

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the
8 July 2009



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 16 February 2009
at
Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Woking

Members present:

Mrs Val Tinney	Chairman
Mrs Elizabeth Compton	Vice Chairman
Mr Shamas Tabrez	
Mr John Doran	Cllr Tony Branagan
Mr Geoff Marlow	Cllr Bryan Cross
Mrs Diana Smith	Cllr Ian Johnson
	Cllr Glynis Preshaw
	Cllr Richard Wilson
	Cllr Simon Bellord
	Cllr Derek McCrum

Part One – In Public

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

01/09 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Mr Andrew Crisp gave his apologies for absence.

02/09 Minutes of last meeting- held on 3 December 2008 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 3 December 2008 were agreed and signed.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

03/09 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Cllr Ian Johnson and Cllr Richard Wilson both declared an interest in relation to item 12.

04/09 Petitions [Item 4]

Petition A

In accordance with Standing Order 64 a petition was received concerning the parking which takes place in Claydon Road, Horsell, by users of the nearby sports fields. The petition was received via Humphrey Malins CBE MP who attached a copy of the petition which was signed by 75 people.

Mr Marshall attended the meeting on behalf of the residents of Claydon Road. He explained that the problems are caused by visitors to the all weather pitches. The cars are poorly parked on Claydon Road and adjacent roads, blocking drives and resulting in poor visibility along the road. This meant that on occasions residents, many of whom were elderly, had to travel along the wrong side of the road around a blind bend. Litter was also being left behind.

Mr Marshall said that the residents were not looking to accept the offer from Jenny Isaac, Head of Surrey Highways (in response to the letter to Humphrey Malins CBE MP) to introduce double yellow lines which would be enforceable "At Any Time". He said that what they were hoping for was signage for drivers coming from Horsell to sign to the location of the pitches. The residents would also like parking on Horsell Birch to be restricted at the crossing point.

Mrs Tinney thanked Mr Marshall for his presentation. The Chairman used her discretion to respond to the petition at the meeting.

Jenny Isaac Head of Highways gave the following response:

Thank you for your letter dated 26 November 2008 and its accompanying petition, which was addressed to Paul Fishwick and concerned the parking that takes place in Claydon Road, Horsell, by users of the nearby sports fields.

As you will be aware from my response to your similar letter of 3 November 2008, Officers were in discussion with residents of Horsell Birch in 2006 / 07 about users of the sports fields who were parking in Horsell Birch to walk up to and along Littlewick Road to enter the sports fields by an access gate there. This led to us putting down some white-hatched markings in some places and white "H-bar" markings across some driveways in an attempt to discourage parking. Unfortunately the photographs that accompany the petition pre-date the introduction of these markings.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

The obstructive parking tends to be in the evenings or at weekends. So we can only deal with this parking by introducing double yellow lines, which would be enforceable "At Any Time". We would have to put yellow lines down the entire length and both sides of Claydon Road and Horsell Birch (cul-de-sac) and an unknown length of Littlewick Road. If we did not, the parking would simply displace from those areas that had lines to those areas that did not.

Out-of-hours enforcement in out-of-town locations would be difficult for our colleagues at Woking Borough Council to enforce on a sustained basis. Any enforcement would not differentiate between resident/visitor parking and sports field parking. Any resident or their visitors would be as liable to enforcement on double yellow lines as the users of the sports fields. I understand that the Deputy Chief Executive of Woking Borough Council, Douglas Spinks, has written to you along similar lines.

Paul Fishwick will present the petition to the Local Committee (Woking), at its meeting on 16 February 2009, although this will not be with a view to the immediate introduction of any waiting restrictions. We are not proposing to make another amendment to the Woking Traffic Regulation Order, which allows waiting restrictions to be introduced and enforced, until at least the second half of 2009 as we have only recently made the last such amendment.

I am sorry that I cannot offer an immediate solution to this matter but I hope this information is helpful.

In a further response on behalf of the parking team, Paul Fishwick agreed to look at the crossing point. He said that signage would normally be located outside the entrance to the hockey club and not further away as Mr Marshall was suggesting and that Surrey County Council policy would not allow it to be located this far away.

Mr Marlow asked how many of the adjacent roads were affected. Mr Marshall clarified that it included Horsell Birch and the entrance to Squires Garden Centre on Littlewick Road.

Mr Branagan noted his disappointment that the residents did not feel that yellow lines would provide an appropriate solution. Mr Marshall said that the residents felt they would be penalised as the yellow lines would restrict parking around their homes and noted the point made in Ms Isaac's letter that out-of-hours enforcement would be difficult, which is the time when the incidents occurred.

Mr Doran asked Mr Marshall if he thought it would be useful if the Chairman of the Local Committee wrote to the hockey club to clarify the position regarding parking for visitors to the club and point out the problems caused to the residents of Claydon Road and adjacent streets as a result of the inconsiderate parking. The letter would also state that more stringent

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

measures may need to be taken if visitors do not respect the appropriate parking arrangements. Mr Marshall agreed to this course of action.

Mr Fishwick to liaise with Ms Isaac to send a letter on behalf of Surrey County Council to the hockey club. This letter will be copied to Mr Malins.

05/09 Written public questions [Item 5]

One written public questions was received. A copy of the question and answer can be found in annex 1 of these minutes.

06/09 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 2 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are below:

Question 1. In response to a supplementary question raised Cllr Branagan, Mr Fishwick confirmed that he will be monitoring the site and will look at additional measures if the traffic along Brewery Road does not slow down as a result of the VAS sign. He also pointed out that a mini roundabout had recently been built along the road which should result in calming traffic.

Question 3. Mrs Smith asked a supplementary question asking for clarification as to whether the posts concerned had gone through the portal process so that they can be recruited too.

Surrey County Council's Local Partnerships Team undertook to liaise with the Area Youth Manager to provide a written answer.

Question 5. Cllr McCrum asked for clarification as to when the footpath would be maintained. Paul Fishwick undertook to seek further clarification from Anne Woods and provide a response outside the meeting.

Question 6. Cllr McCrum raised a supplementary concern that the manhole boxes had been left 'high' due to the footway only having a wearing course. Mr Fishwick undertook to provide a response.

Question 7. Mr Doran raised a supplementary question asking for reassurance that the no 73 bus would not be lost due to lack of patronage. Mr Fishwick undertook to provide a response outside the meeting.

Mr Doran proposed the following motion, which was seconded by Mrs Diana Smith and agreed by the Committee.

AGREED

The Local Committee ask the Executive:

- To investigate why this implementation has taken more than a year
- Are there any lessons to be learned, and

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

- Can the Executive assure the Council that we will get value for money from this contract.

Information Items

07/09 Street Lighting PFI Project [Item 7

The committee noted this report.

Sarah Rayner and Paul King presented this item.

Sarah Rayner introduced the project, which is looking at how Surrey County Council is working towards a PFI financed agreement for the long term maintenance and replacement of its street lighting stock.

Paul King confirmed that Best and Final Offers have now been submitted by the two bidders and initial evaluations have shown that they were affordable.

Members raised a number of questions:

Cllr Wilson asked if the remaining 20% of the current lighting stock needed replacing. Mr King confirmed that approximately 78% of the current lighting stock would need replacing in the next five years and the remaining 22% had been recently renewed.

Mrs Tinney asked for clarification regarding details of the credit approval process. She was concerned that this may be made via taxation. Mr King will look into this and provide an answer to Mrs Tinney.

Mr Marlow asked for clarification regarding major traffic routes. It was confirmed that this included all class A and B roads and bus routes. He asked who would identify the 5% of residential roads as crime spots. Mr King confirmed that this will be done in consultation with the police, neighbourhood officers and Local Partnerships Team. It was confirmed that a meeting of this group had been scheduled for 26 February 2009.

Mr Marlow also asked when new lighting would start to be implemented. Mr King confirmed that the PFI contract procurement programme was due to be completed and signed off in June. This would be followed by a three month mobilisation period. New columns would start to be implemented in early October 2009.

Cllr Cross asked what sort of performance standards would be imposed for the lighting to ensure effective turnaround of replacement columns. Mr King said that old light columns will not be removed before new columns were in place and that if the service provider did not meet the contract milestones appropriate deductions would be made to their monthly invoice

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

Cllr Cross also asked what sort of performance standards would be used for the maintenance of the other 20%. Mr King said that they would be maintained alongside the other 80% for the period of the contract which was 25 years.

Mrs Smith asked for confirmation as to how the consultation process regarding the siting of new lighting was being conducted to ensure the effective input of local knowledge. It was agreed that Members could send through their concerns to the Local Committee and Partnership Officers in advance of the meeting on 26 February. Mr King confirmed that where possible replacements would be as close as practically possible to existing columns. It was agreed to provide further clarification regarding smart siting and on the consultation process.

He said that if Members were interested in more technical detail they could request a copy of the project agreement.

The committee noted this report.

Executive Functions – For Decision

08/09 Local Transport Plan & Local Allocation Programme 2009/10 & Indicative 2010/11 to 2013/14 [Item 8]

It was noted that the last word in paragraph 2.5 should read Annex B and the last word in paragraph 2.6 should read Annex C.

Paul Fishwick introduced this report and asked Members to agree a programme of Local Transport Plan Schemes to be implemented in 2009/10 and the provisional forward programme. He explained the two options in Annex A which gave Members the option of using £49,000 to fund Cycle Working, or to use this funding to take forward additional high priority schemes within the assessment pool.

Mr Doran put forward an alternative proposal forward asking the Local Committee to ask the Executive to fund the additional £49,000 needed for the Cycle Working schemes. This was seconded by Mrs Smith.

Mr Fishwick stressed that if no decision was made until the next Committee meeting, no schemes would be able to be progressed until after 8 July and that certain schemes were ready to be progressed after 1 April 2009 including Heathside Road and Pirbright Arch.

The Committee therefore agreed to the schemes that were common to both option A and B, and for Val Tinney and Geoff Marlow to take a report to the Executive on behalf of the Local Committee asking for an additional £49,000 to enable both the Cycle Working schemes and the high priority schemes within the assessment pool to be progressed during 2009/10. If this additional funding is not forthcoming, then the Local Committee will make a decision on which option to fund at its next formal meeting.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

Mr Fishwick confirmed that Cycle Woking was being funded mainly through Section 106 contributions but that there were still some gaps that he would be looking to the Executive to fund.

RESOLVED

That a report be taken to the Executive by Val Tinney and Geoff Marlow on behalf of the Local Committee asking for £49,000 additional funding to enable the schemes in both options A and B of tabled Annex A to be progressed.

- (i) That schemes in tabled Annex A (LTP schemes 1-5 and Local Allocation schemes 1-13) be approved for 2009/10 and defer agreement on the schemes in the shaded areas until the Local Committee knows the outcome of the decision of the Executive and the 4-Year indicative programme 2010/11 to 2013/14 as indicated in Annex B be approved.
- (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 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 be used to assist delivery of the Integrated Transport Capital schemes for 2009/10 programme, (Initial and detailed design, accessibility improvements) as indicated in Annex A (excluding shaded area).
- (v) That the Local Committee approves the schemes as scheduled in Annex C are deleted from the programme.

09/09 Cycle Woking – Proposed Programme 2009/10 and Indicative Programme 2010/11 [Item 9]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report outlining the programme for the 2009/10 financial year and the indicative programme for 2010/11.

Cllr Johnson asked if it was possible to bring forward the Victoria Arch 'tunnels'. Mr Fishwick confirmed that it was listed as a key area which does need improvements. He said that it was also an important part of the development of Woking as a 'transport hub' as part of the South East Plan. If Airtrack does go ahead, Mr Fishwick said that this could provide an opportunity to do the works.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the draft Programme attached as Annex A is approved.
- (ii) That where possible, any new Section 106 funding will be allocated towards the Woking Cycling Town project

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

- (iii) That officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects.
- (iv) That officers will update members of the Local Committee in relation to the progress of the Woking Cycling Town Project, at appropriate times during the year.
- (v) That the Local Committee would receive a report at its scheduled February 2010 meeting, to agree a works programme for the 2010/11 financial year.

10/09 Cycle Woking Infrastructure Improvements [Item 10]

Mr Fishwick introduced the report to consider a proposal for a parallel cycle/pedestrian crossing on Victoria Way, by Victoria Bridge and the creation of 'off road' pedestrian and cycle routes.

Cllr Johnson was concerned that this would lead to some residents cycling through Woking town centre and asked what could be done to reassure people that cyclists and pedestrians could coexist in the town centre safely.

Mr Fishwick confirmed that currently there is an order which does not allow cycling through the town centre. A new order will be implemented which revokes cycling in certain locations. He said that experience elsewhere had shown that when there are shared areas for cyclists and pedestrians in town centre locations it seemed to encourage better behaviour.

Mr Doran asked if the zig zag going from the wooden bridge towards Brewery Road would change as part of the proposals. Mr Fishwick confirmed that it would and a new ramp would be constructed.

Cllr Cross was concerned about cyclists crossing Victoria Way and cycling into the town square. Mr Fishwick confirmed that cyclists would be able to cycle across the left hand crossing (coming from Victoria Bridge) but that the right hand side would be for pedestrians only. He confirmed that once cyclists got to the town centre they would be able to cycle across the town square.

Cllr Branagan wanted reassurance that the new system would be properly publicised to ensure a smooth transition from one system to the other.

Mr Doran asked Mr Fishwick to look into arranging a tour to see how the system works effectively in other cycle towns. Cllr McCrum suggested that an alternative could be via a DVD presentation.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

RESOLVED

- (i) That the proposed parallel cycle/pedestrian crossing on Victoria Way, by Victoria Bridge shown on Drawing No.12768 be approved for detailed design and construction.
- (ii) The proposed 'off road' routes detailed in paragraph 2.4 are approved.

11/09 Maintenance Allocations for Surrey Highways [Item 11]

This report was written at the request of the Local Committee following their meeting on the 3 December 2008. Following the budget speech on 10 February 2009, Mr Fishwick provided a verbal update and explained that a detailed breakdown of the budget would be decided in service plans. He confirmed that there are no major maintenance schemes scheduled for Woking in this period. There are three surface treatment schemes scheduled – Hook Heath Avenue, St John's Hill Avenue and Beaufort Road. There are no drainage schemes scheduled.

Mr Doran asked that when the final numbers were agreed that Mr Fishwick circulate a report detailing major maintenance, surface treatment structures and wet spots to Local Committee with spend for Woking and Guildford. This will be circulated outside the meeting.

Cllr McCrum asked what colour Bonsey Laney was. It was confirmed that it does not have a colour code as it is not a major enough road.

Cllr Johnson asked if there was a rolling programme for footpath maintenance. Mr Fishwick confirmed that there is a programme which includes structure repair, surface dressing and surface treatment. Improvements as a result of Cycle Woking will also assist. In response to a further question from Cllr Johnson regarding inputting into the maintenance programme, Paul Fishwick confirmed that schemes are developed as a result of inspections and from complaints reports and that there is a programme for drainage and emptying gullies and jetting. When the list is sufficient it is submitted to the contractors.

Cllr Wilson asked how Surrey County Council ensures that it gets money back from its contractors if works are not completed satisfactorily. Mr Fishwick confirmed that it is part of the Community Highways Officers' responsibility to ensure that works are completed satisfactorily and that contractors are fined if this does not happen. The two year guarantee starts once the work has been done satisfactorily.

12/09 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members Allocations [Item 12]

In accordance with Standing Order 60, Cllr Ian Johnson and Cllr Richard Wilson both declared an interest in relation to item 12.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

Local Committee received a tabled amendment with one additional allocation.

RESOLVED

- (i) The Committee agreed the following allocations.

1	York Road Project Washing machines CCTV	£1,220 £1,015
2	Woking CAB – waiting room refurbishment 2 nd stage	£3,908
3	Woking Swimming Club	£1,250
4	Holiday Classes for Muslim girls	£2,000
5	Lightbox – Leonardo Education Programme	£4,470
6	Pyrford Village War Memorial Hall	£6,000
7	St Mary's Centre – Entertainment Project	£1,311
8	Ozone Youth Club	£1,250
9	Easter Community Radio Trial	£750
10	Tour Series – Schools Event	£4,000
11	Bikeability (with the same criteria as was agreed on 3/12/08)	£5,000
12	Birchmere Scout Camp	£1,200

- (ii) Noted that there were no allocations to report under delegated powers since Local Committee on 3/12/08.

Information items

13/09 Update

The Tour Series coming to Woking

Mr Doran asked for confirmation regarding where the buses would be running and what had been agreed with the Highways Agency. Mr Fishwick confirmed that he had meetings planned with the Highways Agency, passenger transport and the bus operators and that there would be a signed diversion around the town centre. The fire service has already been consulted and they will move to a location outside the town centre for the day.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

Cllr Johnson asked whether there were plans to clean up Victoria Arch for the event. Mr Fishwick said that this was being actioned.

Mr Fishwick said that pedestrians would have access to the town centre and as many as 10,000 people were expected for the day and South West trains were looking to run additional trains.

Farnborough Airport

Members were informed that two consultations are currently running regarding proposals to expand Farnborough Airport. A discussion took place and it was agreed that Members would make individual representation to Richard Evans who is preparing the Surrey County Council response to the Rushmoor Borough Council consultation by 20 February 2009.

14/09 Forward Programme

On behalf of the Committee, Mr John Doran thanked Mrs Tinney for all the work she has done and wished her all the best for her retirement in June.

RESOLVED

Agreed the forward programme as set out in the report.

15/09 Exclusion of press and public

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 9.25pm]

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the
8 July 2009

Annex 1

LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS
16 February 2009

1. Question from: Mr Richard Thomas

Costs of advertising on street furniture

What is the SCC policy concerning the placing of banners on street furniture in the area of the villages? What locations are banners allowed in (for example, are they allowed on railings, at the side of the road, at traffic lights, mini roundabouts etc)? How long are they allowed for? What size banners are allowed and are charges made with conditions? I am assuming that small signs advertising events, cash for cars etc are erected on street lamp posts and traffic lights without SCC permission, is that correct?

Answer from Paul Fishwick, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager:

The County Council's Policy as stated on the web site is as follows:

Banners on the roadside

Charitable organisations may apply to us, as the highway authority, for a licence to place a banner on the roadside. However, building owners are responsible for the strength of any mounting points. The purpose of the legislation is to prevent damage and injury to the public.

If you wish to place a banner on the highway, or to report a banner placed illegally on the highway, please call 0300 200 1003, email contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk or select the 'tell us about it' below.

Consent under the Highways Act 1980 - Section 178

This procedure also contains guidance and conditions for use.

The fixing or placing of banners over the highway is unlawful without having first obtained the consent of the highway authority.

The relevant legislation may be found in the Highways Act 1980, section 178. Its purpose is to prevent, as far as possible, damage and injury to persons using the highway, which might arise if the placing of banners was unregulated.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

Consent given by the Council under these provisions will therefore have attached to it a series of terms and conditions with regard to the fixing, placement, maintenance and removal of such items. The requirements are thought to be fair and reasonable, bearing in mind the need to protect the public and the applicant, and also in the event of any claim arising as a consequence of placement.

There may be circumstances in which the Council might refuse to give consent. In which case the reasons for refusal will be clearly given. An applicant then has the facility to appeal to a magistrate's court, either against the refusal or against the terms and conditions required by the authority.

A request to place a banner over the highway must be made not less than six weeks before the date of the proposed installation. This will give sufficient time to process the application and resolve any difficulties that may arise with the siting and the paperwork.

A request must be accompanied by the following essential information:

- Proposed location of banner
- Dates required (commencement of installation to complete removal)
- Certified copy of current certificate of public liability insurance (£5 million)
- Diagram of banner fully dimensioned including lettering
- Contact person (24 hours), tel. no. (fixed and mobile), e-mail and postal address
- Method statement for installation, maintenance and removal of banner using approved council contractor
- Copy of written consent from the owner(s) of the fixing points to use them
- Copy of the current structural adequacy certificate (obtained from owners of the fixing points).

With regard to headroom, the minimum clearance to underside of banner/suspension cables from the highway surface must be:

- Designated High Load Routes – 7.5m
- Other carriageway and shared surfaces where vehicles have access – 5.7m
- Footways, footpaths and areas restricted to pedestrians – 2.5m
- Bridleways and horse margins – 3.5m

Consent will not be given to any banner containing direct commercial or sponsorship advertising.

The fixing of banners to trees or lighting columns will not be allowed. Suspension fixing points are typically found on the front elevation of buildings. The owners of the buildings are usually responsible for the fixings and making sure they are strong enough to take the loading imposed by the banner in all weather conditions.

The building owners may possibly charge for the use of the fixings. There may be circumstances where a local authority is the owner of the fixings. A structural adequacy* design certificate must be held by the owners and a certified copy produced to the council. Such certificates are normally valid for a two-year period and must be renewed before expiry.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

It is the responsibility of the banner applicants to satisfy themselves that the fixings certificate is current and to certify that fact to the Council as part of the application procedure.

The Council reserves the right to remove the banner should it become unsafe. The cost of so doing will be recovered from the applicant.

Application forms for the placing of banners are obtainable from [Surrey Highway offices](#).

Definitions:

'applicant' means the person(s) or body to whom the consent or refusal will be directed and who will be responsible for the banner, the installation, maintenance and removal.

'Council' means Surrey County Council as the highway authority.

*As a minimum this may be written dated evidence that eyebolts, or similar, have been checked and tested to be satisfactory for the type of banner proposed.

Charges are not made for banners, as they are only authorised for Charitable organisations and the Local Authority etc. There are no sizes specified for banners but they must fit into the authorised site allowing for the clearances given above. The duration of any banner is a maximum of 4 weeks but normally they are placed on site for 3 weeks due to other banners waiting to be installed.

Within Woking there are two authorised banner sites:

1. Station Approach (guardrail by the library) in West Byfleet.
2. Building mooring points over Chobham Road near junction with Chertsey Road Woking town centre.

Surrey County Council does not give permission for small signs advertising events, such as cash for cars etc that have been erected on street lamp posts and traffic lights and these are removed on a regular basis by the County Council and Woking Borough Council.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the
8 July 2009

Annex 2

LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)

MEMBER QUESTIONS
16 February 2009

1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Speeding traffic / dangerous bend on Brewery Road

In the interests of safety could the VAS sign which has been placed near the junction with Horsell Park, the other side of the bend, be moved adjacent to Old Malt Way, before the bend? The decision was arrived at by consultation with interested parties, but excluding the resident who is very concerned at speeding traffic along this stretch of Brewery Road.

Answer from Paul Fishwick, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager

The position of the VAS sign was agreed between SCC officers, the County Council Divisional Member and one of the (then) Ward Councillors. Although placing the sign in the vicinity of Old Malt Way was considered, it was felt that the recently constructed mini-roundabout, plus the presence of the bend would in themselves act as speed reducing measures, whereas on the long straight section of Brewery Road many drivers were speeding.

The sign has now been erected, and we will be monitoring its effectiveness in reducing vehicle speeds. There is no reason why we could not erect a normal bend sign, with a recommended maximum speed, near Old Malt Way if our monitoring reveals that this is necessary.

2. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Commuter Parking, Kirby Road – Waldens Park Road end

A resident has asked for assistance over difficulty in exiting from her property due to commuter parking.

Please advise the feasibility of having yellow lines from the last house on each side of Kirby Road to the junction with Waldens Park Road.

Answer from Roger Evans, Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager

As you will be aware, when the restrictions were introduced around the junction of Kirby Road and Waldens Park Road, they were intended to deal with the

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

immediate problem of parking around the junction and the associated safety implications, in the same way that we dealt with the parking on the bends in Waldens Park Road.

If the parking is taking place on both sides of the road, as I have interpreted from your question, it should be possible to introduce a restriction on one side of the road in order to maintain safety, passage and access. If memory serves me correctly, parking historically took place on the odd-numbered side of the road, so any such restriction is likely to be proposed for the even-numbered side. Clearly this will displace vehicles into other roads; we have previously tried to keep this displacement to a minimum because of the problems that this can exacerbate elsewhere.

However, given the issues that seem to have arisen in Abbey Road the time might be right to revisit the possibility of extending the controlled parking zone into this part of Horsell.

I am not sure when this might be looked at. At the moment, the Parking Team is not looking at issues in Woking and it is unlikely that any significant work will be undertaken in the first half of this year due to workloads elsewhere.

3. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

Please could I be informed on the following:

- i. Which Youth Development Service posts are currently unfilled in Woking, and what is the effect of these posts being unfilled, particularly upon West Woking at Lakers?
- ii. Youth Worker posts were not initially on the 'red list' that would have allowed them to be filled in the recent recruitment freeze. Have all vacancies in Woking now been through the 'portal process' to allow them to be filled? If not, what are the reasons for this?
- iii. Page 7 of the annexes to the budget papers for Full Council on the 10th of February shows in the *Summary of Budget movement for Children's Schools and Families* a reduction of £171,000 as 'YDS vacancy management' and a £36,000 'Reduction in Voluntary Organisation payments and other Youth Projects'. What effect is this reduction having on the planning of Youth Services in Woking for 2009/10?

Answer from David Waine, Area Youth Manager (West)

i. There are a number of sessional youth work posts currently vacant in Woking. The largest group of vacancies directly relate to Lakers YC where we have very recently appointed a new Full Time Youth Worker. However, unless we can fill these posts, the YDS offer at Lakers will be greatly restricted. We are looking to appoint a 10hr substantive youth worker as well as four 3hr posts. Sheerwater and WYAC have a number of 3hr sessional posts vacant that need to be filled in order to maximise the programme we can deliver to young people.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

ii. The YDS Senior Management Team submitted a list of all youth work posts, along with a rationale, to be included in the RED list. This was done on Monday 9th Feb 2009 and it is hoped that this list will be presented to the Gateway Group today.

iii. The YDS Senior Management Team has taken the decision to find these 'reductions' from that part of our budget that is not related to staffing. Hopefully this will mean that there is no significant impact on the delivery of youth work in Woking. There may however be additional pressure on staff to draw down more external funding than they already do.

4. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

The drive of Holly House in Trinity Road, Knaphill was covered by a parking restriction box because of the neighbouring Knaphill School. An amendment to this restriction to enable the zigzag to be removed was passed on 23rd June 2008. The markings have not been removed, with the result that the resident was issued with a parking ticket. Although this was successfully appealed against, the situation is not satisfactory.

When will these road markings be removed?

Answer from Roger Evans, Parking Strategy and Implementation Group Manager

The removal of the line in question is with the Borough Council. I have been unable to obtain a date for this work, but will update the Committee at the meeting.

5. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council

Is Surrey County Council responsible for the footpath on Stockers Lane leading from Kingfield Rd? If so where should it begin and end and when will it be repaired so that students are able to access both SJB School and Woking College without having to avoid huge water filled puddles.

Answer from Anne Woods, Countryside Access Officer

The Definitive Statement says "3' 0" width, metalled. The section from junction with FP57 to Scotts Court is reasonable. There are concrete posts at the western end of this section. However, the remaining part, to the junction with Kingfield Road is in poor condition. The road is unadopted, so the County Council's only responsibility is to maintain a pedestrian footway to the 3' 0".

6. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council

Who is responsible for project managing the Puffin crossing on Westfield Road?

This is a SCC project with many sub contractors. Each stage has had

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

problems.

1. Groundwork (Left in a dangerous state and the dropped kerb missing from the plans.)
2. The lights themselves (unfinished due to the wrong coloured cover for the controls)
3. EDF supplying the Power (surprisingly done before Christmas)
4. Road markings (completed before the cables for the sensors were cut into the road surface)
5. Repositioning the Bus Stops (latest date March, some 4 months after a temporary stop was made leaving residents with children standing in the rain.

Answer from Paul Fishwick, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager

The project managing of the works is the responsibility of Ringway. Referring to the points above I comment as follows:

1. From observations by Surrey County Council staff, the condition of the site was never reported as dangerous. The detailed design carried out by Ringway missed off a drop kerb. This was subsequently rectified on site.
2. Peeks are the subcontractor supplying and installing the Puffin controller and they would normally supply a grey coloured cover. I am unaware of any issue of the controller colour.
3. The County Council dictated that the electrical supply must be installed before Ringway commence the civils works.
4. The slot cutting for the detectors does not affect the road markings.
5. Firstly there is one bus stop at this site that needs to be relocated. This stop was within the 'works area' and therefore a temporary bus stop was used whilst the works were being undertaken. The bus shelter is in the ownership of Clearchannel UK who were requested to relocate it when it was 'safe to do so' following certain works being completed. However, Virgin Media telecommunication cables have been identified at the location chosen for the relocated shelter.

Following a site meeting, the bus shelter is now due to be relocated on Tuesday 17th February. On completion of this work, there will be a minor modification to the footway.

7. Question from Mr John Doran, Surrey County Council

I quote from a SCC press release from December 2007.

"Surrey County Council is extensively improving the way it delivers real-time bus information to passengers across the county.....

To continue offering the best service to residents the council is to upgrade the system which will assist in making timetables more effective and improve the level of information provided.

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the 8 July 2009

To do this we have a new provider, Trapeze UK, a proven transport information company with a record of reducing costs, increasing productivity and improving services.

The new system, which will be up-and-running early next year, will allow bus operators to better monitor their services so they can change timetables to match passenger demand as well as improve the punctuality of the services for the general public."

More than a year later could the committee be told:

- Why the system is still not working properly?
- When will it be working properly?
- What penalties have been paid by the supplier?
- How much has the supplier been paid?

Answer from David Ligertwood, Team Manager Initiatives & Development, Passenger Transport Group

The hardware and software to support RTPI is now in place and working as intended. This has taken longer than expected because the old system was in a worse state of repair than expected. There have however been a number of problems with the operation of the equipment which we believe is largely due to human factors. This can be inconsistency with the data being used or errors being generated if the buses don't "log in" to the system as they start each route.

We are working with the bus operators to try to resolve these problems, as far as possible. While it is difficult to predict when staff will be sufficiently adept at using the system that further problems do not occur, it is likely that real time information will become progressively more reliable and problems more infrequent as time progresses.

Trapeze UK has occurred no performance penalties and have been paid the contract price.

8. Question from Mr John Doran, Surrey County Council

What impact has the community transport service from Chobham had on the 73. Specifically how many fewer passengers are using the peak time services than a year ago. How much has SCC paid for this so far and how much is committed to pay.

Answer from David Ligertwood, Team Manager Initiatives & Development, Passenger Transport Group

From information that the bus company has been able to supply, it would appear that there are 4/5 fewer "peak hour" passenger journeys per weekday being made on route 73, at least in the morning, compared to a year ago. It has not been possible to determine whether the reduction is for passengers from Chobham, or Horsell (which is not served by the Chobham Community Shuttle), or both, or to analyse whether they have transferred to the Shuttle. Chobham Community Interest Co. reports that a survey of Shuttle users indicated that nearly all had

DRAFT to be agreed at the Local Committee on the
8 July 2009

previously travelled into Woking by car, as driver or passenger and that some people return in the afternoon to Chobham before the shuttle starts and use route 73, thus giving that service some extra patronage.

To date, Surrey County Council has contributed £6000 to the start-up fund for the shuttle in Spring 2008.