

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)/
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 8 July 2009
at
Surrey County Council's Offices, Quadrant Court, Woking

Members present:

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Mrs Elizabeth Compton | Chairman |
| Mr Ben Carasco | Vice Chairman |
| Mrs Liz Bowes | Cllr Tony Branagan |
| Mr William Forster | Cllr Bryan Cross |
| Mr Geoff Marlow | Cllr John Kingsbury |
| Mrs Diana Smith | Cllr Rob Leach |
| Cllr Derek McCrum | Cllr Glynis Preshaw |
| Cllr Richard Wilson | |

Part One – In Public

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

16/09 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Mr Mohammed Amin gave his apologies for absence. Cllr Rob Leach substituted for Cllr Richard Sharp.

17/09 Minutes of last meeting - held on 16 February 2009 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 16 February 2009 were agreed and signed.

18/09 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 61, both Cllr Bryan Cross and Mrs Liz Bowes declared personal interests in relation to agenda item 10.

19/09 Standing Orders: Local Protocol [Item 4]

As in previous years and in conjunction with the Standing Orders of the County Council, Carolyn Rowe, Area Director, Surrey County Council introduced the report for Members to agree a local protocol to deal with public questions, petitions and rights of way matters to the Local Committee for the year 2009/2010.

RESOLVED:

Public Questions:

- (i) that the committee will offer an opportunity for public engagement and informal questions for half an hour before each formal Local Committee meeting commences (subject to annual review);
- (ii) that written public questions, dealt with as part of the formal agenda, are accepted up to 12.00 noon four working days before the day of the meeting;
- (iii) that the Committee may accept up to eight written public questions, and that the Chairman may use his/her discretion to regard a single question that has been divided into a number of sub-questions as several different questions within the allowable total number that may be asked at the meeting;
- (iv) that in addition to the electorate, any young person under 18 who lives within the Woking Borough area may ask one question at the discretion of the Chairman, within the total allowable number which may be asked at the meeting;

Petitions:

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

Public Speaking on Rights of Way applications:

- (vii) that the Committee noted the changes to the County Council's standing orders concerning public participation on Rights of Way applications, attached at Annex 1 of the report.

20/09 Petitions [Item 5]

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mr Grahame Osborn which had received 951 signatures. The petition concerned the stretch of the Old Woking Road, West Byfleet outside the Marist Catholic Primary School which is considered dangerous to pedestrians, especially the children of the school due to the constant flow and speed of traffic. The petitioners requested Surrey County Council to consider the installation of a pedestrian crossing.

Mr Osborne expressed concern that without a crossing, there was a strong likelihood that there would be a serious accident on this stretch of road. He said that cars had narrowly missed pedestrians a number of times and that they were not always stopping for the lollipop man outside the school. He said one car had recently driven into the school fence.

The petitioners were given the following written response from Ian Haller, Local Highways Manager:

Surrey County Council has secured a pedestrian crossing via a section 278 agreement linked to the development known as Broadoaks. The development is phased, with phase 1 having been constructed but the remaining two phases have still to be built. The construction of a crossing near to the junction of Oakcroft Road is required in one of these two remaining phases. However, it is understood that the developer of the Broadoaks site has gone into administration although the specific detail of this and likelihood of continued development is still unknown. As a result it is not possible to report at this time when and if the crossing will be built by the developer. There is no proposal in the Committee's current local programme for the construction of pedestrian crossing at this location.

There does exist a School crossing patrol on the Old Woking Road in the morning and afternoon for children at the school. This is operated by the school caretaker. I am informed that the school crossing patrol warning signs may not be operating at present, which if correct, will be attended to.

There have been nine injury accidents in the length of Old Woking Road between Sheerwater Road and Oakcroft Road in the last three years plus the first four months of 2009. None involve pedestrians but it is suggested that the site is visited along with the police to observe the operation of the crossing patrol and general traffic conditions in the vicinity of the School throughout the day. It is suggested that this is reported back to the next meeting of the Committee in October along with an update on the status of the Broadoaks development.

Mrs Elizabeth Compton expressed her concern and said she was aware that cars regularly went too fast along this stretch of road and that traffic could get very dense.

Mr Haller re-iterated that he wanted to meet with the police and the lollipop man to secure further information and to investigate the site in person and identify if Broadoaks were still in a position to complete their commitment. He would then feedback a recommendation to the Local Committee at the next meeting in October.

In response, Mr Osborne expressed concern about timing and said that he was aware of four accidents in the area since Christmas. He questioned why a crossing had been installed on Sheerwater Road around the corner and not on this stretch of road.

Cllr Richard Wilson noted that the crossing on Sheerwater Road had been installed for students from Bishop David Brown and Fulbrook travelling to school on their bicycles. He suggested that the County and Borough Councillors, school headteacher and governors and residents' association work together to help facilitate the introduction of a crossing.

He asked if there was any money left in the safe routes to schools budget to contribute. Mr Haller agreed to investigate if there is any money available from the safe routes to school budget.

Mr Geoff Marlow said that as local county councillor for the area he was very aware that this was a serious priority and also raised the need for an additional crossing on the A245 near the Oyster Lane roundabout in Byfleet

Mr Osborne asked how much it was likely to cost to secure a crossing.

In response, Mr Haller estimated that a crossing would cost in the region of £100,000 to £130,000. He said that he was not in a position to commit to any works until budget had been secured and that Members had already set out their highways priorities for this year and would need to determine this against other schemes on the list.

Mr Marlow suggested that a fresh approach to the issue was needed and suggested that Surrey County Council's legal department spoke to the Broadoaks development representatives to see if funding the crossing was still a viable option and could be brought forward.

All Members recognised the need for a crossing and that it would need to be considered alongside other priority schemes.

RESOLVED:

That officers would conduct further research as outlined and fully look at

the proposal and bring an update on the status of the Broadoaks development to the next Local Committee on 22 October 2009.

21/09 Written public questions [Item 6]

Five written public questions were received. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 1 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are below:

Question 2: Mrs Marshall asked if a lorry ban could be imposed on the Knaphill side of the petrol station exit so that deliveries would have to be made by the A roads.

It was agreed that Mr Haller would liaise directly with Mrs Marshall to see if this issue could be resolved outside the meeting.

Question 3: Mrs Manton asked if it would be possible to have temporary closure of Warbury Lane to traffic?

Mr Haller agreed to set out in more detail the issues, requirements and impacts for such a proposal including the option for an experimental order and to bring a report back to the Local Committee on 22 October 2009 for Member consideration.

Question 4: Mr Dell raised a supplementary question asking how an improvement scheme for additional parking at Rydens Way could be reconsidered by Local Committee?

Mr Haller responded that a scheme would need to be reviewed against Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan objectives. A scheme based solely on parking provision would not do so. The road was built to the standards of the time and if the roads were built now this would be to the current standards. Mr Haller agreed to see if there was a possible scheme that could be taken forward.

Question 5: A concern was raised by Mr Dell on behalf of Mr Butler that this did not reflect his recollection of what happened.

Mr Haller agreed to seek further information from Surrey County Council's legal services .

22/09 Written Members' Questions [Item 7]

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

Question 3. Cllr Cross requested that Mr Masson provide further information following the de-brief meetings and the Tour Series/Sweetspot in August regarding the suggested amendments.

Question 6. Diana Smith asked the following supplementary questions:

a) What can local residents do to ensure the accident statistics are accurate for Warbury Lane?

Mr Haller responded that Surrey County Council base their information on police statistics which are compiled after injury related accidents and that information was received in a three month timeframe.

b) She was pleased to hear temporary closure could come within Surrey County Council's remit and asked if the proposal could definitely be considered in the Autumn.

Mr Haller responded that Mrs Smith could put this forward as one of the schemes she would like to be considered in the Autumn.

c) Can we refresh the lines and signage at the entrance to Warbury Road to ensure people are aware of the restrictions?

Mr Haller confirmed that this was already on the existing programme.

Question 7. Diana Smith asked if it was possible to see the timetable for events at Lakers over the summer and make a visit. It was agreed that Surrey County Council's Youth Development Officer would make contact with Mrs Smith regarding this.

Question 8. Cllr Kingsbury commented that the piece of Hook Heath Road approaching the junction with Saunders Lane had been missed off two previous re-surfacing programmes and asked that it was definitely included in the forthcoming programme.

Mr Haller confirmed that it is on the major maintenance/surface treatment rolling programme.

Information Items

23/09 Surrey Fire and Rescue's Service Activities in Woking [Item 8]

Chris Webb presented this item and highlighted that 90% of the Service's activities involved working with young people and in assisting the prevention of road traffic accidents.

Cllr Kingsbury said he was interested in the comments on the problems caused by automatic fire alarms. In response, Mr Webb said that new legislation, which enabled prosecutions if necessary, had led to a reduction of 40% in the number of false alarms attended at commercial premises.

Mr Marlow said the Safe Drive, Stay Alive show was very effective and recommended that all Members watch it.

Mr Webb responded that the programme was currently being re-vamped and modernised and Safe Drive, Stay Alive would be re-launched in November this year and local secondary schools will be approached to attend. Details of performances will be circulated to Members once they have been finalised.

Cllr McCrum asked Mr Webb if the fire service could investigate the large amount of brush on the corner of Westfield Avenue and Balfour Road. Mr Webb agreed to action this.

Cllr Kingsbury raised concerns about the frequency of arson attempts on St John's Lye. Mr Webb said that the situation was being monitored in conjunction with the local police and that they were visiting local schools and trouble hot spots.

Cllr Cross expressed his gratitude to the service for all the good work they are doing in the borough. Mrs Compton thanked the service on behalf of the Local Committee.

RESOLVED:

The Committee noted this report and recognised the achievements of the Fire and Rescue Service.

Executive Functions – For Decision

24/09 Update of Local Highways Programme [Item 9]

Mr Haller introduced this report to update the Committee on the works programme and budgetary position and explained that the recommended schemes were consistent with County Council objectives and those of the County Council's Local Transport Plan. Their inclusion will ensure a full forward programme of works.

He said that the Executive had recently approved the overspends for Woking from the last financial year and that the highways programme had been re-adjusted and set out in Annex A.

Mrs Bowes asked Mr Haller to confirm why there had been so much overspend. In response, Mr Haller agreed to review the estimates against the actual costs and to identify why there had been such an overspend and report back outside the meeting.

Cllr Branagan asked whether the overspend was due to bad accounting or issues with contractors. Mr Haller explained that in previous years the contractor had submitted a cost estimate and this had sometimes differed from the cost of what was actually delivered. He said that the system had now been changed and contractors were expected to agree the budgetary figures up front which should prevent this happening in the future.

Cllr Kingsbury asked for clarification regarding item 2.3 and asked if the figure of £127,492 was the actual overspend figure. In response, Mr Haller confirmed that this was the overspend figure.

Cllr Cross estimated that the overspend was in the region of 30 – 50% of the total budget. He said that a lot of these schemes appeared to have gone on for weeks and had not been properly project managed. He asked Mr Haller to confirm why Lockfield Drive/Kirkland Avenue already appeared to be degrading when the scheme had only been completed recently. Mr Haller commented that the surface of Lockfield Drive had started to degrade along the entire length of the road and this was likely to be due to poor material choice originally.

Mrs Smith expressed concern that three different contractors had been involved with the works to Redding Way and commented that there was not sufficient money in the budget to fund a major scheme like the crossing outside the Marist School.

Cllr McCrum asked for confirmation why there are double headed traffic lights on the puffin and toucan crossings on Westfield Road and Kingfield Road. Mr Haller to investigate and respond to Cllr McCrum.

Mr Carasco suggested that Surrey Highways might put together a proposal to monitor their spend more effectively.

Cllr Kingsbury asked if Dr Andrew Povey could be invited to the next Local Committee meeting in October to discuss contractor performance and value for money. Elizabeth Compton agreed to write to Dr Povey to invite him to the meeting on 22 October.

In response to the comments raised by Members, Mr Haller again confirmed that detail of the overspend would be provided outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee:

- a) Noted and approved the minor improvements programme and funding arrangements, as contained in the report and annex A.
- b) Noted and approved the proposed local revenue spend, as detailed within the report
- c) Noted the approved major maintenance, surface dressing, footway, local structural repair and drainage programme

25/09 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocations [Item 10]

In accordance with Standing Order 61, both Cllr Bryan Cross and Mrs Liz Bowes declared personal interests in relation to agenda item 10.

Carolyn Rowe introduced this report to set out the funding available for County Councillors' Member Allocations for 2009/10 and outlined the recommendation to agree a protocol for the expenditure of this money, and to consider and agree the requests received. It was noted that recommendation (iii) should have read paragraph 3.1 and not paragraph 3.2 as stated in the report.

Mr Carasco outlined that there were differences of opinion as to whether the funds should be pooled or whether each County Councillor should have an individual allocation. In previous years the funds have been pooled in Woking. However, with four new County Councillors he suggested that to optimise the use of the money, the allocations are kept separate but that members could choose to pool allocations on certain bids.

He read out the following amendment to the recommendations:-

The Local Committee (Woking) is asked to:

- i) Agree to divide the revenue and capital funding for 09/10 for individual members to sponsor to Local Committee for decision as follows:
 - a) £8,250 revenue per member
 - b) 5,000 capital per member
- ii) Agree to delegate the power of revenue bids up to £1,000 to the Area Director between meetings (up to two bids per member, between each meeting) subject to consultation with and agreement of the local Member and the majority of County Local Committee Members
- iii) Defer bids (1) and (2) (**outlined in 3.1**) and consider and agree the individual proposed amount of expenditure from the Members Allocation budget.
- iv) Note the allocations approved under delegated powers (**outlined in 3.2**).

Mr Marlow commented that since the start of the Members Allocation process in Woking, the money had been pooled and felt that the system had worked well. He said that many of the projects which had been sponsored by County Councillors in the past, had benefited the whole borough rather than their individual areas.

Mrs Smith agreed that the system of pooling had worked well and thought it would be harder for the new councillors if the money was individually allocated. She objected to the suggested amendment (iii) which would exclude Mohammed Amin's bids from decision by 8 July Local Committee.

Mr Forster said that he had put forward his bids on the basis that the money would be pooled and said that Woking's areas of deprivation and the town centre all fell within one division.

Mrs Bowes said she was concerned that there was a race to use the allocation money up as quickly as possible and would prefer separate allocations, and seconded the amendment.

The Chairman asked for a vote on the officer recommendations.

Four councillors voted in favour of the original recommendations and two councillors voted against.

RESOLVED:

- i) To pool revenue and capital funds of £57,750 and £35,000 respectively for 2009/10
- ii) Agreed to delegate the power to approve revenue bids up to £1,000 to the Area Director between meetings (up to two bids per Member, between each meeting), subject to consultation with and agreement of the local Member and the majority of County Local Committee Members
- iii) Agreed the following expenditure from the Members Allocation budget.

| | | |
|---|---|--------|
| 1 | Tea Time to Dance – Anecdotes in Time | £1,774 |
| 2 | Relate - Relationship Counselling at Sythwood Children's Centre | £5,310 |
| 3 | Holiday at Home 'Now and Then' | £600 |
| 4 | Upgrading Wishell Lawn Tennis Clubhouse | £4,000 |
| 5 | Byfleet Primary School – Swimming Pool | £2,870 |
| 6 | Physical and Educational Activities at Attitude Youth Club | £3,854 |

- iv) Noted the allocations approved under delegated powers (outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the report) between the last Local Committee on 16 February 2009, and 31 March 2009.

- Holiday at Home £960
- Refurbishment of St John's Youth Centre- Sports Hall £1,000
- Asian Elders Luncheon Club £1,000
- Freemantles School Music technology project £761.66
- Bicycle Ballet £1,000
- Lakers Youth Committee £800

Information items

26/09 Members Allocation 2008/9 Overview [Item 11]

Members noted this report.

Executive Functions – For Decision

27/09 Representation on External Bodies and Joint Working Groups[Item 12]

The following members were appointed to represent Local Committee on external bodies and on the Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group:

RESOLVED:

- a) To nominate **Diana Smith** to represent the County Council (with the Area Director) on The Woking Partnership (Local Strategic Partnership and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership);
- b) To nominate **Will Forster** to be the youth lead;
- c) To establish a Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group, and appoint **Geoff Marlow and Liz Bowes** to the group.

Information items

28/09 Update

Farnborough Airport

Cllr Kingsbury proposed that the Local Committee write a letter of objection regarding the proposed increase in the number of aircraft movements from Farnborough Airport during weekends and weekdays.

This was agreed by a vote of 10 for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

To write a letter of objection regarding the proposed increase in the number of aircraft movements.

29/09 Forward Programme

RESOLVED

Agreed the forward programme as set out in the report.

30/09 Exclusion of press and public

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 8.30pm]

LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8 July 2009

1. Question from: Mr Derek McCrum

After many promises to clear the Moor Lane Ditch, nothing has been done. When will work start?"

Answer from Ian Cresswell, Operations Manager, Surrey County Council

Work on clearance of the ditch over its full length is expected to start in the next 4 weeks. An earlier start in the spring wasn't possible due to adverse ground conditions and the need to wrap up agreements with adjacent owners. The slight delay also has allowed the tenant farmer to complete his cut for silage. As soon as the start date is finalised it will be advised by e.mail.

2. Question from: Mrs Pauline Marshall

7.5t Lorry ban area Knaphill/Chobham

The exit from the Total petrol garage in Chobham is in the blanket 7.5t lorry ban area which covers Knaphill. Large tankers access the garage via Limecroft Road, Chobham Road (North), Guildford Road/Castle Grove Road and return by the same route, very often in the dark. Can the committee ask Surrey Heath to indent the start of the lorry ban to the Knaphill side of the exit from the garage so the deliveries have to be made by the A roads (Lorry Routes). It would then NOT be LEGAL for them to use the above mentioned route as it is at present. Rigid lorries using the route from Knaphill have to use the whole width of the road when going round left hand bends. in an area where emergency vehicles and other travel quickly.

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath & Woking

It is not possible to indent the restriction as suggested as the signing needs to extend the entire length of the road covered by the weight restriction. Signing is necessary at the junction of Station Road and Castle Grove Road so as to advise motorists of the restriction ahead. If the signing was indented this would not be immediately visible to drivers at this junction. Repeater signs are not permitted but a sign opposite the exit to the petrol station would be beneficial to remind drivers of the weight restriction on Castle Grove Road. Surrey Highways will look at providing the most appropriate sign.

If residents observe any vehicles using roads in contravention of a restriction they should report the full details to their Police Neighbourhood Officers or directly to the goods vehicle operator concerned. Correspondence can be copied to the South Eastern & Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner in Eastbourne, which licences Heavy Goods Vehicle Operators.

3. Question from: Mrs Sandra Manton

Can Warbury Lane be closed to traffic due to the amount of serious accidents and for the safety of pedestrians and local residents?

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath & Woking

Warbury Lane cannot be closed to traffic without a more detailed analysis of the issues and impacts. There are likely to be differing views to such a proposal and a public consultation would be necessary to gauge public opinion to the idea. This is best done following the analysis, where the scale of the impacts and any advantages and disadvantages can clearly be defined and explained. Members would need to include a proposal in their forward programme, the earliest opportunity to do so being this Autumn. There is no reason why a proposal could not be considered by members as it would align with Surrey's Local Transport Plan objectives.

4. Question from: Mr Tony Dell

Background: In 1989 an independent Planning Inspector looked at viable options for improving Rydens Way. He stated, "I conclude that the land at Rydens way is not appropriate for housing, but that it's use for car parking and open space is to be preferred, and should form part of a positive rehabilitation programme."

Surrey CC have now had 20 years to address this matter and improve the highway around Rydens Way and maintain most of the Open Space.

Bearing in mind Surrey CC Highways owns the 3m strip, which was reserved solely for highways improvements, and not housing. What do they intend to do to improve the situation for residents?

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath and Woking

The 'open space' land was declared surplus to highway requirements on 11 December 1991, subject to the condition that any development must include for the widening of Rydens Way to provide for parking and for reasonable access including that by buses. For this purpose a 3m strip adjacent to the carriageway was retained as highway.

The Local Committee in February 2007 formally deleted an improvement scheme for additional parking at Rydens Way on the basis that it did not meet the criteria under Surrey's Local Transport Plan. The 3m strip of land remains highway and could still be improved through development.

5. Question from: Mr Paul Butler

In the Public Inquiry concerning the Village Green Application for Rydens Way, held in the Autumn of 2009, Surrey Highways did not make themselves available to the Inquiry for cross examination, despite being both registration Authority and Objector. Residents felt this was an obstructive approach to a full investigation of the facts. Residents wish to know why the Highways department did not allow barristers to fully probe the evidence by cross-examination of the highways department?

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath and Woking

Surrey Highways informed the Registration Authority and the parties well in advance of the start of the inquiry that it maintained its objection but that it did not intend to appear at the inquiry. None of the parties, nor the inspector, requested that they appear. During the course of the inquiry, the Inspector put several questions in writing to the solicitor acting for Surrey Highways, which were responded to promptly.

**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
8 July 2009**

1. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum Woking Borough Council

We have been told that no roads will be resurfaced in Surrey due to financial cutbacks. It was understood that potholes would be repaired. What is the definition of “repair?” It seems that the only type of repair currently being carried out is the emergency type, where a bucket / shovel of tarmac is thrown in to a pothole without any attempt to square off the damaged surface and seal the repair. The consequence of that is that all too quickly the “repair” breaks up. Furthermore it seems that many potholes are being marked twice before being repaired indicating that they are not being repaired in a timely fashion. There have been instances where one marked hole has been filled but an adjacent one, unmarked, has been left. Is that normal policy?

**Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council’s Local Highways
Manager for Surrey Heath & Woking**

It is not the case that no roads will be resurfaced in Surrey due to financial constraints. There are constraints, but there is a full programme of works for major maintenance resurfacing and surface dressing schemes, as well as minor schemes for short sections. The candidates are assessed and rated on a County-wide basis, and those not selected for one year's programme will remain on a rolling programme list, and will be monitored and reviewed annually.

Surrey Highways has a responsibility to use the resources available in the best way to ensure that the Highway asset is maintained. Applying the prioritisation process across the County rather than sub-dividing the budget across the Districts, as was done prior to 2008, has meant that some areas have benefited more than others. Despite some public perceptions, Woking's network is by no means the worst in the County, so although there are, for example, over 40 Woking roads on the major rolling programme, with another 20 in the process of assessment, there are none on this year's works programme - although there has been some surface dressing, and some minor works are planned.

As regards pot hole repairs, Surrey Highways works are categorised in accordance with a set of safety criteria that matches or is more stringent than the National Standards. There was a particular problem with so many defects after the snow and ice in February, that it made it necessary to adopt a policy of fill and make safe, in order to manage the volume of high priority defects within an acceptable time frame. It was recognised that some of these repairs were not lasting very well, but that is largely a result of the prevailing conditions. If the hole is properly cleaned out, any loose material removed, and the sides tack coated with a purpose made binder, the repair should last at least until the next routine inspection.

In an ideal world, all potholes would be saw cut at first visit and include surrounding areas with more minor defects, but resources will not allow that. Therefore there will be places where, for example, a hole has been filled, but the crazed surface around it remains - even though it may also have been marked for attention. The backlog of high priority work has been largely cleared now, and the less serious defects are being addressed, but of course, new defects appear and old ones get worse faster than we can get to them. We are still doing saw cut repairs, as follow-ups and on first time visits in locations where, for example, there is heavy traffic.

2. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum Woking Borough Council

I have been informed that Ringway is contracted to clean pedestrian crossing bollards every 12 months. I have proof that that is not been done and the only clean bollards are new ones. Who is checking that the contract is being adhered to?

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath & Woking

All electrical 'keep left' type bollards are cleaned as part of the street lighting contract operated through Balfour Beatty. Cleaning is undertaken in conjunction with the bulk lamp change programme, which was undertaken during 2008/09. The bulk lamp change is due to commence shortly for 2009/10 and our street lighting engineers' monitor the work undertaken in their respective areas. Please forward any evidence where it is believed cleaning has not taken place and it will be investigated. Illuminated bollards, non-illuminated bollards and other highway infrastructure can require cleaning on a more frequent basis and this is undertaken by the Community Gang on an ad hoc basis. Reports can be made to wah@surreycc.gov.uk where these will be assigned accordingly.

3. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross Woking Borough Council

I would like to congratulate both Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council on the very successful and enjoyable afternoon of cycling on 2nd June and to bringing the Tour Series to Woking. I would also like to congratulate all organisations and individuals who contributed and made the afternoon such a success.

What was disappointing, however, was the lack of proper signage to explain to motorists and local residents that significant road closures would be taking place on 2nd June.

The large yellow metal signs that were placed outside the Town Centre, some weeks before, failed to make this clear

Would the Local Transport manager please let me know what lessons have been learnt from this and what will be done differently if the Tour Series returns to Woking or any similar event takes place resulting in significant road closures in the Town centre?

Answer from John Masson, Principal Engineer Surrey Highways

A large number of "Road closed" and "Road ahead closed" signs, together with diversion signs, were erected on the morning before the event. Generally, drivers approaching Woking from the south followed the diversion route and there were few problems. Unfortunately, however, many drivers approaching Woking from the north ignored the signs and, on reaching Woking, had to retrace their steps.

As the signing from the south 'mirrored' that from the north it is possible that drivers from the M25 (Chertsey) followed their Sat Navs' and not the diversion signs. We are aware of several drivers who admitted that they followed their Sat Nav and ignored the temporary signing.

De-briefing sessions have been held with several authorities since the event and a number of minor amendments have been recommended. These will be discussed with the Tour Series/Sweetspot during August to try and avoid the problems with traffic entering the town centre from the north.

4. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross Woking Borough Council

Would the Local Transport Manager please let me know whether his officers are taking down the large number of advertising boards that regularly appear attached to street furniture, and road signs along or on the Highway in the Borough?

Has he recently authorised any action against persistent offenders?

Answer from Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Surrey Heath & Woking

In accordance with County policy, Surrey Highways and our agents do remove 'fly posting' on a continuous basis, either through the Community Gang (there is a standard order on their weekly work sheets for the purpose), or directly by our own officers. We also call and/or visit the offending perpetrators to advise them that they are not permitted to advertise on the public highway without permission. In some cases, such

as the scrap car merchants, we have referred the issue to Trading Standards. This applies to banners as well as small signs on lamposts, though we retain banners for collection on request.

As well as our personnel, our colleagues working for the Borough Council also remove illegal signs, especially around the town centre.

There are a few events that we allow advertising for - generally civic or community related, rather than purely commercial - eg Woking Hospice - but only in agreed locations and under specific conditions and insurance - and not on lamp posts or road signs. People can put advertising on private property facing the Highway, but we would speak to them about anything that we consider may be a hazard to Highway users.

Developers can apply to put up small signs to direct site vehicles via a preferred route, but only for larger developments, and not for the purpose of advertising to potential buyers. We rarely approve these, and do also take them down.

However, many fly posters are persistent, and it is very difficult for us to legally enforce - you virtually have to catch the person in the act of putting the sign up. It is traditionally someone doing it for cash in hand, and the beneficiary of the advert will always deny that they gave any instruction to use the street furniture.

Lastly, our resources are limited, and while a nuisance and an eyesore, fly posting will not be at the top of our priorities except where this causes a significant risk, such as blocking a sight line or coming loose. We do at least remove and destroy enough to be a deterrent to some.

5. Question from Cllr Glynis Preshaw Woking Borough Council

Concerns have been raised by some local residents about the width of the road at Pirbright Arch following the construction of pedestrian walkways. Are Arriva buses and other wider vehicles using the route without any material problems either to their vehicles or pedestrians?

Answer from Derek Lake, Local Highway Manager, Guildford.

This project was implemented early in 2009 in response to public demand for better pedestrian facilities through the arch. It is used by families living north of the arch, including many from the army camp, walking to Pirbright School. Footways of about 1 metre width have been built on each side of the road, protected by higher than normal kerbs. It was not possible to build a wide footway on one side of the road only, as this would have moved vehicles to one side, increasing the likelihood of bridge strikes. As part of the work, road markings have been improved and the entire arch has been painted white to improve visibility. It has also been treated with a 'graffiti-proof' coating.

During the design, the 'swept path' of buses and coaches were checked to ensure that these movements would still be possible. Following completion

of the project, all of the bus and coach operators who use the route, including Arriva, were invited to meet at the site with their vehicles, and the movements through the arch were tested from all angles. Their trade unions were present, as were representatives of Surrey's Passenger Transport Group, Safety Audit team and the Surrey Highways officers responsible for the design and construction of the project. The bus and coach operators expressed satisfaction with the design and are using the arch without any problems.

Pirbright Parish Council, Pirbright School and the local SCC elected Member, Cllr. Mike Nevins have all expressed their delight with the finished scheme.

6. Question from Mrs Diana Smith Surrey County Council

- a) What record does the SCC have of accidents to cars and people, and damage to width restriction barriers, in Warbury Lane, Knaphill?
- b) What steps would need to be taken to close Warbury Lane to motor traffic, and has consideration been given to this in the past?

Answer from Mr Ian Haller, Surrey County Council's Local Highway Manager, Surrey Heath & Woking

- a) The County Council receives data from Surrey Police of collisions involving casualties. In the last three full years plus the four months to April 2009 there has been one injury related collision along Warbury Lane resulting in four casualties, one serious and three slight. This was in January 2009 near Kiln Lane. The 'road history' indicates 22 work orders, seven related to potholes, one to vegetation issues, six to repair or replace signs, one to clear oil from the carriageway, two attendances to the width restriction bollards and five to deal with fly tipping. More recently a request to attend to the bollards has again been received.
- c) For a closure to be considered a formal investigation would be required to look at all the relevant issues and impacts along with some form of public consultation. A traffic regulation order is required and currently that would require the approval of the Local Committee. The Local Committee will be asked to review its highway improvement priorities early in the Autumn and if members deem it appropriate could include such a proposal for future investigation. Whilst I am certain closure of the road has been debated in the past, no formal proposal has ever been investigated.

7. Question from Mrs Diana Smith Surrey County Council

- a) What will Surrey's Youth Development Service be doing for young people in Woking over the school summer holidays?
- b) What footfall is anticipated in Woking's youth centres?

c) What youth worker and sessional worker effort will be available over the summer holidays?

Answer from David Blake, Surrey County Council's Youth Development Officer (Woking)

a) The Youth Development Service Team in Woking will be offering more to young people this summer than ever before.

There are a whole array of activities being organised at youth centres and other venues across the borough for young people to engage in over the summer holidays, including:

Parkour workshop

First Aid courses

Wide Games

Circus skills workshop

Streetdance and other dance workshops

Drumming workshop

Camp Craft sessions

Arts Week at WYAC (to include: dance, animation, paper mache mask making, rainstick making, silk screen printing, badge making, podcast production and drama)

An Extreme Sports Activity Day (to hopefully include: climbing, brushsurfing and mountain biking)

We are working with our partners at Woking Borough Council to advertise these activities alongside the activities they themselves are offering to young people, recognising that we are both just one piece of a jigsaw of activities available to young people across Woking. By bringing together the publicity for ALL opportunities on offer by the statutory sector synergises our work, strengthens our partnership and ensures all information is in one place rather than marketed on a piecemeal approach.

These activities are all IN ADDITION to the regular non-school related sessions that will continue as normal at the various youth centres.

Furthermore, we are working with our partners in the voluntary sector to make our centres available to them for their summer programmes when we are not using them. For example, activities for young people with disabilities will be taking place at youth centres for three weeks during August.

b) As with any public building it is very difficult to estimate footfall, especially during major holidays when people tend to take vacations. However, we are expecting a greater number of young people to engage with us this summer given the extensive programme of activities on offer. Yet, as we all know, some young people do not wish to access anything formal so we will continue with our detached projects to ensure that arm of our work in the community is maintained.

c) Aside from agreed annual leave, ALL youth workers will be working their regular sessions but many will be working additional sessions to ensure the activities highlighted in A) are adequately staffed.

8. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

- a) Resurfacing of a section of Hook Heath Road from around the Conference Centre to approaching the junction with Saunders Lane has been overlooked for many years. When will this work be undertaken?
- b) Following recent discussions with your senior engineer, when will the tree root work at Turaco House, Hook Heath Avenue be undertaken, together with remedial repair to the driveway?

Answer from Mr Ian Haller, Local Highway Manager, Surrey Heath & Woking

- a) Hook Heath Road is currently on the major maintenance/surface treatment rolling programme. The scheme limits are between Saunders Lane and Pond Road. The rolling programme is reviewed annually and each road is 'scored' using a set of criteria covering an engineering assessment of the road condition, the type and volume of traffic on the road and the importance of that road to the public and County Councillors. The programme for 2010/11 is currently being assessed and this should be confirmed before the end of the year.
- b) The root system from a very mature pine tree is lifting a small area of the highway on the vehicle crossover leading to the property. It is not viable or good practice in this instance to overlay the protruding root. Having sought professional arborist advice it is proposed to undertake remedial root pruning, which can be done without affecting the stability and health of the Pine. The Community gang will shortly undertake to expose the root of the tree in readiness for Serco to undertake the root pruning. Once completed the Community gang will return to reinstate the footway. All work will be completed by the end of July.