



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)  
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 20 February 2008  
at  
the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

<b>Mrs Val Tinney</b>	<b>Chairman</b>
<b>Mrs Elizabeth Compton</b>	<b>Vice Chairman</b>
<b>Mr Andrew Crisp</b>	<b>Cllr Peter Ankers</b>
<b>Mr John Doran</b>	<b>Cllr Philip Goldenberg</b>
<b>Mr Geoff Marlow</b>	<b>Cllr Mohammed Iqbal</b>
<b>Mrs Diana Smith</b>	<b>Cllr Richard Sharp</b>
<b>Mr Shamas Tabrez</b>	<b>Cllr J Kingsbury</b>
	<b>Cllr Richard Wilson</b>

---

**Part One – In Public**

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

The Chairman noted that not all members had received their papers by post despite all having been despatched a week in advance.

**01/08 Apologies for absence [Item 1]**

Mr John Doran gave his apologies for absence.

**02/08 Minutes of last meeting- held on 2 November 2006 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 31 October 2007 were agreed and signed.

**03/08 Declarations of interests [Item 3]**

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Mrs Diana Smith declared a personal interest in relation to Item 18, Cllr Philip Goldenberg declared a personal interest in relation to Item 4, Petitions 2 and 3.

## **04/08 Petitions [Item 4]**

There were four petitions received.

### **Petition 1**

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition requesting a pedestrian crossing on A 3046 Chobham Road Woking. The petition was signed by 53 people and was presented to the Committee by Ms Louise Rowe.

The Chairman thanked Ms Rowe for her presentation. Ms Rowe confirmed that she was satisfied with the response.

### **Petition 2**

In accordance with Standing Order 60 Cllr Philip Goldenberg declared a personal interest in this item.

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition requesting a reconstruction of the Heathside Crescent junction with White Rose Lane, Woking on the basis that this junction as constructed was dangerous. Cllr Philip Goldenberg presented the petition, which was signed by 85 local residents.

Cllr Goldenberg explained the widespread concern about this area because a driver turning left would need to look in three different directions before proceeding. Reconstructing this junction would stop illegal South North movements, and deal with the problem of vehicle convergence until after the crossing. In view of this Cllr Goldenberg expressed his concern that the proposed audit was currently scheduled for July 2008 and asked that this be brought forward.

The Chairman asked the Highways manager to comment on Petitions 2 and 3 at the same time.

### **Petition 3**

In accordance with Standing Order 64, the Committee received a petition requesting the commissioning of an independent safety audit on the crossing at Heathside Crescent and White Rose Lane junction without delay.

Mr David Bittleston presented this petition that was signed by 344 residents. Mr Bittleston explained that since submitting the petition the number of people who had signed the petition stood at 600 signatories. He suggested that the fact that it was not necessary for him to knock on people's doors to obtain support demonstrated the strength of feeling on this matter. Mr Bittleston stated that this was the most important road section in the whole of South Woking and that he had received many complaints about this crossing.

The Local Highways Manager Paul Fishwick gave the following response to petitions 2 and 3:

The information presented by the petitioners will go to the Road Safety Audit. The general process when a crossing is constructed is that a

Stage 3 audit is undertaken at the end of construction and a Stage 4 audit is carried out at least 12 months after construction.

However, given the widespread concern Paul Fishwick confirmed that he would arrange a Stage 4 Audit as soon as possible.

#### **Petition 4**

The Committee received a petition with 120 signatories requesting that given the recent number of road accidents, Surrey County Council identify what permanent road safety improvements could be made to Westfield Avenue to reduce the risks to residents, pedestrians and other road users.

Mr. Carl Thomson, lead petitioner, stated that he did not believe it was accurate that there had only been one accident in this area and he felt that the County Council should not wait until there were more accidents before taking action.

The Local Highways Manager Paul Fishwick responded that following receipt of this petition an investigation going back three years was conducted to assess the number of accidents. There was only one recorded accident. Westfield Avenue was being monitored and speeds were coming down slowly.

#### **05/08 Written public questions [Item 5]**

Annex 1 of these minutes details public questions and answers. The following supplementary questions were put:

Question 1. In response to a supplementary question from Tony Branagan regarding the amount of time and persistent correspondence from members of the public before action is taken, Paul Fishwick responded that funding for this scheme had yet to be identified in 2008-9.

Question 2. In response to a supplementary question from Oliver Wells regarding the periodic review of this bus service, Paul Fishwick responded that a review of this route had taken place and that no reduction in service was anticipated in the near future.

Question 4. - Cllr Derek McCrum requested on behalf of residents that the depth remains the same and that the banks be preserved during ditch works. Paul Fishwick agreed to forward this request to the Valuations manager.

#### **06/08 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]**

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

Question 4. In response to a supplementary question on whether anything can be done about EDF by this committee, Mr Fishwick explained that the Street Engineer was in regular communication with

EDF. The streetlight had its electrical certificate and would be connected very shortly.

Question 6. In response to a supplementary question regarding whether the driver of a motorcycle on a bridleway is required to have tax and insurance for the vehicle, Mr Fishwick responded that since a bridleway is highway tax and insurance is required.

Question 7. In response to a supplementary question regarding the delays in making the Traffic Order for Sheets Heath Brookwood, Mr Fishwick responded that he would speak to the legal department to find out what is happening.

Question 8. In response to a supplementary question as to why the traffic light phasing was not programmed correctly from the outset, Mr Fishwick responded that it was necessary to see the effect the road closure had on traffic flows before making the necessary adjustments.

## **07/08 Trading Standards Annual Report [Item 7]**

Keith Vivers (Food and Agriculture Team Manager) introduced the report to the Committee.

Asked about the cost of implementing the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive, Mr Vivers estimated approximately £60,000 plus on costs given that two additional officers would be required.

In response to a question as to the cost of intellectual property over and above the RSG, Mr Vivers stated it was approximately £34,000.

Mr Vivers advised that members of the public may call an emergency help line number if concerned about someone on their doorstep selling services [0845 4 04 05]. Mr Vivers confirmed that a claim had been submitted to Government seeking compensation for the cost of dealing with the Foot and Mouth outbreak.

Members wished to record the Committee's thanks and congratulations to the Trading Standards team for their outstanding work during the Foot and Mouth outbreak and more generally in their work.

In response to a question regarding how the Buy with Confidence traders are approved, Mr Vivers advised that a number of checks are conducted including

- analysing the database for complaints
- looking at the trader's complaints procedure
- whether CRB checks are carried out for staff
- visiting the companies that apply

Mr Vivers advised that this comprehensive check was more reliable than similar types of scheme and that Trading Standards aim was to double membership of the scheme.

## **08/08 Transport for Woking [Item 8]**

Ray Morgan, Chief Executive Woking Borough Council introduced the report which informed the Committee of a proposal to establish a multi agency forum which would address and make recommendations on the transport needs for Woking.

Mr Morgan advised that:

- This initiative was seen by Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council as effective collaborative working around recognising Woking as a hub for transport.
- It would be more than an interchange between transport modes but about developing a sustainable, centre for stimulating economic growth and employment. It would have an impact on travel habits and on the wider area.
- This initiative would be an opportunity for Borough, County, community, transportation operatives and other agencies to work together.
- The forum would be an advisory body with no executive authority but it would identify projects where some agencies could contribute and create added value together rather than act on their own.

Iain Reeve, Head of Transport for Surrey stressed that this was an opportunity to think about what a 'hub' for Woking would mean, a rare opportunity to bring together such a range of operators.

Cllr Philip Goldenberg welcomed this constructive piece of work and hoped that it would be genuine partnership working.

Mr Morgan agreed that the area outside the rail station was congested but that it would be false to give hope of an instant fix since a strategic long term approach around movement in and out of the station was needed. He suggested that a lot could be done in the short term on cycle and pedestrian access routes, but a major project would need to attract private investment.

Asked about member involvement given that it was proposed Transport for Woking would comprise of officers, Mr Morgan replied that all documents would be accessible by members. A review of the terms of reference could be implemented if there were any concerns.

Mr Reeve stated that they were trying to take a fractured history and create something that works. It was open to take on the Transport for London model or this one where you bring lots of partners together. There still may be a need to come to the Committee for approval.

Mr Morgan was not certain whether Transport for Woking would include discussion of airports within its remit. It was agreed that a report on the

consultation on expansion of Farnborough Airport would be considered at the next Local Committee.

In response to a question about the commitment of partners such as Network Rail, Mr Morgan advised that there had been an exploratory meeting and representatives from South West Trains and Network Rail attended. Network Rail recognised a real opportunity to increase platform capacity and rail cross over so that the Portsmouth lines do not interrupt the Basingstoke service, and to promote better integration with Arriva. Mr Morgan and Mr Reeve agreed that if partners do not join in positively it would fail and that inclusion and participation would be crucial.

## **RESOLVED**

- i The context of Woking as a “Hub”, as outlined in Annex 1
- ii “Transport for Woking” be established;
- iii The terms of reference, as set at Annex 2
- iv The initial priorities of “Transport for Woking” are as follows: -
  - Pedestrian and Cycle access to and across the Woking town centre for a radius of two kilometres from Woking railway station;
  - North/South movement across Woking town centre, particularly through Victoria Arch;
  - Enhancement of bus and taxi facilities in close proximity to Woking railway station;
  - Railway infrastructure improvements with particular regard to access to airports; and
  - The Public Realm in Woking town centre with particular regard to its future management and maintenance.

## **Executive Functions**

### **09/08 A245 Parvis Road j/w Oyster Lane Proposed Crossing Facilities** [Item 9]

Kevin Patching introduced the report.

Mr Geoff Marlow expressed concern that, whilst being a dangerous road for frail elderly people and children, the County Council was relying on the Broadoaks Development to deliver two new crossings at no cost to the County Council but this had been delayed. He reluctantly agreed that no money should be spent whilst there was a realistic prospect of these crossings but proposed an amendment which would prioritise the crossings in the event of further delay.

Mr Fishwick confirmed that the scheme was at 64 on the list of schemes based on a cost: benefit ratio so that if the cost were to increase the scheme would go down the list. He said that another annual review was scheduled for autumn 2008.

Members discussed the suggested amendment to the recommendation in detail, and substituted the following addition to recommendation ii: “with the appropriate objective ranking”.

Mr Fishwick agreed to look at providing improved signage about pedestrians on this road, as an interim measure.

### **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed

- i. No further works should be undertaken on the A245 Parvis Road scheme as outlined on drawing 12490 revision A (Annex A) at the present time.
- ii. That the scheme should remain on the Local Transport Plan 5-Year Programme with the appropriate objective ranking.
- iii. That negotiations with the Broadoaks developer will continue to establish the earliest start date for their planned Section 278 works (Phase 3) associated with the development.

#### **10/08 Byfleet Village Zebra Crossing [Item 10]**

John Masson introduced this report to the Committee.

In response to a request that the double yellow line be extended by 10 metres or so to go around to Studland Road, John Masson stated that he would certainly look into this and reinstating the current yellow lines.

### **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed:

- i. The proposed Zebra crossings shown on Drawing Nos. 12587A and 12588A was approved for construction, and
- ii. That the necessary Notices be published in the local press.
- iii. Any objection(s) will have to be considered by the Chairman of the Local Committee (Woking), the Divisional Member and the Local Highways Manager.

#### **11/08 Lower Guildford Road, Knaphill –Speed Limit and Pedestrian Crossing Facility [Item 11]**

This report was presented to the Committee by Kevin Patching.

It was suggested that closure of the adjacent service road could improve road safety. Members commented that further consultation on

this should be undertaken with residents, Lansbury estate tenants, and users of the industrial estate.

Paul Fishwick agreed that consultation on closure of the service road, and initial design, would be undertaken as soon as possible, and that a further report on the results be submitted to the June Local Committee.

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed:

- i. The proposed Puffin crossing was approved for construction on Lower Guildford Road, to the south of its junction with Northwood Avenue, as outlined on drawing 12597 (Annex A).
- ii. The necessary Notice under Section 23 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertising the Council's intent to construct the crossing be published.
- iii. The 40mph speed limit currently in place over parts of Lower Guildford Road and Hermitage Road to be reduced to 30mph
- iv. The necessary Notice under Section 84 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertising the Council's intent to reduce the speed limit be published.
- v. Any objection(s) will have to be considered by the Chairman of the Local Committee (Woking), the Divisional Member and the Local Highways Manager.
- vi. Vehicle Activated Signs to be introduced on Hermitage Road and Lower Guildford Road, the approximate locations of which are shown on drawing 12602, to emphasise the reduced speed limit.
- vii. A Vehicle Activated Sign to be introduced in Redding Way, the approximate location of which is shown on drawing 12602, to emphasise the existing 30 mph speed limit.

### **12/08 Paxton Gardens –Reduce Rat Running [Item 13]**

David Durrant introduced this report.

[Cllr Peter Ankers left at 8.25pm]

In response to a request regarding the reengineering of the roundabout to improve westbound traffic flow such as two lane entry further down the road, Paul Fishwick stated that there were 93 schemes currently on the list (as set out in Item 12) and the electoral member may propose this addition, but it was unlikely that there would be any capacity to take it forward. The suggested work may not be feasible because of mature trees and limited highway-owned land.



## **RESOLVED**

The committee agreed that no further action be taken on this issue.

### **13/08 Old Woking Road – 40 mph speed limit [Item 14]**

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed:

- i. A Traffic Regulation Order, imposing a 40mph speed limit on the B382 Old Woking Road, from its junction with Maybury Hill to its junction with Sheerwater Road, be advertised, and that if no objections are maintained, the order be made, and
- ii. Any objections to be considered by the Local Highways Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Divisional Member.

### **14/08 Raglan Road Safety Improvements [Item 15]**

Kevin Patching introduced the report.

In response to a question as to whether a mini roundabout had been considered, Mr Patching advised that it was not advisable to have a four- armed mini roundabout as it could be dangerous.

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed that no further work should be undertaken at the crossroads junction of Raglan Road, Victoria Road and Inkerman Way at the present time.

### **15/07 Local Transport Plan Programme 2008/2013 [Item 12]**

Paul Fishwick introduced the item which set out the programme of Local Transport schemes to be implemented in 2008/09 together with the forward programme for Woking covering 2009/10-2012/13. Paul Fishwick stated that the schemes were in ranked order, from the top down with those schemes ready to go from next year. 2 schemes as set out in Annex B had been deleted.

Cllr Philip Goldenberg proposed an amendment to the officer recommendations without which, he stated, would result in a poor service to residents. Mrs Diana Smith seconded the proposed amendment. The Committee discussed the wording for final inclusion to the resolutions for this item.

In response to a question regarding the methodology of collating the scheme including how the score is reached and costs are reached, Paul Fishwick confirmed that the cost is estimated at the feasibility and pre-feasibility stage; the site is looked at and an evaluation is made of the best solution. This is then assessed in relation to the cost of the current schemes, and the date when it is likely to take place, will be

used to assess the cost. He agreed to forward details of the cost-benefit ranking system to members.

Members requested that in future any annexes should be circulated in a larger font size to improve readability.

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed:

- i. The detailed programme for 2008/09 and the 4-Year indicative programme 2009/10 to 2012/13 as indicated in Annex A.
- ii. That the officers are authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.
- iii. That the officers hold 'round table' meetings with the Chairman and Electoral Division Member(s) at appropriate times to progress Initial Design and Detailed Design processes to enable the schemes to progress to the next appropriate stage (subject to funding).
- iv. That the Local Capital Allocation is used to assist delivery of the integrated Transport Capital schemes for 2008/09 programme, (Initial and Detailed Design, accessibility improvements and part towards the Basingstoke Canal as indicated in Annex A.
- v. That the schemes as scheduled in Annex B are deleted from the programme.
- vi. That the Chairman and Local Highways Manager agree any additional funding for the schemes highlighted in yellow in ranked order, when the funding is known, to enable the 2008/09 works programme to be agreed with Ringway Infrastructure Services, and in consultation with the local member(s)
- vii. That the Local Committee sub group meet during July 2008 to review progress of the 2008/09 programme and November 2008 to review the possible 2009/10 programme by touring the district similar to November 2007.

In addition to these Decisions, to be inserted after Item 12 Decision i:

- ii. That this Committee recommend to the Executive that:
  - a. The money available for spending on roads in Woking be maintained at 2007/08 levels
  - b. The 50/50 split between resurfacing and ITS projects be maintained
  - c. It deplores the lack of funding by Government for roads in Surrey

## **16/08 20mph Speed Limit Policy [Item 16]**

### **RESOLVED**

The committee noted the report.

## **17/08 Flooding Report [Item 17]**

In response to a question regarding whether Bars Lane and Anchor Hill would receive attention this year, Paul Fishwick stated that he awaited an Executive decision on funding levels.

### **RESOLVED**

The committee noted the report.

## **18/08 Members Allocation [Item 18]**

In accordance with Standing Order 60 Mrs Smith declared a personal interest in this item.

Carolyn Rowe introduced the report.

In response to a question regarding funding of capital items out of revenue money, Carolyn Rowe advised that capital money may only be spent on capital items but that revenue could pay for capital items as well as revenue costs.

Mrs Elizabeth Compton asked members to consider increasing the recommended allocation to item 1, St. Johns Scouts Group. Mr Geoff Marlow confirmed that he would support re-allocating the sum recommended for item 11 to item 1, since the Committee funded double glazing for St John's Cornerstone only fifteen months previously, and they would have the option to apply to a future Committee. Members agreed therefore to increase the allocation for item 1 to £18,429.

In response to a question regarding whether the Members Allocation could be used to fund item 2, the Primary Care Trust proposal, Mrs Diana Smith confirmed that the proposal was not Primary Care Trust core work and that it was for general use for the benefit of the Woking community.

In response to a question regarding item 8, Woking and Maybury Sports Club proposal, given that the long term proposal could take some time and the timescales for spending members allocation, Carolyn Rowe confirmed that if money is not spent within one year then it would need to be reported to the Committee but it is not lost. The funding could be carried forward as committed to the next financial year.

In response to a question about the outstanding £2,000 Carolyn Rowe advised that with the Committee's agreement it could be spent under delegated powers for two projects up to £1,000.

Item 12, YPOD Counselling Service, Members agreed that the Committee refuse the application.

Mrs Tinney proposed and members agreed that a decision on awarding members allocation to the Credit Union, item 10, be deferred to the new financial year, to allow for decisions by participating councils to be known.

Mrs Tinney proposed and members agreed that a decision on the application from Woking Borough Council for the Summer Beach Day, item 14 be deferred until the next Committee so that costings and detailed projects could be finalised.

### **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed:

(i) the following allocations:

1	St. Johns Scouts - Equipment Store	£18,429
2	Surrey PCT- 'Cracking Up'	£2,800
3	Byfleet Bowls - Security Fencing	£7,015
4	West Byfleet Libray - Improvement to children's area	£260
5	Lakeview Community Action Group -Family Craft Club	£1,700
6	St. Andrew's Church Hall -Refurbishment	£1,100
7	1 <sup>st</sup> Horsell Scout Group -Replacement Equipment	£1,250
8	Woking & Maybury Sports Club – provision of building for changing facilities, storage and office	£39,340
9	Meadow Sports Youth Football Club – Floodlighting improvements	£5,500
13	CAB- Waiting room refurbishment	£966

(ii) That any funding returned as unspent before the end of the financial year be allocated to Woking and Maybury Sports Club, item 8.

**19/08 Forward Programme [Item 19]**

**RESOLVED**

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

- Community Safety Annual Report
- Consultation on expansion of Farnborough Airport
- Lower Guildford Road service road feasibility report
- Waiting restriction review

**[The meeting ended at 9.30pm]**

**Chairman**

---

## **Annex1**

# **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

## **LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)**

**20<sup>th</sup> February 2008**

### **Public Questions**

**This question was received from: Tony Branagan**

#### **QUESTION 1**

At the last Local Committee meeting on 30 Oct 07, a petition was presented over residents concerns with the traffic lights on Lockfield Drive at the junction with Well Lane. Suggestions were made, presumably by officers, to overcome the concerns. Could an update report be provided on the progress to addressing residents concerns

#### **Paul Fishwick, Local Highways Manager responded:**

Following the agreement of the Local Committee to allocate £2,500 from the 'Emerging Safety Problems' budget to carry out works to the controller to enable revised timings on the toucan crossing to be made permanent Officers of Surrey Highways (Woking) have been working with officers of Transport for Surrey (Traffic Systems) to carryout these modifications which are due to be made permanent by 31 March 2008.

In addition to the above, these alterations will also include the following:

- For traffic on Lockfield Drive, heading away from town, the junction signal head should change to red before the crossing signal (this should eliminate passing through the crossing at red).
- Pedestrians should cross during an "all-red" phase. In simple terms, this means that the traffic in Well Lane will be held in the road until pedestrians have finished crossing and then be allowed out onto Lockfield Drive.

The Local Committee requested that the westbound (out of Woking town centre) approach to this junction be reduced to one lane. This has been investigated and a single lane located within the 'centre' of the existing two lanes is considered to be the most appropriate. The cost of these proposed amendments are currently being drawn up, which include the existing loop system being replaced. However, taking into account the pressures on the Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation funding for 2008/09 (item 12), no funding has presently been allocated to these possible alterations.

**This question was received from: Oliver Wells**

## **QUESTION 2**

While noting the new funding to replace section 106 funding for bus travel, can we be assured that this funding will be applied to the 34 and 35 bus routes through Knaphill, and that these will not be subject to an in-year variation?

**Laurie James Service Planning Team Manager Transport for Surrey responded:**

The supplementary funding announced in the Leader's Budget Statement, to replace monies for bus services previously obtained through Section 106, is welcomed. Services 34/35 are recognised as being important routes in the Woking area and have seen significant patronage growth since they were enhanced in 2002.

At present, there are no plans to fundamentally vary the level of service on routes 34/35. However, like all supported bus services they are periodically reviewed to ensure that they continue to provide good value for money in terms of the investment being made as there will be an ongoing need to provide support to services across the county which is sustainable and within the funding allocated by the Executive.

**This question was received from: Peter Jarvis**

## **QUESTION 3**

I am writing on behalf of the Ridgeway Road Association Limited. We are concerned about the state of the public right of way which runs alongside Ridgeway in Horsell from the entrance to St Andrew's School to the junction of Ridgeway with Morton Road. The pathway, which is the responsibility of the County Council, is a major walking route to both Woking High and Horsell C of E schools as well as St Andrews School.

There is no obvious delineation between the road and path and in the past the Council has installed wooden posts to separate cars and pedestrians. Many of the posts have been knocked down. In addition, there is no street light along this part of the path making it difficult for pedestrians not only at night but also in the late afternoons in mid winter when pupils on the way home from school.

Since May last year, the Association has been in communication about these matters with officers of SCC (West Area Highways (Woking)) and have met on site. But even though new posts have been promised, nothing has happened. We have also been informed that is unlikely that SCC would agree to install a street light along this path since it would be on a private road. This argument misses the point since the purpose of requesting the installation of a light is primarily for the benefit of pedestrians using the path not the immediate residents.

We had intended bringing this matter to the attention of the Woking Committee at your last meeting but delayed since we thought that discussions with officers would lead to action. This has been proved wrong. We would therefore like to raise the following questions.

- 1) Why has there been no progress in replacing the posts alongside the public right of way along Ridgeway? Could the committee set a date by which the posts should be installed? We believe that the posts have been delivered to a council depot so a deadline of, say, two weeks seems appropriate.
- 2) Will the committee ensure consideration is given to installing a light along the path?

For the Committee's information, we have also asked the West Area Highways (Woking) Department to look at car parking around the junction of Ridgeway and Morton Road since this often makes access into Ridgeway from Meadway or Morton Road difficult if not impossible and, more importantly, dangerous. This problem occurs not just when pupils are being dropped off and collected from school but at all times of the day. At times the parking is such as to make access by emergency vehicles impossible.

**John Masson Principal Engineer responded:**

Several posts delineating the Right of Way have been damaged or knocked down on a number of occasions during the last few months. New posts have been ordered, and are now in our contractor's yard. These will be erected by the end of February.

Funding for new street lighting is limited, and in general terms the County Council is unable to provide and maintain new street lighting on private roads. Priority is given to maintaining and improving street lighting on the public highway network, for which the Council is responsible.

However, the County Council is investigating Walking and Cycling Routes as part of its Walking & Cycling Strategy for Woking and this right of way may feature in future improvements.

The level of parking at the junction of Ridgeway/Morton Road/Meadway Drive will be monitored. If additional waiting restrictions are considered necessary, then a report will be brought to the Committee in June.

**This question was received from: Cllr McCrum**

**QUESTION 4**

"The drainage ditch which runs around the South Woking flood plain, from Moor Lane to Old Woking, is clogged with vegetation which restricts any appreciable flow and is smelly and unsightly. As Riparian Owner, Surrey County Council cleared the ditch in 2000. Now the company building 22



houses on Newlands Avenue, Westfield, has agreed to remove all rubbish and debris from their section, as surface water from the site will be entering the watercourse.

Will SCC please attend to the rest of the ditch, which has not been managed for 7 years?

**Steve Evans Valuations Manager Corporate Services responded:**

Surrey County Council owns the adjoining land as part of its smallholding estate managed by Estate Planning and Management. The County Council are aware of problem and, despite not being directly responsible for the whole of the ditch, have already given instructions to our retained consultants to carry out regular inspections and to ensure debris and rubbish is removed from the ditch where appropriate.

## **SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

### **LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)**

**20<sup>th</sup> February 2008**

#### **Members Questions**

**This question was received from Cllr John Kingsbury:**

##### **QUESTION 1**

Following the closure of St. John's Hill Bridge over the weekend some weeks ago, what were the results of the test carried out and when can residents expect to see their permanent traffic light system in operation?

**Brian Sessions Senior Engineer Structures Group responded:**

The information gathered during the road closure on the weekend of the 24th/25th November 2007 is useful and shows that the draft initial assessment should be reviewed. The Structures Group intends to complete this by the end of March 2008. It is hoped that the County Council can agree the figures of this assessment capacity with Network Rail by the end of June 2008 but this will depend to some extent on Network Rail's resources and priorities.

It is quite possible that the result will show that there is likely to be some benefit in further analysis of this structure as it may demonstrate that strengthening is unnecessary and that only a permanent scheme to address incursion onto the railway is necessary. This will significantly reduce the disruption to the community. However, these additional activities will inevitably mean slippage in the works programme start date; (2008/09), previously approved by committee. My assessment of the revised date for the works depends on a number of current unquantifiables, but we expect to determine the programme in 2009.

**This question was received from Cllr Diana Smith:**

##### **QUESTION 2**

In the autumn of 2007 County Council members of this committee were invited to suggest two new transport schemes each for their Divisions. What progress has been made in assessing these schemes? When will I be able to

tell the residents of Beechwood Road and Barrs Lane what the result of my proposals are likely to be?

**Paul Fishwick, Local Highways Manager responded:**

The results of the bids for new schemes are included within Item 12 of tonight's meeting. Item 12 is for decision by this Local Committee and therefore following the meeting you may inform the residents.

**This question was received from Cllr Diana Smith:**

**QUESTION 3**

What is the current position with regard to improving the crossing point of Littlewick Road that was the subject of a petition to this Committee last year?

**Paul Fishwick, Local Highways Manager responded:**

Although signs were installed to warn drivers of the crossing point, from a recent survey it has been noted that they are not in the most suitable location. It has also been noted that as the crossing point is not up to standard on the 'Goldsworth Park' side and the crossing as such is not particularly visible from a drivers perspective, dropped kerbs and reflective posts will be installed by the end of March 2008 together with the repositioning of the warning signs to better highlight this crossing facility.

**This question was received from Cllr Diana Smith:**

**QUESTION 4**

What progress has been made with repairing light no, 15, Chobham Road, Knaphill? Is the work still with EDF, and if so can any approach be made to expedite it, or sanctions applied if the light remains unlit?

**Paul Fishwick, Local Highways Manager responded:**

This streetlight has somewhat of a potted history, in summary a new lamp column was installed after the original was found to have had power removed when the column had been vandalised. The original lamp column was in poor condition.

EDF, the Regional Electricity Company were requested to connect an electric supply to the new lamp column from their low voltage mains. Unfortunately, EDF were initially unable to locate their mains cable, but found a cable that had been connected to the original lamp column, that was now deemed unsuitable by EDF.

EDF requested that the new lamp column needed to be relocated to the opposite side of the road where there was a suitable low voltage main. The County Council have relocated this column to the opposite side of the road, but are awaiting EDF to make the connection from their low voltage main.

**This question was received from Cllr Norman Johns**

## **QUESTION 5**

### **RESURFACING OF THE JACK & JILL STEPS ON 20,21 & 22 FEB 08**

The resurfacing project to be undertaken on 20.21.22 February is applauded, however concerns have been voiced by residents. May I be assured that the following actions have been taken prior to commencement.-

[1] That steps are to be taken by the contractor to prevent a reoccurrence of the vandalism to property experienced by residents living in Barrens Brae during the 2006/7 closure.

[2] Surrey Police are aware of this closure and of the implications to the public that regularly use this footpath.

[3] The general public that rely on the footpath to travel between Kingfield and Mount Hermon via White Rose Lane have been alerted by a notice in the press and by prior notices at the two entrances to the J & J steps.

### **Paul Fishwick Local Highways Manager responded:**

1. The Contractors (Ringway) are aware of the need to properly secure the site whilst the works are taking place. The works should be completed within 2 days and the closure is only in operation whilst the gang is on site.
2. Sharon Simister of Surrey Police has been informed about the closure.
3. A Notice is not normally placed in the newspaper where a closure is lasting for only a few days. Notices were placed on site on 15 February 2008 advising of the proposed closure, which coincides with the school half term.

**This question was received from Cllr Geoff Marlow**

### **QUESTION 6**

1. Do pedestrians walking along a bridleway have right of way over motorcycles exiting fields and crossing over the bridleway?
2. Is an organiser of a motorcycle scrambling event entitled to ban pedestrians from a bridleway which goes through the area where the scrambling event is being held?

**Paul Fishwick Local Highways Manager responded:**

1. People using a bridleway have a right of way over motorcycles exiting fields and crossing over the bridleway.
2. A bridleway is open to users (pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders) at all times unless there is an official closure.

**This question was received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg**

### **QUESTION 7**

Can we please have a Schedule of Traffic Orders resolved to be made by this Committee during 2007, showing in respect of each:

- (a) the date on which the Committee so resolved;
- (b) the date on which it was made;
- (c) the date on which it was advertised; and
- (d) the date on which it was confirmed.

**Paul Fishwick Local Highways Manager responded:**

In response to question 1, I can answer as follows:

Description	Local Committee	Date Advertised	Date Confirmed
Proposed Waiting Restrictions*	28 Feb	8 Dec 07	23 Jan 08
York Road Crossing *	28 Feb	8 Dec 07	23 Jan 08
Waiting Restriction Review	21 June	8 Dec 07	23 Jan 08
Heavy Goods Vehicles – 17T to 18T	31 Oct	18 Jan 08	TBC

\*Proposed Waiting Restrictions and York Road Crossing CPZ amendments were made in the Traffic Order confirmed on the 23 January 2008

**This question was received from Cllr Philip Goldenberg**

**QUESTION 8**

Why, with the temporary closure of Queens Road Bisley, has no action been taken to increase the time allowed by the traffic lights at Brookwood Crossroads for traffic proceeding southwards along the A322 to turn right into the A324?

**Paul Fishwick Local Highways Manager responded:**

Changes have been made as a temporary measure, by Transport for Surrey Network Information Centre, following the closure of Queens Road, to accommodate the increased right turn movement from A322 into Connaught Road during morning and evening peak periods.

From feedback received, these have helped the A322 southbound, but it may be at a cost to other approaches.

This is a very busy network, which suffers significant congestion particularly during peak periods. Brookwood crossroads and A322/Cemetery Pales (*next junction south*) are linked and coordinated to keep traffic flowing as smoothly as possible and the changes we have made have therefore been small.

We are aware of the current problems, but the high traffic flows mean there is no complete solution to any congestion problems.

Surrey suffers from more than double the national average traffic flows and the highway network can only accommodate so much.