the wider community. Councillor Kingsbury proposed and the Committee agreed an

amendment to the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Hinks, asking for bus diversions from the Broadway and a wider consultation with Knaphill residents.

A survey of over 4000 Knaphill households will be undertaken and reported to the Committee on 28 February 2007 (Item 17 Forward Programme).

QUESTION 6

What is the current anticipated timescale for the opening of the new Knaphill Library? When is the 'local consultation on the layout' written of by Mr Norris in his answer to my question on the 1st February likely to take place?

Rose Wilson, Libraries Area Manager responded:

The new library is expected to open in February 2007. The local consultation is anticipated to take place by September 2006.