

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 3 February 2010
at
Surrey County Council's Offices, Quadrant Court, Woking

Members present:

Mrs Elizabeth Compton	Chairman
Mr Ben Carasco	Vice Chairman
Mr Mohammed Amin	Cllr Tony Branagan
Mrs Liz Bowes	Cllr Bryan Cross
Mr Will Forster	Cllr John Kingsbury
Mr Geoff Marlow	Cllr Derek McCrum
Cllr Glynis Preshaw	Cllr Richard Sharp
Mrs Diana Smith	Cllr Richard Wilson

Part One – In Public

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

01/10 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence.

02/10 Minutes of last meeting - held on 22 October 2009 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 22 October 2009 were agreed and signed.

03/10 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

In accordance with Standing Order 61, Mrs Diana Smith, Cllr Tony Branagan and Cllr Glynis Preshaw declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 8, Cllr Richard Wilson declared an interest in relation to agenda item 9 and Cllr Bryan Cross and Cllr Richard Wilson declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 11.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

04/10 Petitions [Item 4]

Petition 1

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mrs Catherine Grace which had received 140 signatures. The petition urged Surrey County Council to install traffic calming on the bend in Brewery Road.

Mrs Grace stated that the petition is strongly backed by the MP and representatives of organisations on the bend. Mrs Grace went on to explain that there is a need to slow cars down around the bend. There have been eight accidents there in the last 4/5 years. There is a childrens playground and a preschool near the bend so people need to cross. In addition it is on route to the village school. They recognise various things have been tried, including vehicle activated signs and community speed watch, but they have not worked, and they are requesting something physical on the road.

Members of the committee were invited to clarify points with the petitioner. In response to John Kingsbury, it was confirmed that the new mini roundabout has not made a difference to the speed.

A response to the petition will be brought to the next committee in July 2010.

Petition 2

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mrs Jo Losty which had received 117 signatures. The petition urged Surrey County Council to install a zebra crossing on Hermitage Road in the vicinity of Five Oaks Close.

Mrs Losty, who is a parent from the school, wants a safe crossing. She explained that the school has an arrangement with the Surrey Pub and Wickes for parking, but this means that they have to cross the road to get to the school. The school has been without a crossing patrol since September 2009. The petitioners are asking for swift and effective action to provide a permanent and safe crossing for pupils and their parents.

Members of the committee were invited to clarify points with the petitioner. In response to John Kingsbury, it was agreed that the school should speak to WAVS regarding a school crossing patrol in the short term. A response to the petition will be brought to the next committee in July 2010.

Petition 3

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mr Mark Hickey which had received 915 signatures. The petition urged Surrey County Council to significantly upgrade the traffic calming measures on Blackhorse Road at the crossroads junction with Saunders Lane and Heath House Road.

Mr Hickey explained that this is a notorious crossroads which has a long stretch of straight road with two roads coming onto it. The visibility is poor and it is hard to judge speed. The road has heavy traffic usage. The petitioners would like the crossroads looked at again to prevent further

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

injuries and fatalities. Mr Hickey also asked for information on prioritisation of schemes.

Members of the committee were invited to clarify points with the petitioner. Ian Haller explained the prioritisation method for schemes.

A response to the petition will be brought to the next committee in July 2010.

05/10 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

Six 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 1: In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Bashir, it was confirmed that there are 20 minute restrictions, but they are not yet signed on the ground, although this is in hand. Regarding parking tickets, it was suggested that they liaise with Woking Borough Council outside the meeting.

Question 6: In response to a supplementary question from Mr Osborn, it was confirmed that Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to deal with potholes. In addition, Mr Marlow reiterated the dangers of potholes to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. Regarding the Marist School, Richard Wilson urged parents to park to the north of the road and walk a bit further to the school.

06/10 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

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

Question 1: Richard Wilson would like officers to keep the pressure on Thames Water.

Question 2: In response to Diana Smith regarding a sweep through of white lining in Woking, it was explained that each district puts a plan forward to Asset Management for consideration. This year the east of the county was done, so next year they will be looking at other areas.

Question 3: In response to Diana Smith regarding the review of salt bins, it was explained that this is being carried out by Asset Management, and members can input into the review from now.

Question 4: In response to Will Forster it was confirmed that Surrey County Council was not aware of a request from Woking Borough Council asking for help clearing pathways during the recent snow, and that Surrey County Council could make it clear to South West Trains that we expect them to clear the paths of snow on their land.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Question 5: In response to Tony Branagan it was confirmed that the review would be carried out by the end of March 2010.

Question 6: Tony Branagan noted his disappointment that the number 97 bus was going the same way as the number 28, and that the interests of the people who do use it should be catered for.

Question 7: In response to Bryan Cross' questions about why 24 hour working and why the contractors were not working all the time they should have been, it was agreed that this would be answered outside of the meeting.

Question 8: In response to questions from Bryan Cross regarding the salting on 12/13 January 2010, it was agreed that this information would be provided outside the meeting.

Executive Items

07/10 Services for Young People – Local Delivery by SCC in Woking [Item 7]

Garath Symonds, Head of Services for Young People at Surrey County Council gave a presentation on the report.

In response to Liz Bowes, Garath confirmed that young people would become more involved through initiatives such as paying young people to be mystery shoppers, peer inspectors and by using the web differently including using it to ask young people to comment of provision.

Ben Carasco commented that the document sets out a good long term vision, but it does not set out a plan for 2010/11. Richard Sharp also agreed with this point.

Diana Smith again commented on the lack of plan, and asked about the proposed budget cuts for 2010/11, and asked for a regular report back regarding what is happening in Woking on both current and future provision.

Derek McCrum explained about the drop in centre at Barnsbury, and the fact that it will have to stop at the end of March due to funding.

Bryan Cross was concerned about addressing Surrey County Council statutory responsibilities.

John Kingsbury asked whether the Local Committee was the right body to be devolving responsibility to, and suggested that perhaps the Woking Partnership may be more fit for purpose. He also asked about how duplication of services provided by the voluntary sector could be avoided.

In response to these issues, Garath Symonds made the following points:

1. The service is restructuring to protect front line staff. There will be no cuts to sessional budgets.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

2. The commissioning team doing the work have been seconded in from other Surrey County Council posts.
3. Regarding Barnsbury, the longer term vision is that if budget is devolved, then this could be the sort of thing which could be funded. The budget is set by the council, the more money available, the more provision can be funded.
4. He is happy to come back to future meetings to report progress. This will include a report on the performance of Lakers.
5. There is a debate to be had regarding which body is the right one to devolve responsibility to. Devolving the budget to the Borough Council is not an option.
6. This work needs to be done in partnership, which should avoid duplication. Surrey County Council are working closely with Surrey Youth Focus who know the key voluntary sector players.

RESOLVED:

Did NOT agree (by a vote of 7 against and 0 for):

- (i) That the Local Delivery Plan forms a robust basis for supporting young people in the Borough 2010-2011.

Agreed:

- (ii) That the vision for future years is something to which the Local Committee can offer support in-principle.

08/10 Cycle Woking – Proposed Programme 2010/11 and Cycle Woking Forum [Item 8]

In accordance with Standing Order 61, Mrs Diana Smith, Cllr Tony Branagan and Cllr Glynis Preshaw declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 8.

Paul Fishwick introduced this item and asked members to note the tabled revised recommendations. He clarified that the three bridges highlighted in yellow in Annex A do still require planning permission. Discussions are taking place on the proposals with users, and the public will be consulted before they are put in for planning permission.

Regarding specifics, the following comments were made:

1. Members were concerned that the De Lara Way bridge may be too narrow for shared use.
2. It was noted that under Victoria Arch, the proposal was that the footway would remain and the cycle track on the road would be widened west wards. It was noted that this was a short term solution, with the longer term vision being new tunnels under the railway. Members were concerned that the road under the Arch may be too narrow for shared use.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Liz Bowes proposed the following amendments to the tabled revised recommendations. These were seconded by Will Forster and agreed by the committee.

RESOLVED:

- i. That the draft Programme attached as Annex A (including Annex C and Annex D) is approved except Annex B and Annex E.
- ii. Where the highway authority is consulted on a planning application, highway officers should consider whether it is appropriate to seek a section 106 contribution, collected by Woking Borough Council, towards the Woking Cycle Town Project
- iii. That the Local Committee delegate authority to the Cycle Woking Programme Manager in consultation with the local member and Chairman the advertisement of traffic orders in relation to projects in Annex A as amended for those schemes only.
- 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 if Cycle Woking is successful in extending the Cycling Town status beyond 31 March 2011 the Local Committee would receive a report at its scheduled February 2011 meeting, to agree a works programme for the 2011/12 financial year.
- vi. That the Local Committee elect Will Forster to attend the Woking Cycle Forum for the period February 2010 to 31 March 2011

09/10 Annual Review of On-Street Parking in Woking [Item 9]

In accordance with Standing Order 61 Cllr Richard Wilson declared an interest in relation to agenda item 9.

Jack Roberts introduced this report and asked members to note the revised tabled recommendations and the tabled amendment to annex A.

The following specific comments were made:

1. If possible local members would like to see a drop off point outside the Marjorie Richardson Centre. As a result recommendation (v) below was proposed by John Kingsbury and seconded by Liz Bowes.
2. Richard Wilson asked whether Station Road, West Byfleet could go ahead to next years review.
3. Regarding drawing 24, Diana Smith asked whether the lines could be extended further to improve sightlines. As a result Diana Smith proposed an amendment to tabled revised recommendation (i) as set out below. This was seconded by Tony Branagan.
4. The signing on Madeira Road CPZ. Richard Wilson and Jack Roberts would discuss this outside the meeting.
5. It was noted that if there were no objections when advertised in the Spring, then they would hope to implement these restrictions in the Summer.
6. Drawing 36 – regarding the taxi rank and the bus stop, it was clarified that it has been through a safety audit and the location has been approved by Surrey Police.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

7. Members noted that they could input into the next review of on-street parking in Woking until November 2010

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Woking as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in annex A (numbers 01-23 and 25-36) and tabled Annex A number 37 are agreed and number 24 is agreed subject to the markings being extended in consultation with the divisional member.
- (ii) That the intention of Surrey County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 be advertised, to give effect to the proposals in the above recommendation, and that if no objections are maintained that the Order be made.
- (iii) The Local Committee give due consideration to allocating funding to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments as part of its budget setting process for 2010/11.
- (iv) To note the intention of the County Council to carry out an annual review of on-street parking in Woking from 2010/11 onwards.
- (v) That a site visit to establish if a feasible drop off point for the Marjorie Richardson Centre can be identified be held, and subject to agreement with the divisional member, that it is added to and advertised as part of these recommendations.

10/10 Local Transport Plan and Local Allocation Programme 2010/11 [Item 10]

Ian Haller introduced the report and asked members to note the revised tabled recommendations. He explained that the Surrey County Council Cabinet was due to meet on 9 February 2010 to discuss the highways budget and it was noted that there may not be an Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) budget for 2010/11, but it was suggested that the paper be approved in case some budget is allocated.

It was noted that if the decision is that there is no ITS budget for 2010/11, then there may be a surplus of funds for the rest of 2009/10. If this was the case, then Members were asked whether they would like to reallocate the remaining funds to schemes that can be completed by the end of this financial year. Members agreed that they would want to reallocate funds. As a result John Kingsbury proposed an amendment to tabled revised recommendation 10 (iv), as set out below. This was seconded by Will Forster.

Some of the feasibility studies in the programme would still be able to be carried out as they are revenue based.

It was noted that if there was no budget for the parking review, then funds for this could be drawn down from the surplus CPZ account.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

RESOLVED:

- i. To approve the work programme for 2010/11 as set out in the report and Annex B and that the schemes are progressed within the available budgets and resources.
- ii. that all statutory processes required to implement the programme are undertaken including the advertising of any traffic orders or notices.
- iii. that the management of the 2010/11 Devolved LTP and Local Allocation budgets be vested with the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and where appropriate the relevant Local Members.
- iv. That the management of the 2009/10 Devolved LTP and Local Allocation budgets be vested with the Local Highways Manager in consultation with members of the Committee at an informal meeting should it become necessary to further review the budget priorities for 2009/10.

11/10 Climate Change Fund Bid [Item 12]

The Chairman asked that item 12 be taken before item 11.

Carolyn Rowe introduced the report which included two bids for the Climate Change Fund, one from Oaktree School and one from Cycle Woking.

Members agreed that both bids were good, but wanted to put forward the bid they thought would have the better chance of success.

Ben Carasco proposed that the committee put forward the bid from Oaktree School as it fulfilled the criteria and would be a good example of best practice. This was seconded by John Kingsbury.

Members agreed that the Cycle Woking bid was also a good request, but thought that there would probably be an alternative way of funding this bid.

RESOLVED:

That the Local Committee would submit the bid from the Oaktree School as its application to the Climate Change Fund.

12/10 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocations [Item 11]

In accordance with Standing Order 61 Cllr Bryan Cross and Cllr Richard Wilson declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 11.

A revised item 11 was tabled at the meeting.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

RESOLVED:

- i. The following allocations from the Members allocation budget for 2009/10:
 1. Changing facility at Horsell School - £2,560
 2. Horsell Village Hall - £1,497
 3. Woking High Litter Team - £672
 4. Kids Out - £500
 5. Pyrford Primary School pond - £1,500
 6. Mayford Village entry signs - £2,870
 7. Kitchen equipment - Marjorie Richardson Centre - £300
 8. Shelter at Westfield Primary School - £6,250
 9. Byfleet Village Football Club - £2,000
 10. West Byfleet Junior School garden - £2,145
 11. Birchmere Scouts Campsite – to defer until July 2010
 12. St Hugh's Key Stage 2 Garden - £4,965
 13. Oaktree School Eco-Classroom – to defer until July 2010
 14. Woking United Sports Club - £4,000
 15. Woking and Maybury Sports Club - £4,000
 16. Woking Hospice – £2,500 plus any underspend as of 31/03/10. Other items deferred until July 2010
- ii. Noted that there were no allocations approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 22 October 2009 and 3 February 2010.
- iii. Agreed that any money returned as unspent before the end of the financial year should be allocated to Woking Hospice.

13/10 Update [Item 13]

The update was noted.

14/10 Forward Programme [Item 14]

Members asked for regular reports on services for young people at future meetings. As part of a report on Localism, members asked officers to look at the number of formal meetings per year, and how the local committee would address a possible increase in workload.

RESOLVED

The forward programme as set out in the report with the addition of the following reports for July 2010:

- i. Services for Young People
- ii. Road Safety
- iii. Localism, if it is an appropriate time

15/10 Exclusion of the Press and Public [Item 15]

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 10.00pm]

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Annex 1

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

3 February 2010

1. Question from: Cllr Mohammed Bashir

1. Regarding controlled parking zones in Woking:
 - a. Some of the local shops on Omega Road like Khan General Store, Light and Sound Centre, 786 Hair Salon and A One Tandoori don't have the 20 minutes free parking bays outside their shops. I would like to ask that why these retail outlets do not have the facility for 20 minutes free parking?
 - b. There are two types of controlled parking in operation, some of the parking zones are controlled only for two hours and some are controlled for the whole day. Can you please advise that why these zones are treated differently and what is the criteria of determining the time factor?

Answer from Jack Roberts, Engineer, Parking Strategy and Implementation

- a. A review of each Controlled Parking Zone in the Woking borough is being undertaken, and anomalies on the ground are being noted. The parking bays outside the Ahmed cash and carry, the Light and Sound Centre, and the Khan General Store should have the 20-minute free parking restriction, but are currently missing the appropriate signs and road markings. We will arrange for these works to be carried out with the implementation of the Woking parking review.

The parking bays at the side of the A1 Tandoori, which currently have the voucher and permit parking, will be considered for 20 minute free parking once the corrective lining and signing works mentioned above have been completed.

- b. The outer Controlled Parking Zones which are controlled for 2 hours of the day (09.30 – 11.30 Monday to Friday) were designed to prevent commuter parking whilst causing as little disruption to local residents as possible. The town centre CPZ, which is controlled throughout the day (08.30-18.00 Monday to Saturday), is designed to control traffic flow throughout working hours.

2. Question from: Tony Dell and Paul Butler on behalf of a large number of concerned residents in the ward

What are the local committee members views on investigating the feasibility of a highway improvement scheme in Rydens Way, Old Woking and adding

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

a suitably designed scheme to the local transport plan with immediate effect?

Answer from County Councillor Liz Bowes

In response to the above question, Division Member, C/Cllr Liz Bowes has asked for Officer advice, which follows:

The carriageway, and the band of three metres reserved as highway land adjacent to the carriageway has been the responsibility of SCC as Highway Authority since the middle section transferred back to the original land owner under pre-emption rights in 1999.

Both the South East Plan (2009) and Regional Transport Strategy (2003) identify Woking as a regional hub, and the promotion of schemes, in line with Surrey's Local Transport Plan objectives, that facilitate improved functioning of the hub can be considered.

The width of the carriageway at Rydens Way is narrow and this can cause problems for the public bus service. A road-widening scheme that could demonstrate a benefit for the improved functioning of public transport would accord with Surrey's LTP objectives.

The Divisional member did nominate a scheme, of this type, as part of Woking's recent LTP scheme review and subject to approval by Committee a scheme based on carriageway widening is listed on Wokings LTP programme for future consideration.

3. Question from: Miss Shabbana Jamil

What is the current position in respect of the additional night time taxi ranks in Chertsey Road that the Surrey County Council had previously announced would be created, when will they be implemented as this would improve the issue of congestion by eliminating unauthorised vehicles in the area, related to this issue is that of access, specifically referring to the installation of the bollards and their usage, despite their installation, they are very rarely used and so current users have become accustomed to free access, can we anticipate future restrictions in respect of access, how will the public be made aware of this especially in light of closures on 16 and 17 January 2010?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

Some night-time taxi ranks are already in place in Chertsey Road; these are adjacent to Dukes Court and are day-time pay and display parking bays. Similar bays already exist in Church Street East, adjacent to Victoria Way Car Park.

The three LOADING ONLY bays are also due to be altered to become overnight taxi ranks. Woking Borough Council has made the necessary designation order for these ranks. Surrey County Council has to amend the signing and bay markings to allow the bays to be used by taxis but we do not yet know when this work will be undertaken.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

With regard to the bollards at the junction of Chertsey Road and The Broadway, their provision and operation was instigated by Surrey Police's Inspector for Woking at the time (2005). After a considerable amount of work by Surrey County Council Officers, they were installed and made operational in January 2007. However, they were rarely, if ever, used by the police for their intended use of maintaining public order. The Surrey Police Inspector who promoted the use of these bollards moved on to other duties and his replacement indicated that there was no longer any intention to use them. Consequently, the power supply to the bollards was isolated and the BT line that was required to communicate with them, to raise and lower them, was disconnected as the line rental was costing SCC several hundred pounds a year. No funds have ever been available to remove them, so the bollards have remained in the lowered position ever since.

SCC has no plans to recommence the use of these bollards or introduce any other form of restricted access for public order or any other reason.

It should be noted that if the bollards were used, the shared use loading / taxi ranks in Chertsey Road could not be used, as the Traffic Regulation Order that allows the bollards to be used and prohibit vehicular entry into that part of Chertsey Road does not give specific exemption for taxis.

Surrey Police have confirmed that the road was closed by them on 16 / 17 January in accordance with the provisions of The Surrey County Council Chertsey Road Woking (Prohibition of Traffic) Order 2005.

4. Question from: Mrs R Freeman

Can you tell me what is happening to the **451** bus - Kingston- Byfleet-Staines. In the original leaflet - **your buses, your say** it says the **451** will be withdrawn. Now on the council newsletter there is no mention of the **451**.

Do I assume from this that the decision has already been decided? Not much consultation there!

This means the people of **Byfleet** are cut off from Addlestone, Chertsey, Thorpe Park, Staines and many other places. The bus company never issued passengers with a ticket on this route, if you have a pass, so how can they know how many people rely on it?

I have been on this bus, a number of times when people have had to stand, so how can it be justified to cut it out?

The 437 is only going to run once every two hours, this is useless for any connection as suggested in your leaflet.

The only solution is for the **446** to be diverted into Byfleet. Is this possible?

Please do not take the **Byfleet Peter bus - 1** service away. Parking at St.Peters hospital is impossible therefore we need a bus from Byfleet.

I thought the idea was to get people out of their cars and onto the buses. Byfleet has a very large population living here, many without cars or too old to drive, how are they going to get around?

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Answer from Laurie James, Transport for Surrey, Environment and Infrastructure

Service 451 was listed for withdrawal in its current form in the published material relating to the Bus Review, although parts of it were covered by other amended services. The proposal was included as a basis for an opportunity to respond by the travelling public and no final decisions have been taken.

Although holders of Over 60/Disabled Persons Free Travel Permits are not given a ticket, the driver should record their journey on his ticket machine. Such data has been used to establish the average number of persons using each service.

Similarly, the initial proposals suggested a two-hourly service from Byfleet to Addlestone. Comments have been received as part of the Consultation regarding the future ability of Byfleet residents to reach Addlestone, Chertsey and Staines by bus.

All Consultation responses are to be summarised in a report to Cabinet on 2 March. The new cost for the proposed revised bus network should be available for a further Cabinet meeting on 18 May, after which the final new pattern of services can be published, for operation from 28 August 2010. It is likely that the network will be modified from that published for the Consultation exercise, in an attempt to take on board some of the issues expressed, but remaining affordable and sustainable in terms of Council funding support.

The Peterbus service is administered by the Ashford-St. Peter's Hospital Trust and any decision over that service would be for the Trust to take.

5. Question from: Anne-Marie Barker

I note that Surrey finally appears to be taking the issue of potholes seriously and has allocated an extra £500,000 to tackling the problem. How is this money to be allocated across the 11 boroughs and within Woking?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

Surrey County Council has taken immediate action to tackle the increase in potholes following the recent severe weather by investing an additional £½ million in pothole repairs. The council aims to fix at least 200 potholes a day to tackle problems caused by the longest cold spell in 30 years.

The County Council always take the issue of carriageway repairs seriously and undertook a similar exercise by implementing a substantial programme of pothole repairs following the snow that occurred back in February 2009.

Urgent repairs are being dealt with first before the focus switches to 'A' roads that carry the most traffic. Teams will move on to other roads after that. The distribution of funding is by need rather than district but, as can be seen by the repair works currently underway, roads in the Woking Borough will receive a fair share of the budget.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

6. Question from: Grahame Osborn

On 8th July last year I submitted a petition of 951 signatures to the Local Committee requesting the installation of a pedestrian crossing outside the Marist School West Byfleet on the Old Woking Road, since then I have obtained a further 240 signatures the vast majority from local residents. There is overwhelming local support for this crossing, costing in the region of £80,000, SCC have announced on their web site that they have allocated an additional half a million pounds for pot hole repairs following the recent bad weather. Bearing in mind that there have been at least 2 further accidents on this stretch of road, could the Committee members please advise which of these two schemes they feel should have priority?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager following consultation with the Divisional Member

Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to maintain the highway and prioritises its maintenance work to minimise risk to users of the highway and its own exposure to risk. Where an increase in defects arises additional funding is essential to assist the County Council to further manage those risks and help retain the structure of its highways. The reinstatement of potholes is a necessary requirement and works of this nature are not directly comparable to those, which seek to improve the highway.

A report to the Committee, at its last meeting, summarised the current provision at The Marist School for the crossing of School Children. The County Divisional member has since requested a scheme, for the provision of a controlled crossing, be added to the Woking Local Transport Plan programme for future funding consideration. This now exists along side any possible provision already secured through a planning agreement.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Annex 2

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)

MEMBER QUESTIONS 3 February 2010

1. Question from Cllr Richard Wilson, Woking Borough Council

Residents in Hatfield Close, West Byfleet, are deeply concerned about the on-going risk of flooding to their properties due to the collapsed highways surface water drainage pipe along Parvis Road (A245). In periods of prolonged heavy rainfall the close and front gardens are flooded. The drainage ditch to the rear of the properties also becomes saturated and overflows into gardens.

When will Thames Water be replacing the already identified length of collapsed pipe?

If the answer is not in 2010/2011, what pressure can SCC bring to bear on Thames Water to bring these works forward?

In the meantime what practical measures can SCC Highways undertake to minimise this risk?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

At a site meeting with Thames Water on 10 November 2009, it was confirmed that further major repair or pipe replacement work was required to restore the efficiency of their carrier. They had not yet completed their camera surveys, but indicated that there could be up to 500m of old concrete piping to replace, and that constituted a major scheme that would need to be agreed, funded and programmed from their central offices. We and the MP, Sir Humphrey Malins, were told that we would be advised accordingly. No further information has been received to date. This office will assist in chasing for an update.

In the meantime, Surrey County Council arranged for a specialised jetting crew to visit on 1 December. They cleared the gullies and pipes leading into the main carrier, and identified that there were some tree roots blocking the outfall of one gully connection into the open ditch to the west of Dartnell Avenue. However, the pipe from the gully at the junction with Hatfield Close was clear.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

That ditch acts a soakaway for any overflow that the main carrier can't cope with, and in normal circumstances should be dry. However, SCC intend to have it cleared to maximise its capacity, and to divert the outlet of the blocked pipe away from the offending young oak tree.

In addition, it was noted that two of the four gullies in Parvis Road upstream from Dartnell Avenue are side inlets, which are more readily blocked by debris than conventional gullies. We intend to replace them when funding is available. This will help to collect water before it washes into the junction, but still relies on the main carrier to be working properly.

The flooding coming from the ditch at the rear of the affected properties is not a Highways asset, and may be private or Borough Council maintained. However, it appears to run back to the same main surface water carrier, in which case it has the same dependency on it as the gullies.

2. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

Please could the Local Highways Manager update:

- a. Progress on items i, iv, and v in the motion relating to Warbury Lane (item 13) at this Committee's meeting on the 22 October.
- b. His answers to the questions put to the Committee by Mr. Ross Daniel and myself at the Committee meeting on the 22nd of October.

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

- a. In respect of the road markings at Warbury Lane a programme of road markings has been issued to our contractors and subject to satisfactory weather conditions works were planned to commence this week from Monday 1st February 2010 and we have requested that Warbury Lane is attended to, this week.

We are still waiting for a costing from our contractor, on the order issued, for the maintenance of the signs, bollards and vegetation removal. A decision was made not to reinstatement the bollards until completion of the road markings as access would be required. We will seek to reinstate the bollards as soon as possible after completion of the road markings using the Community Gang if necessary.

There will be an agenda item at the Surrey Heath Local Committee on the 18th February 2010 to update members. This will outline the issues and varying opinions raised through the Local Committee (Woking).

- b. A programme of road markings has been issued to our contractors and subject to satisfactory weather conditions works were planned to commence this week from Monday 1st February 2010. The works to the zebra crossings at The Broadway and High Street, Knaphill should be completed this week.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

3. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

Is the list of salt/grit bins for the public to use in Woking that is given on the SCC website correct and complete, and can it be reviewed and bins added in the light of public comments and requests during the recent snow and ice?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

The list of salt bins was correct when put on the SCC website. We are aware that some have been damaged, one has been moved (not by ourselves), and at least one has disappeared.

There are other bins out on the network that have been supplied by other agencies, such as the Borough Council, local residents and private businesses, that are not maintained or filled from Surrey Highways resources.

There have been many enquiries relating to existing bins and requests for additional ones. These are being collected, and there will be a review before the next winter maintenance season.

However, the general policy for many years has been to provide bins only in critical locations, such as near a health centre or school, or on a steep hill that is not on a primary gritting route. Each request is considered according to its merits, but especially given the restrictions in funding that have recently been promulgated, it is unlikely that there will be many additions to the existing list.

4. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

During the January snowfall:

- a. Surrey County Council deployed teams to help the Borough and District Councils' attempts to clear the footways of the county's Town Centres. Two teams were sent to Guildford, one team to Staines and another to the East of the county.

Why did Surrey County Council not deploy any of these teams to assist in Woking Borough Council's efforts to clear Woking Town Centre's footpaths?

Did Woking Borough Council request support from Surrey County Council to clear the footways?

- b. Why was both the roadway and footpaths of Station Approach Woking not gritted before or cleared during the January snowfall?

Routes to railway stations are classed as part of the Priority 2 Network, however those routes are only treated once Priority 1 roads are treated.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

What is the purpose of classing routes as Priority 2 if the County Council does not have the resources to clear the Priority 1 Network - therefore leaving any other route untreated?

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

a. Surrey County Council (Surrey Highways) and Woking Borough Council have a long-established understanding regarding snow clearance.

Basically, the Borough uses its manpower (eg street cleansing operatives) to clear and grit the pedestrian areas of the town centre and routes in from public transport and car parks as a priority.

Surrey Highways uses its resources (eg Community Gang) to visit identified sites in the outlying areas, and there is liaison between the two organisations to try to ensure that all locations listed on the winter maintenance plan are covered. We also try to address customer requests as far as we can.

There is arrangement whereby the Borough can replenish their grit supply by request from SCC stocks, which they did, until operations were curtailed when the restrictions on salt use were imposed.

In the January snowfall, it was considered by the central Winter Maintenance Team that, thanks to the efforts of the Borough both in the town and the villages, its own resources could be deployed to areas in greater need. Nevertheless, two gangs were put into Woking over the weekend to grit routes to secondary schools who had 'A' level exams starting on the Monday.

b. One section of Station Approach, between the new flats and the Station forecourt, is privately maintained.

However, with reference to 4a above, the Borough Council did grit some routes for pedestrians from the Station into the town, and from the car park in Heathside Road (and of course the subway under the railway was not affected).

As a primary route, the carriageway in Station Approach would have been gritted prior to the snowfall, but after salt restrictions were imposed, only that section of the road on the A320 one way system could be included.

5. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

It would be appreciated if the progress on the feasibility study re Abbey Road could be advised. The issue was raised at the October 2009 meeting.

Answer from Marc Samways, Surrey County Council's Local Highways Manager for Woking

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

A review of traffic conditions in Abbey Road has yet to commence but it remains on our schedule of works for investigation in the near future.

6. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Feedback from Countyliner on the usage of the bus service through Horsell, replacing the no 28 bus could be advised

Answer from Laurie James, Transport for Surrey, Environment and Infrastructure

Countryliner report that usage of bus service 97 (which part-replaced the 28 in Horsell) has been disappointing and they cannot any longer sustain it on a commercial basis. They proposed to withdraw it from 8 February but SCC has offered some modest financial support so it may continue, at least until September 2010, when we intend to review/change bus services to the north of Woking as part of the Bus Review. Also from 8 February, the Countryliner bus route will be extended to serve Knaphill village and Sainsburys, in response to local requests from Horsell and a revised timetable will apply. This is about to be advertised locally.

7. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

I would be grateful if you could let me have the following information regarding a number of matters concerning the Highways in Woking:

- a. Can you please let me know the powers that SCC have with relation to directing when and at what times 'utility companies' can carry out significant road works on Highways?
- b. Can you please let me know why SCC did not insist that the Contractor carrying out the work under Woking Arch:
 - at night
 - 24 hrs a day until finished
- c. When can residents and visitors to Woking expect that the work under Woking Arch will be completed and the diversion removed?

Answer from Nia Griffiths, Streetworks Manager

- a. Section 56 of the New Roads and Streetworks Act 1991 (as amended by the Traffic Management Act 2004) enables the authority to serve a Direction on an undertaker, setting out the dates and times during which proposed or ongoing works may be carried out, if the authority believes that the works will cause 'serious disruption'.

The Direction is served by the authority when the advance notification of proposed works is received by the authority.

- b. A formal direction was not served in relation to the works at Victoria Arch, as an agreement for 24 hour working for the main section of the Southern Gas

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

Networks scheme (ie works directly beneath the railway bridge) had already been reached at planning meetings before any notice was submitted. Extended working hours (7am to 10pm) were agreed for the rest of the scheme.

We have received assurances from SGN that 24 hour working has taken place up until 31st January, when the laying of the new gas main beneath the bridge was completed, and until 10pm on 1st February. Any evidence to the contrary would be welcomed.

Works will continue on extended hours for approximately 4 – 5 weeks, but the lane closure will be swapped to the opposite carriageway in about two weeks time. There will also be short periods of 24 hour working within this timescale, where connections are made that require excavations across the carriageway. All of these works have been carefully planned to accommodate the SCC pedestrian crossing improvement works that are also being carried out at the same time.

- c. The lane closure will be removed in full in 5 weeks time (by 12th March 2010). There will still be some connection works to follow by SGN, but these will all be localised with minimal traffic management required.

Members are also reminded that there is still a significant programme of works planned for the Woking town centre area (as detailed in the response to the Committee in October 2009), including development related works on behalf of SCC. This continues to be planned in order to minimise the impact on residents and visitors as far as possible.

8. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

Would the LHM please advise:

- a. how long 'salt and grit' can be stored for before its becomes ineffective to be used on roads and paths?
- b. What is SCC's policy on the gritting of roads and approaches to Schools and Community Centres?
- c. On how many days, between 1st January 2010 and 25th January 2010, were the following gritted:
 - roads in Woking Town Centre
 - 'A' roads in the Borough
 - roads and approaches to Schools in the Borough of Woking

Answer from Simon Mitchell, Asset Planning Group, Surrey County Council

- a. Provided salt is stored in a dry environment it has an indefinite life, once exposed to moisture its structure will change with crystals joining together to form a crust together with leaching. Ideally salt should be recycled every two years, following Surrey's investment in salt bars the cycle of replacement can be extended.

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

b. Within the policy the Priority 2 salting network includes for main access route to large education establishments (500+ pupils). In the event of snow the operation will be expanded to include access to other schools but only once the priority 2 network is cleared.

c. Details of salting runs below

Jan-10	01/01/10 10GMS	All Primary routes @ 6pm
	02/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @ 6pm
	03/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @ 3.30pm
	03/01/10 15GMS	Followed by secondary routes @ 9pm
	04/01/10 10GMS	All Primary routes @ 7pm
	05/01/10 10GMS	All Primary routes @ 2pm
	05/01/10 15GMS	A roads with ploughs @ 7pm
	06/01/10 15GMS	A roads with ploughs @ 12am midnight
	06/01/10 15GMS	A roads with ploughs @ 3.30am
Winter Event 9	06/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @7am with Ploughs A Roads only
Winter Event 9	06/01/10 15GMS	Hand gritting
Winter Event 9	06/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @10am with Ploughs A Roads only
Winter Event 9	06/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @1pm with Ploughs A Roads only
	06/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 7pm with Ploughs
	07/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 12am midnight with Ploughs
	07/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @ 3.30am with Ploughs
Winter Event 10	07/01/10 N/A	Refilling Salt Bins and Footpaths
	07/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 7pm with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
	08/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 4am with Ploughs Surrey Mix A roads
Winter Event 11	08/01/10 N/A	Footway and Salt bins
	08/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 6.30pm with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
	08/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only @ 12 Midnight with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
Winter Event 12	09/01/10 N/A	School footways
	09/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only + Specials @ 6.30pm with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
	09/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only + Specials @ 12 Midnight with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
	10/01/10 15GMS	A Roads only + Specials @ 4am with Ploughs Surrey Mix A Roads
Winter Event 13	10/01/10 N/A	School footways
	10/01/10 15GMS	All Primary routes @ 6.30pm with Ploughs Surrey Mix
Winter Event 14	11/01/10 N/A	Hand gritting
	11/01/10 20GMS	All Primary routes @ 7pm with Ploughs Surrey Mix
Winter Event 15	12/01/10 N/A	Hand gritting Sand

Draft to be agreed on 7 July 2010

	12/01/10	10GMS	A Roads only @ 7pm
Winter Event 16	13/01/10	N/A	Hand gritting Sand
	13/01/10	10GMS	All Primary routes @ 7pm with Ploughs White Salt
	14/01/10	10GMS	All Primary routes @ 4am with Ploughs White Salt
Winter Event 17	14/01/10	N/A	Footway and Salt bins
Winter Event 18	15/01/10	N/A	Footway and Salt bins
	15/01/10	10GMS	Pesalt Hoggs Back and BVR only
	17/01/10	10GMS	A Roads only + Specials @
	17/01/10	10GMS	A Roads only + Specials @ 7pm
	20/01/10	20GMS	All Primary routes @ 4am