

DRAFT



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 20 October 2008
at
Committee Room 1a/b, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Mrs Val Tinney | Chairman |
| Mrs Elizabeth Compton | Vice Chairman |
| | Cllr David Bittleson |
| Mr John Doran | Cllr Tony Branagan |
| Mr Geoff Marlow | Cllr Bryan Cross |
| | Cllr Ian Johnson |
| Mr Shamas Tabrez | Cllr Derek McCrum |
| | Cllr Richard Wilson |

Part One – In Public

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

47/08 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Diana Smith and Andrew Crisp gave their apologies for absence.

48/08 Minutes of last meeting- held on 16 September 2008 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 16 September 2008 were agreed and signed with the following amendments:

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking) Meeting held at 6.30pm on **16 September** 2008 at the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

DRAFT

41/08 Minutes of last meeting – held on **23 June 2008**

49/08 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Mr John Doran declared an interest in Question 6 on Building Schools for the Future within Item 6, Written Member Questions.

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Councillor Richard Wilson declared an interest in Question 6 on Building Schools for the Future within Item 6, Written Member Questions.

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Councillor Bryan Cross declared an interest in Question 6 on Building Schools for the Future within Item 6, Written Member Questions.

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Councillor Ian Johnson declared an interest on Item 7, Consultation on Improvements to Learning Disability Day Services

50/08 Petitions [Item 4]

Petition 1

In accordance with Standing Order 64 a petition was received apposing the proposed waiting restriction at Darmouth Avenue, Sheerwater. An officer response was sent to the petitioner, who did not attend to present.

Petition 2

A petition was submitted regarding Youth Development Services in the Knaphill area. Cllr Olly Wells presented the petition to Committee.

51/08 Written public questions [Item 5]

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

Question 1. No supplementary question.

Question 2. What is determined as a reasonable amount of time for a response to a question?

Local Highways Manager Response: 21 days

52/08 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

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

Question 1. Do we have a date from EDF?

DRAFT

Local Highways Manager Response: Meeting with the sign suppliers, who manage the contract with EDF, who will take forward action. Surrey County Council are withholding any payment until complete.

Question 2. No supplementary question

Question 3. Can we have greater clarity of details?

Local Highways Manager response: the contract commencement is programmed for June 2009, it is anticipated to run as a 5-year programme

Question 4. No supplementary question

Question 5. will the implications of this scheme for Horsell be properly considered?

Local Highways Manager response: The scheme will be considered and rated against others at the Local Transport Plan sub-group meeting. The schemes relating to the Woking Cycle Town will be removed from the assessment pool.

Question 6. No supplementary question asked. John Doran made the point that the timeframe was long.

Question 7. No supplementary question

Information Items

53/08 Consultation on Improvements to Learning Disability Day Services [Item 7]

Yvonne Waltham, Service Manager Physical and Sensory Disabilities, and John Willson, Cranstock Day Centre Manager attended to present the consultation.

Yvonne introduced with some figures, there are 3,000 people with learning disabilities in Surrey, 855 registered for the service across the county, 45 are registered from Woking, with users also coming to Cranstock from Camberly and Guildford. Consultation part of 10-year programme to modernise services in a way that seeks to integrate rather than segregate.

Yvonne outlined the framework of the consultation on the centres of excellence (which includes Cranstock), to meet more complex needs, and to develop more community projects to meet less complex need. To date, the consultation has involved roadshows from across the county, with the one in Woking taking place at Woking Leisure Centre on 23 October 2008.

Consultation closes on 14 November.

Councillor Ian Johnson endorsed what the consultation sets out to achieve, and drew attention to the point that some accessed these services away

DRAFT

from the structured facilities, such as outreach or voluntary services. In response Yvonne and John talked about collaborative work with the Leisure Centre, and projects that looked at alternatives to residential care.

John Doran highlighted the issue with transport, and the costs of having segregated transport schemes for such services. John Willson and John Doran discussed the options in encouraging Day Centre service users to engage in public transport, such as a consistent concessionary bus pass and training of bus drivers to deal with issues.

Councillor Derek McCrum made reference to an address error within the document, which John Willson will amend.

Val Tinney asked for more on the main challenges of the consultation. Yvonne highlighted the challenge to maintain friendships as centres change, the increasing journey lengths for users, need for satellite services. Yvonne re-iterated that nothing would be shut, closed or stopped until something else is in place.

RESOLVED

The committee noted this report.

54/08 Older People Services in Woking [Item 8]

Craig Chalmers, North West Service Manager for Older Peoples Services, introduced the report. Craig opened by highlighting some of the figures in the report, emphasising the expense in providing this service (£10 million in Woking each year), such as £55,000 average annual amount for one person with high level needs.

Craig detailed the services challenge would be to provide more preventative services, as it is very difficult to predict who will need the type of services provided.

The Local Committee re-emphasised Craigs points on the challenges for this service, to which Craig responded by highlighting the importance of working with the NHS.

Geoff Marlow asked for confirmation on the role of a Care Manager, Craig responded by outlining the nature of the post as a front line worker managing and providing the programme of care for an individual.

Councillor Ian Johnson pointed to the role of Woking Borough Council as key partners in this service area, and asked how the service intended to plan for future issues. Craig highlighted the need for smarter procurement, referral, and use of voluntary organisations as just three areas that the service is thinking strategically about meeting need going forward.

John Doran asked about the role of voluntary organisations and its link with the Older Peoples service, Craig agreed that the service needed to engage more with voluntary organisations and that the Older People services could take more risks with voluntary services, particularly as they are closer to

DRAFT

community. In response to questions from John, Craig also outlined the process behind a Care Alarm, and emphasised the difficulty for his service-users (usually over 85 years of age) to access public transport.

In response to a question from Val Tinney, Craig highlighted that cross-boundary working was key and that certain projects were being explored, and referred to the good work and support that Woking Borough Council provide.

In response to a question from Councillor Bryan Cross, Craig emphasised that recruiting and retaining staff in this service area is not easy in Surrey, but that this is not a crucial issue for his service in the North West.

Craig invited Members to contact him for further information or to arrange a visit to his service.

RESOLVED

The committee noted this report.

Executive Functions – For Decision

55/08 A320 Route Management Study (Guildford Boundary to Victoria Arch) [Item 9]

Paul Fishwick, the Local Highways Manager for Woking, introduced the report, and directed committee towards the recommendations at the end of Annex 1.

Local Committee welcomed the recommendation (f) in the report, that recommended the 40mph speed limit between Turnoak roundabout and just to the south of Almond Avenue be reduced to 30mph.

Councillor Ian Johnson asked that greater clarity be given in developing the Toucan Crossing proposal, and that public are sufficiently engaged. Paul responded to say that the public will be consulted.

In response to Geoff Marlow's question on whether the cycle/pedestrian path referred to in recommendation (a) in the report would end at the edge of the borough, Paul Fishwick commented on the work with Guildford Borough Council and Rights of Way Teams from County Council to ensure continuity of the route into Guildford.

John Doran requested a further item be brought back to Committee to focus on the finances behind Woking Cycle Town and the risks associated with them.

Councillor Simon Bellord raised some schemes that might be further considered as part of the A320 study, Val Tinney suggested that Andrew Crisp would be the local Member to contact for support regarding those schemes raised by Councillor Simon Bellord.

DRAFT

In response to Councillor Bryan Cross's comment regarding the pedestrian safety at the aggregates exit yard near Victoria Ach, Paul Fishwick confirmed that the island would be extended to prevent vehicles turning right out of the aggregates yard exit.

RESOLVED

i) That the A320 Route Management Study (including its recommendations A-F) are added as schemes for future prioritisation as and when funding permits

ii) That officers be authorised to process with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects

56/08 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members Allocations

Carolyn Rowe introduced this report.

Local Committee received a tabled amendment to allocation 4.

RESOLVED

The committee agreed the following allocations:

| | | |
|---|--|--------|
| 1 | Brooklands Museum – Clean up and Building Assessment Survey (Byfleet Fire Station) | £5,000 |
| 2 | Home Start – Awareness & Recruitment Campaign. | £3,000 |
| 3 | Dance for Health | £1,000 |
| 4 | Ockenden Project | £2,000 |
| 5 | The Evergreens | £2,000 |
| 6 | SFRS - Youth Engagement Scheme | £1,000 |

57/08 Exclusion of Press and Public

[The meeting ended at 8.30pm]

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)

16th September 2008

Public Questions

1. Question from Paul Butler, Old Woking:

Discussions regarding traffic calming and car parking along Rydens Way in Old Woking were started in 2006, between residents, Woking BC and Surrey CC. These were stopped using the excuse of impending local Borough elections in the affected ward. What plans do Surrey CC have to take the situation in Rydens Way forwards? I would appreciate detail in the answer rather than a simple "yes or no"!

Answer from Surrey County Council's local highways manager:

There was a scheme within the Local Transport Plan 'Assessment Pool and programme' to create parking bays within Rydens Way. This scheme along with others was deleted from the schedule following the Local Committee meeting on the 28 February 2007 (minute 11/07 refers), as it did not contribute towards the Local Transport Plan targets and objectives.

With reference to traffic calming; an item relating to a 20mph speed limit and HGV restriction was presented to the Local Committee on the 23 June 2008 (minute 30/08 refers) under the heading 'Old Woking Traffic Conditions', where it was agreed not to introduce a 20mph speed limit and 7.5 tonne lorry ban for Old Woking.

2. Question from Cllr Olly Wells, Knaphill:

I have experienced increasing difficulty with discussing concerns of local residents about their roads, following an apparent loss of expertise and detailed local knowledge from retirement of a senior officer, who does the local highways officer suggest I contact concerning non routine non emergency road issues in Knaphill?

Answer from Surrey County Council's local highways manager:

All non emergency highway issues should be reported as follows: telephone 08456 009 009 or email wah@surreycc.gov.uk or using the County Council Highways report form on the county council web site.

Once these are received if the issue relates to maintenance, they would be passed to the Community Highways Officer to investigate. For the area covering Knaphill this would be Douglas Richards. Other issues will come to John Masson or myself.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)

16th September 2008

Members Questions

1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council:

This sign has been in situ for months and is still not in operation, as the connection has to be made by EDF. Members have been advised that meetings take place on a regular basis between SCC and the Utility Companies, but the priorities of the various parties are very different. Can some pressure be brought so the signs in situ throughout Borough be activated as a priority? Please advise a date of connection on the sign on Brewery Rd

Answer from Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager:

The Vehicle Activated Sign within Brewery Road was installed by a specialist sign supply company contracted to the County Council. This company is also responsible for obtaining the electrical connections to all of these types of signs, using EDF. In this instance EDF will be contracted to the sign supply company and not the County Council, as the electrical compliance certificate is issued by them and not the County Council. However, pressure has and will continue to be applied to resolve this outstanding issue and payments are being held by the County Council. At the time of answering this question a date for connection of the electric supply has not been made available.

2. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council:

It is appreciated that resources are scarce, but a blind resident has requested consideration be given to increasing the frequency of the no. 73 bus makes towards Woking. At present the last bus to Woking leaves at 1615 hours, while the last bus to Horsell is somewhat later. There is no bus on Sundays. Could consideration be given for increasing services on the no.73?

Answer from Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport service:

Later evening and Sunday buses on a route like the 73 are always welcome additions. However, unfortunately the County Council is not in a position to support them due to budgetary constraints. The Bus Service budget is already fully-committed in maintaining the existing network of supported services countywide. There are hourly evening services up to 10.30pm, Mondays to Saturdays, between Woking and Horsell on route 28, although this runs via

DRAFT

Brewery Road and Church Hill rather than via Well Lane and Ormonde Road as the 73 does. Consideration could be given to running some or all of these via route 73, although this could be to the detriment of those people wishing to use stops on the existing Brewery Road/Church Hill route. Local feedback would be welcome on this suggestion before taking the matter further. In general, the County Council will take any future opportunity to improve bus services and accessibility, although this would need to be affordable within the overall funding available and sustainable in the longer term.

3. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council:

Some 10 years ago the replacement of the street lighting in all of Surrey was under consideration. Is this project still being actively pursued? I understand this to be a PFI issue.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| OBC to Government Procurement Review Group for final approval and allocation of credits. | 18 Nov 08 |
| Issue BAFO documentation to bidders | End November 08 |
| BAFO submissions returned | December 08 |
| Draft Final Business Case to DfT | January 09 |
| Preferred Bidder appointment & Final Negotiations | March 09 |
| Contract award | April 09 |
| Mobilisation begins | Apr – Jun 09 |
| Contract commencement | June 09 |

Answer from Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager

The County Council is progressing with a PFI contract for its street lighting stock. The PFI Project Plan milestones are as follows:

4. Question from John Doran, Surrey County Council:

How many people are using the community transport bus from Chobham to Woking and back? What impact has this had on ridership of the 73 bus route. What is the net cost? Who is paying?

Answer from Surrey County Council's Passenger Transport service:

The Chobham-Woking Shuttle service is a local initiative administered by the Chobham Community Interest Co. (C.C.I.C.). Running during peak hours, Mondays to Fridays, the majority of its usage is seemingly new business, suggesting a reduction in car journeys. From mid May, when it started, until the first week of September 2008, 1130 passenger journeys have been recorded. There has been no observed or reported impact on conventional bus service 73 (Chobham-Horsell-Woking), which the Shuttle service complements. The service has had a net cost of £7,250 in its first 17 weeks. Start-up funding has been provided by Surrey Heath Borough Council and Surrey County Council, until the service is in a position to be self-sustainable. Currently, C.C.I.C. are reviewing the service offer and considering further marketing activity.

5. Question from John Doran, Surrey County Council:

DRAFT

Earlier this year a petition was presented to the committee for a crossing on Chobham Road. When is this likely to be programmed and what effect has the halving of funds for safety schemes had on this?

Answer from Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager:

The Local Transport Plan sub group of this Committee are due to meet on the 4 December 2008 to discuss the process for allocating the devolved Local Transport Plan funding for the 2009/10 financial year. The 'Allocation Pool' and draft 5-year Programme will then be rated by officers and presented to the planned Local Committee for Woking on the 16 February 2009. At the present time the County Council has not determined its funding for the forthcoming financial year and therefore it is unknown where this scheme will be placed within the programme.

6. Question from John Doran, Surrey County Council:

The Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme is promising to deliver greatly enhanced secondary school facilities. When is this likely to happen in Woking and what are the likely plans for local schools?

Answer from Surrey County Council's BSF Programme Manager:

Surrey is in the early stages of preparing for entry to the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme and have not yet be invited by the Government to join the programme. An expression of interest is being prepared to be submitted at the end of November upon which the Government will reprioritise the national programme (results expected early 2009). Government will be prioritising all authorities not yet in the programme upon attainment and deprivation indicators only.

BSF is a long term programme and based on the guidance, the earliest possible construction date for Surrey's first BSF schools would be in 2012/13. However, given the scale and complexity of the programme it would be impossible to undertake the process of upgrading all schools in one go, therefore investment is likely to be spread over several years. As a large authority, Surrey will divide its schools up into a number of phased 'projects'. The point at which any school is involved in rebuilding and refurbishing depends on which phase it has been grouped in, and Government decisions on the order in which a project will be financed.

Given that Surrey does not yet know where it will fall in the national programme or the level of funding that will be available, the Local Authority is not yet in a position in which it is able to put forward its plans on when schools would be delivered through BSF and hence where they might fall in the programme. A member briefing on BSF will shortly be issued to all members and more information on Surrey's BSF programme will be provided once Government has reprioritised the national programme early in the New Year.

7. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council:

During a Police Panel Meeting residents raised concerns about safety at the mini-roundabout in Oaktree Road at the junction with Sparvel Road, Knaphill. The road markings are currently faded and unclear, and the space in the road is very limited making it 'tight' to get around.

DRAFT

In the short term, when can the signage be improved and the markings renewed?

In the longer term, if the Brookwood Farm site is developed and a new exit onto Bagshot Road created, what will be the effect on this mini-roundabout?

Residents of Oaktree Road would also like the road surface repaired. Does the Local Highways Manager consider it is in a condition that requires repair, and if so, when can improvements take place?

Answer from Surrey County Council's Local Highway Manager:

The roundabout and other works in Oak Tree Road were built under a S278 but have been adopted, so maintenance and any improvement would be the County Council's responsibility as highway authority. The site has been inspected and the road markings are beginning to fade but not significantly enough to warrant a refresh. The lining will be monitored during normal inspections. Although the road space is 'tight' this does keep traffic speeds low. However, any physical improvement to this road would need to be funded from the devolved Local Transport Plan budget and taking into account the existing schemes within the 'Assessment Pool' and programme this would be rated as a low priority.

As part of any future planning application for development at Brookwood Farm, the developer will be required to assess the development transport impact, including on this mini-roundabout, if the development is intended to access via the existing Oak Tree Road estate

The road has been inspected and there are no significant defects that warrant a repair. However, the road will continue to be inspected by the Highways Inspector and the Community Highways Inspector.