

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)  
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 7 July 2010  
at  
Surrey County Council's Offices, Quadrant Court, Woking

Members present:

**Surrey County Council**

Mr Ben Carasco (Horsell) – Chairman  
Mr Mohammed Amin (Woking Central)  
Mrs Liz Bowes (Pyrford)  
Mrs Elizabeth Compton (St Johns and Brookwood)  
Mr Will Forster (Woking South)  
Mr Geoff Marlow (The Byfleets)  
Mrs Diana Smith (Knaphill)

**Woking Borough Council**

Cllr John Kingsbury (St Johns and Hook Heath) – Vice Chairman  
Cllr Tony Branagan (Horsell West)  
Cllr Bryan Cross (Goldsworth East)  
Cllr Rob Leach (Goldsworth East)  
Cllr Glynis Preshaw (Brookwood)  
Cllr Derek McCrum (Kingfield and Westfield)  
Cllr Richard Wilson (West Byfleet)

The meeting was preceded by a public engagement session. The notes of this session are set out in Annex 1 of these minutes.

---

**Part One – In Public**

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

**16/10 Apologies for absence [Item 1]**

Cllr Mohammed Bashir sent his apologies and Cllr Rob Leach acted as his substitute.

**17/10 Minutes of last meeting held on 3 February 2010 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting of the local committee (Woking) held on 3 February 2010 were agreed and signed.

**18/10 Declarations of interests [Item 3]**

In accordance with Standing Order 61 Mrs Diana Smith, Cllr Glynis Preshaw and Mr Ben Carasco declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 4c relating to Basingstoke Canal.

**19/10 Petitions [Item 4]**

**Petition 1 [4a]**

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mr Ajmil Latif urging Surrey County Council to undertake carriageway resurfacing works in Maybury and Sheerwater. The petition received 700 signatures.

A response to the petition was provided at the meeting. Mr Latif commented that he was pleased with the response, that funding was now available for carriageway resurfacing for Walton Road and work was scheduled to be carried out.

**Petition 2 [4b]**

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mr Kevin Davis which received 209 signatures. The petition urged Surrey County Council to remove the pedestrian/ cycle island located just to the north of A322 Brookwood crossroads.

Mr Davis felt the location of the island did not give proper consideration to the safety of cyclists, pedestrians or drivers and gave examples which he felt demonstrated safety was being compromised. He said the island caused congestion which had a knock on effect back to the traffic junction by Sainsbury's which meant vehicles were cutting through the back roads to avoid the island. He was concerned that the rephrasing of the traffic lights recommended in the officer's report would cause havoc and questioned the cost and need for solar power on the junction. He was particularly concerned that Surrey County Council officers had taken the decision to install the junction without adequate consultation with local residents and concerned parties.

Paul Fishwick responded to the points made by Mr Davis and explained that the island formed part of the cycle improvements along the length of the Basingstoke Canal and was located on the desire line where the north side towpath is 'broken' by the A322 Bagshot Road. He detailed the surveys which had taken place at peak times which had shown that the majority of people were using the crossing and clarified that consultation had taken place with key parties including Surrey Police, Woking Cycle Users Form and Woking Cycle Forum.

## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

He said the recommendations made in the report following the safety audit which involved rephrasing the traffic signals would help to improve the junction. Solar panels would be used to illuminate the 'Keep left' sign. He said the use of solar power would be a more appropriate option than putting in cabling.

Members of the committee were invited to clarify points with the petitioner. Cllr Preshaw was concerned that there were inaccuracies in the officer's report. She thought that Surrey Police had raised concerns that HGVs would not be able to turn out of the junction (reference paragraph 6 of the report) and that it was not actually Surrey Police policy to consider the re-phrasing of the traffic flows (paragraph 7).

Cllr Wilson requested that in future a map and supporting documentation be provided to help explain the complexities of the issue.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that there was obviously concern and disquiet about the proposals and felt that the committee was not currently in a position to make a decision. He suggested that a site visit was arranged and that the current traffic signalling was kept in place until members had had the opportunity to consider the proposals further.

Diana Smith was concerned that if the decision was delayed the recommendations from the safety audit would not be implemented. Mr Fishwick confirmed that it was not always possible to implement the recommendations made by these audits immediately.

Geoff Marlow requested that members stop referring to the island as 'Fishwick Island'.

Members deferred the decision and asked officers to prepare a full response for consideration at the local committee on 20 October 2010.

### **Petition 3 [4c]**

In accordance with Standing Order 61, Mrs Diana Smith, Mr Ben Carasco and Cllr Glynis Preshaw declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 4c.

In accordance with Standing Order 65 a petition was presented by Mr Michael Peel which received 176 signatures. The petition urged Surrey County Council to remove the cycle signs on the Basingstoke Canal through Brookwood and including Brookwood Park.

Mr Peel said that 'a one size fits all' approach to the signage was not appropriate in this location which is a SSSI and suggested members look at the petition which includes photographs demonstrating the visual impact of this signage. He suggested that the local school might be approached to get the school children involved in designing signage. He was concerned that more signage was being suggested to publicise the 9mph cycle speed limit and noted that the CPRE were calling for the reduction of man made clutter in the countryside.

## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

Mr Fishwick confirmed that 9mph was approximately three times the speed of someone walking. Similar signs have been put up in Spelthorne to control cyclists speeds and had been successful. These signs would be attached to the existing wooden signposts.

Members of the committee were invited to clarify points with the petitioner. Diana Smith asked whether the petitioner saw any value in implementing the 9mph signage. Mr Peel replied that local people were not aware this had been proposed and the recommendations needed to be looked at properly.

Will Forster requested clarification as to whether it was possible to implement smaller signs. Mr Fishwick confirmed that it was.

Cllr Preshaw said that the local resident who complained had asked to see an example of the amended signs but had not been sent one yet. Mr Fishwick confirmed the resident had been provided with the dimensions but that it was not possible to reproduce an exact replica of the signage.

Members deferred the decision and asked officers to prepare a full response for consideration at the local committee on 20 October 2010 in the light of comments made.

### **20/10 Written Public Questions [Item 5]**

Five written public 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 2: In response to a supplementary question from Cllr Barker, Marc Samways agreed that the Casualty Reduction Working Group would consider the sequencing of traffic signals on the junction of Arthurs Bridge Road/Well Lane and Lockfield Drive and whether the carriageway could be reduced to a single lane at the junction.

Question 3: In response to a supplementary question from Mrs Manton, Andy Lobban, Senior Maintenance Engineer, agreed that the damaged metal bollards on Warbury Lane would be straightened and sleeved.

Question 4: In response to a supplementary question from Ms Morales, Cllr Bowes advised that Mrs Morales should report her concerns about Surrey County Council's skip hire fees to cabinet and speak to Mrs Bowes outside the meeting.

### **21/10 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]**

Nine 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 2: In response to Diana Smith regarding the replacement of bollards on Warbury Lane, it was confirmed that the bollards would

## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

continue to be maintained but noted that the committee cannot commit to open ended funding for replacements.

Question 4: Will Forster asked for a written response to be sent to him regarding the question of enforcement of no entry restrictions for vehicles (access should be for taxis and buses only) by the Albion Square Canopy outside Woking station, raised in the open public question time.

Question 5: Cllr Wilson requested that Streetworks apply proper monitoring to works like the Thames Water repairs to the A245.

Question 6: In response to Cllr Cross' request for an update on the resurfacing of Lockfield Drive, Marc Samways confirmed that the Arthurs Bridge Road junction is due to be resurfaced on 19 July and money from the additional funding for damage caused by the severe winter weather might be available for further resurfacing works.

Mr Samways agreed to review the response sent to Cllr Cross from one of the Community Highways Officers.

Question 7: Cllr McCrum requested that members drive down Bonsey Lane before the next meeting of the local committee.

### **Executive Items for decision**

#### **22/10 Local Committee Public Engagement Protocol, Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group and Member Representation on External Bodies [Item 7]**

Carolyn Rowe, North West Area Director, presented this report which sets out a local protocol to deal with public engagement with the local committee (Woking) for the year 2010/2011. Surrey County Council's standing orders outline the protocols for committees, but have agreed local committees can make their own arrangements for handling matters related to public engagement.

The report also outlines terms of reference for the Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group and notes member representatives on external groups.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that it was important to have two borough representatives comprising one conservative and one liberal democrat on the Civil Parking Enforcement Working Group and that these would be decided outside the meeting.

### **RESOLVED:**

Public Questions:

- (i) that the committee will offer an opportunity for public engagement and informal questions before each formal local committee meeting commences (subject to annual review);

## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

- (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 and local businesses, any young person under 18 who lives within the 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;
- (vii) Public speaking on Rights of Way applications  
that the Committee notes the County Council's standing orders concerning public participation on Rights of Way applications, which also apply to local committees (outlined at Annex 1);

### Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group:

- (viii) To establish a Civil Parking Enforcement joint member working group, and appoint Geoff Marlow and Liz Bowes as the county council members to the group.
- (iv) To note the following Member representatives:
  - a. The Woking Partnership - Ben Carasco with Diana Smith as substitute
  - b. Youth Lead – Will Forster
  - c. Woking Cycle Forum – Will Forster

## **23/10 Cycle Woking – Proposed Schemes [Item 8]**

Paul Fishwick introduced this item and asked members to agree the schedule of cycling town schemes for implementation during the 2010/11 financial year.

It was noted that Cycle England funding would be paying for the work under Victoria Arch, and this needs to be spent by 31 March 2011. Any remedial work that needs to be carried under the arch by the Utilities would be co-ordinated with any Cycle Woking work agreed. In response to Cllr Cross, Paul Fishwick confirmed that there had been no serious accidents under the arch in the last 5 years.

Members were concerned that the options outlined in Annex A on the planned improvements to Victoria Arch, which was deferred from local committee 3 February 2010, still did not provide a suitable option and asked Mr Fishwick to provide further information and clarification. Members were also concerned about the cost of the scheme.

Members were concerned that the consultation conducted for Annex C, to make the experimental order within the town centre allowing cycling (dual use with pedestrians) permanent was not sufficiently extensive. They expressed concern about the impact on residents and asked Mr Fishwick to review options for further consultation. It was noted that the Deputy Mayor had received an email from the Older Peoples Forum expressing their members concern.

Members felt uncomfortable making the decisions on Annex A and C at this time. Cllr Smith proposed that an additional formal meeting be organised in early September 2010 to consider decisions on Annexes A and C of the report. This was seconded by Cllr John Kingsbury and agreed by the committee.

It was noted in the report that at present there was no funding available for the Hermitage Road scheme attached as Annex F.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i) To defer the decision on the Victoria Arch Scheme attached as Annex A to an extraordinary local committee meeting in early September.
- ii) The York Road – De Lara Way scheme attached as Annex B.
- iii) To defer the decision on whether the experimental order is made permanent to formally allow cycling (dual use with pedestrians) within the town centre on designated streets as attached in Annex C to an extraordinary general meeting in early September
- iv) The planned Advanced Stop Lines at Walton Road/Monument Road and Eve Road/Monument Road attached as Annex D1 and D2.
- v) The A318 Oyster Lane Byfleet scheme attached as Annex E.
- vi) The Hermitage Road scheme near Five Oaks Close attached as Annex F
- vii) To delegate authority to the Cycle Woking Programme Manager in consultation with the local member and Chairman in order to proceed with traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver the projects agreed.

**24/10 Update of Local Highways Programme [Item 9]**

Marc Samways introduced the report which outlined the latest position in relation to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) Programme, provided specific details of maintenance works planned in the Woking area in 2010/11 and gave details on the budgets available to local committee.

## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

There would be no dedicated funding allocated to the ITS budget for 2010/11 and the budget for the footway programme had been cut by 50%.

£10k developer contribution from Waitrose would enable the progress of a number of outstanding waiting restrictions agreed in 2007/08 including the Chertsey Road taxi rank.

Will Forster expressed concern regarding the equalities implications of reducing the footways budget.

Will Forster asked for drainage works information to be circulated to all members.

Cllr Preshaw asked Mr Samways to provide clarification regarding what the £424,000 contingency budget which is being held centrally will be used for. Mr Samways replied this had still not been confirmed but it was likely that it would be used to cover overspend from 2009/10 and road safety audit work.

### **RESOLVED:**

#### **The Local Committee (Woking) agreed to:**

- a) Note the budgetary position in relation to the Integrated Transport Schemes programme (minor improvements programme).
- b) Note and approve the proposed local revenue spend, as detailed within the report
- c) Note the approved major maintenance, surface dressing, footway, local structural repair and drainage programmes.

### **25/10 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocation and Community Safety Funding [Item 10]**

A revised item 10 was tabled at the meeting.

Carolyn Rowe introduced the report which set out members allocation funding and community safety funding available to the local committee.

Members had a discussion around criteria for members allocation and the need to be responsible for the bids put forward and be able to justify the public expenditure.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed to:

- i. delegate responsibility for expenditure of the County Council's local community safety funding of £2,500 to the Area Director, and note that, as a domestic abuse outreach service is provided, a further £12,000 is contributed to the Community Safety Partnership funds



## Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

- ii. pool Members Allocation revenue and capital funds of £57,750 and £30,000 respectively for 2010/11
- iii. note the guideline limit of £3,000 per bid for both capital and revenue funds (with the possible exception of larger borough wide schemes)
- iv. agree 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
- v. The following allocations from the members allocation budget for 2010/11:
  - 1. Birchmere Scouts Campsite second water supply - £800
  - 2. Eco-Classroom - The Oaktree School - £3000
  - 3. Warren Farm Residents Association - £600
  - 4. Woking Malayalee Association - £1000
  - 5. Chobham and district lawn tennis club - £525
  - 6. Woking Community Action Fund - £813
  - 7. Woking Street Angels - £3000
  - 8. Link Leisure - £3750
  - 9. The Lightbox Gallery and Lets Read: Escape to Wonderland - £2870
  - 10. Cycle Woking – £5000
- vi. Noted the allocation under delegated powers for £879 for Burbank Community Home between the last local committee on 3 February 2010 and 7 July 2010.

### **26/10 Proposed Updated Speed Limit Policy for Consultation with local Committees [Item 11]**

Will Ward, Safer Smarter Travel Manager, presented this report which asked the local committee to consider and comment on a proposed amendment to Surrey County Council's policy on the setting of speed limits.

Mr Ward outlined the changes to the policy which are detailed in Annex A of the report and the extra powers for local committee.

The following comments were made by members which will be considered in the report to cabinet. Further comments from Members were requested by Friday 9 July 2010 for inclusion.

- 1. Members were concerned that they were being asked to agree a policy, that apart from the £100k revenue for which there were many competing priorities, there is no funding to implement any speed limit changes if they were to be agreed.
- 2. The local committee recognised that a change in speed limit by 10mph may only draw average speeds down by 2-3 mph.
- 3. Members would like to be able to make use of vehicle activated signs to help address local speeding issues and would appreciate knowing the resources available locally.

**27/10 Small Area Disadvantaged Fund [Item 12]**

Carolyn Rowe presented the information on the small area disadvantaged fund. She said that guidance on criteria and application forms are available from the Local Partnerships Team and highlighted that completed forms need to be returned to the team by 1 October 2010 to be considered at the Local Committee on 20 October 2010.

**Items for information/Update**

**28/10 Petition responses [Item 13]**

**a. Response to petition regarding Hermitage Road**

Kevin Patching, Surrey Highways Engineer, provided a full response to this petition urging Surrey County Council to install a zebra crossing on Hermitage Road in the vicinity of Five Oaks Close.

The local committee noted the report.

**b. Response to petition regarding Blackhorse Road junction with Saunders Lane and Heath House Road**

Mr Patching provided a full response to this petition urging Surrey County Council to significantly upgrade the traffic calming measures at the crossroads junction.

Cllr Preshaw noted that the speed limit in paragraph 1 of the report was wrong and should read 40mph. She asked if speed cameras could be installed at the junction; when better highlighting of the junction for drivers on Blackhorse Road would be implemented; the costing for bollards; and how frequently the vegetation will be cut back. Mr Patching agreed to follow up her enquiries and feedback to her outside of the meeting.

The local committee noted the report.

**c. Response to petition regarding Brewery Road**

Mr Patching provided a full response to this petition urging Surrey County Council to install traffic calming on the bend in Brewery Road.

Mr Patching agreed to inform Cllr Branagan and Ben Carasco where Brewery Road is on the ITS scheme.

The local committee noted the report.

**d. Update on petition requesting a pedestrian crossing outside The Marist Catholic Primary School**

Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

Mr Patching provided an update report on the current situation regarding the provision of a pedestrian crossing on the Old Woking Road, West Byfleet, outside The Marist Catholic Primary School.

The local committee noted the report.

#### **29/10 Update on topics for note (for information) [Item 14]**

Carolyn Rowe drew the committee's attention to the written update on a number of topics including Woking Library, Martyrs Lane Community Recycling Centre, the Bus Review and Farnborough Airport.

Cllr Kingsbury asked officers to ensure appropriate signage was in place on surrounding roads to alert residents to the closure of the Martyrs Lane Recycling Centre.

#### **30/10 Forward Programme**

Members noted the forward programme as set out in the report.

In addition, Cllr Preshaw asked that the head of highways and the cabinet member for transport be invited to the next committee to discuss quality control of utility works and highways, measures to explore transparency, communication with members and the public, target service levels, the responsibility for service delivery locally and a forward schedule of items that need to be considered by the committee. Ben Carasco agreed to write a formal letter to the head of highways and the cabinet member inviting them to the October meeting.

Cllr Preshaw also requested that the leader of Surrey County Council be invited to a future local committee meeting.

#### **31/10 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

---

**Chairman**

[The meeting ended at 11.10pm]

**Annex 1****Notes from Public Engagement Meeting****Public Open Questions [Public Engagement - Item 1]**

**Question 1:** Cllr Ann Roberts asked how the speed limit on the A245 Parvis Road, West Byfleet, could be enforced and when the proposed change to reduce the speed limit would be enforced. In response, Marc Samways agreed to speak to Surrey Police about enforcing speed limit restrictions and would feedback to Cllr Roberts. He noted that proposed change to the speed limit is on the ITS list but that it was unlikely to be progressed for the next three to four years until funding becomes available.

**Question 2:** Cllr Melanie Whitehand asked if the area outside the old Knaphill Library could be used to hold a remembrance day service. Carolyn Rowe agreed to look into this and provide a response to Cllr Whitehand outside the meeting.

**Question 3:** Kathryn Dodington expressed concern at the standard of signage on the sustrans cycle route on the Basingstoke Canal outside her house. In response, Paul Fishwick explained that a full response had been produced for the petition, Agenda Item 4c, which would be covered later in the meeting.

**Question 4:** Michael Peel asked why it took so long to get a response from Surrey County Council. He had raised a number of written queries with Paul Fishwick's manager and was still waiting for a response. Carolyn Rowe agreed to follow up this up with Mr Fishwick's manager.

**Question 5:** Mr Flemming reinforced the comment made by Mr Peel and said he had submitted a number of questions to Mr Fishwick which he was still waiting for a response to. Carolyn Rowe asked Mr Flemming to forward details of the questions he raised and the people who were copied into the correspondence to the local partnerships team and that the team would follow up the response on his behalf.

**Question 6:** Mr Christie asked why, one year after a lorry had destroyed a bus shelter in West Byfleet, it still had not been repaired. A written response to this question was provided to Geoff Marlow (Question 8, Annex 3)

**Question 7:** Mr Iqbal asked what could be done to enforce the no entry restrictions for vehicles (access should be for taxis and buses only) by the canopy at Woking station which was ignored by most members of the public. Marc Samways said that this was an enforcement issue and he would speak to PC Graham Cannon, Surrey Police.

**Question 8:** John Martin asked if Surrey County Council could review the Lockfield Drive/Well Lane junction to see if safety could be improved following the recent serious accident. Marc Samways said that this would be picked at the Casualty Reduction Working Group on 21 July and would

follow up with colleagues. A written response to this question was provided to Cllr Barker (Question 2, Annex 2).

**Question 9:** Pauline Marshall asked what priority would be given to gritting the main routes in Knaphill following the decision taken by the county council that A routes would be gritted first? Andy Lobban replied that the main routes in Knaphill are all primary routes (A roads) and would therefore receive priority for gritting in future episodes of severe winter weather.

### **Community Safety Annual Report [Public Engagement - Item 2]**

Carolyn Rowe introduced this report on behalf of The Safer Woking Partnership. She noted that the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership is now known as the Community Safety Partnership and that Sussex and Surrey Probation Trust had joined the partnership in April 2010. This brings the total number of statutory partners to seven.

Camilla Edmiston, Community Safety Officer, Woking Borough Council, provided an update on the work of the Safer Woking Partnership, key initiatives and its priorities for the coming year. Inspector Lynette Shanks, Surrey Police, provided up to date figures for crime in Woking and gave an overview of some of the police campaigns to tackle crime in the area. Surrey continues to be one of the safest county's in England with high levels of public confidence that the police and local council are dealing with anti social behaviour and crime issues.

Inspector Shanks also provided a report on Drive Smart, a joint enforcement and education campaign with Surrey County Council to tackle anti-social driving.

Cllr McCrum reported that the pedestrian crossing on Westfield Road was not working again despite the fact that it had been mended the previous day and expressed concern regarding the safety of children using the crossing to get to school. This is the fourth time he's reported a fault with the crossing. Mr Patching agreed to liaise with colleagues and get back to Cllr McCrum.

Cllr Wilson asked about the location for a police presence in the West Byfleet/Byfleet/Pryford area. Inspector Shanks confirmed that Byfleet Police Station will shut to achieve necessary cost savings but not until a suitable alternative has been found in the area. A number of possible options are being looked at. The police have been consulting with the public regarding where they would like to engage with the local team on a regular basis.

He also wanted reassurance that the local police team is working with colleagues in Runnymede and Elmbridge to exchange intelligence. Inspector Shanks reported that Woking was the only borough in Surrey to be completely surrounded by other Surrey boroughs and districts and had good intelligence links with them all.

Cllr Cross asked Inspector Shanks to look at the timing of the Goldsworth Park panel meeting which takes place at 1.00pm, rather than in an evening,

prohibiting attendance for some people and whether any panel meetings were due to take place in the town centre.

Cllr Whitehand (public question) expressed concern about the wording of a poster on the south side of Woking station on terrorist activity which she thought was alarmist. Inspector Shanks agreed to look into this but did not believe they were Police posters.

Cllr Kingsbury expressed concern that the St Johns speedwatch was not able to receive any training given the absence of the casualty reduction officer on longterm sick leave. Inspector Shanks reported that other officers were helping out with speedwatch activity in his absence and agreed to provide Cllr Kingsbury with information on training before the next meeting of the group scheduled for 26 July.

Cllr Branagan asked what contingency plans were in place to prevent fly tipping given the proposed closure of the Martyrs Lane Recycling Centre for refurbishment work. Camilla Edmiston said that this was a joint issue for the county and the borough and would feedback on what is proposed.

### **Fire and Rescue Annual Report [Public Engagement - Item 3]**

Alan Clark presented this report outlining the main activities of the Surrey Fire and Rescue Services team, who are based at Woking Fire Station, to reduce the risk from fire and road traffic collisions. This includes direct contact with the public, education programmes and campaigns. Woking continues to be a safe place to live with only 134 primary fires reported in the year April 2009-10.

Diana Smith asked for more information about the Youth Engagement Scheme (YES) and why seven people started the course and only one graduated. Mr Clark explained that this course had a particular set of issues and this was not usual. Normally 70% of participants complete the YES. It is a one week course, targeted at particularly vulnerable young people, taking place at Farnham fire station, 7.30am – 5.00pm. Participants learn about all of the things which a firefighter does.

Cllr Wilson asked for reassurance that the ongoing schools education programme was going to be continue in the future. Mr Clark said that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service valued the delivery of safety education to young people which was not only a good way of educating children, but also their parents.

Louise Morales (public question) expressed concern that 'Safe Drive, Stay Alive' was targeting at people already in education and suggested that there should be more focus on young people not in education or employment. Mr Clark explained that Lifecut was targeted at these people, and that there are several versions of the new Safe Drive Stay Alive video which is targeted at different groups.

**Trading Standards Annual Report [Public Engagement - Item 4]**

Keith Vivers introduced this item and outlined the key services provided by Trading Standards during 2009-10 and main activities in Woking which include a wide range of functions to protect residents, support reputable businesses, tackle rogue traders and contribute to the reduction of crime and disorder in the area.

Geoff Marlow asked why if 89% of residents felt safer in a No Cold Calling Zone there were no plans to extend this programme. Mr Vivers explained that they were looking at other ways to provide a more comprehensive service which would include the use of super stickers for residents to display. These would make it an offence to cold call at houses displaying this sticker.

Cllr Forster congratulated the service on the loan sharks campaign and asked for confirmation of the number for residents to call. Mr Vivers said via consumer direct on 08454 040506 or by contacting trading standards.

Cllr Branagan questioned whether the work on healthier food choices was directing resources in the right place and whether there were other priorities for the service. Mr Vivers said this work was part of a partnership arrangement with Primary Care Trusts and district council Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) in response to the Food Standards Agency Strategic Plan for healthier food. The scheme is voluntary and although the healthy eating is not a statutory requirement the work is carried out mainly at the same time as the statutory enforcement work and is shared with district council EHOs.

Cllr Leach asked whether the remit of the service extended to telephone scams. Mr Vivers confirmed that these were a national problem and would fit within the work of the regional fraud unit. Cllr Whitehand (public question) reported that she had been a victim of a telephone scam. Mr Vivers invited councillors and residents to contact the service with any examples and trading standards would look into them on their behalf.

**Monitoring of Utility Works on Surrey's Highway Network [Public Engagement - Item 4]**

Nia Griffiths introduced the report which sets out what Surrey County Council's Streetworks team can do to monitor and inspect works on the highway network by utility companies and their contractors. This includes ensuring that works are undertaken safely and to the required standard, that assets are properly protected and that minimum disruption to members of the public is caused. The processes to govern this are set out in the report.

She provided a paper with a summary of where major works are scheduled in Woking over the next quarter for members of the committee. This information will be provided to members on a quarterly basis in future. An e mail subscription service is available via the existing Surrey County Council Roadworks website for members of the public. A service which includes

specific information on temporary traffic lights is in the planning stages, and information on streetworks in neighbouring counties is available via an external website.

Cllr Cross said that he had contacted Surrey County Council regarding the utility works to Victoria arch. He was concerned about the length of time the works had taken and wondered why 24 hour working had not been implemented for the scheme and reported that workmen were often not there when they were due to be there and had logged details, but had received no response. He asked for reassurance that the council had taken this comments seriously and pointed out that the issue had been on the front page of the local paper twice.

Ms Griffiths agreed to look into why he didn't get a response and get back to him. She commented that they had not imposed 24 hour working as there were some residential properties in the surrounding area and it was felt that 7am – 10pm working was more appropriate. The Council has been looking at certain aspects of the scheme with the Traffic Manager and the overrun has been nominal, as it was agreed up front that the scheme was likely to take 13 weeks. The Council is now looking at how it can improve this utility's performance overall, but specifically regarding a number of other sites in Woking.

Mr Christie (public question) asked Ms Griffiths if she could take a tougher line and put appropriate monitoring in place for the works scheduled to take place on Camphill Road to prevent the public fury caused by the A245 works.

Ms Griffiths agreed to look at the works and spoil on the grass verge caused by the EDF works at Chobham Road and Lane End Drive in response to a public question from Mrs Marshall.

Mr Mir (public question) asked when then the last successful prosecution of a utility company by the county council was. She replied that she was not aware of any prosecutions, and there had been none since she had been in post. In order to bring a successful prosecution the county needs to be confident that it has all the appropriate legal information in place, and this is something which the service is keen to address in the future.

**e) Members Allocation 2009/10 Overview [Public Engagement - Item 5]**

A report setting out how the Members Allocation budget for 2009/10 was spent in Woking was presented to the committee.



**Annex 2****LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(WOKING)****WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS****7 July 2010****1. Question from: Richard Hennessy**

Residents are very concerned at the traffic volumes and speeds along Park Road, and the impact on daily environmental health. Speedwatch volunteers have been in operation for 21 months and reported over 1,400 vehicles travelling at excessive speeds. Park Road has been designated as an area of Special Residential Character, but this is being eroded by the traffic. We believe the situation has been made worse by the extension of the CPZ to the whole of Park Road, increased numbers of houses locally and traffic calming and roads works in White Rose Lane. Park Road is increasingly being used as a rat run which creates additional problems.

The Department of Transport is encouraging the greater use of 20mph speed limit and zones. We would be happy for such a scheme to be trialed in Park Road with the aim of bringing down speeds and the noise pollution.

Please could you let us know what action can be taken to reduce the speed of vehicles travelling along Park Road?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

With regard to the designation of the road as an area of Special Residential Character, I am presuming that this refers to Woking Borough Council's supplemental planning guidance from April 2000. If so, it would appear that areas to the north and south of Park Road are included but not the road itself. However, as a Highway Authority we do not apply such descriptions to roads.

Although I was not directly involved in the scheme to extend the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) along Park Road, I am aware that the original intention was to introduce double yellow lines through the bends at the Ivy Lane junction to remove the danger caused by parking there. I am also aware that there was a considerable amount of correspondence between my former colleague and you and your fellow residents about this before the option of extending the CPZ was progressed.

The County Council's Parking Strategy and Implementation Group now deal with parking issues and I will forward your letter and this response on to them for your proposal to remove the CPZ to be considered. Reviews of waiting restrictions in an area are now undertaken once a year and because the most recent review was

reported to Local Committee in February this year, it will be some time before changes in Park Road can be considered.

We have no plans to introduce traffic calming along Park Road. Our records indicate that there have been no recorded personal injury collisions along the road in the last 3 years and based on this, it is unlikely that traffic calming would be proposed. For a number of years now, our budgets have been limited and have been used with the aim of casualty reduction. We have no budget this year and not likely to have a budget for improvement work such as traffic calming, pedestrian crossings etc, for the next 4 years or so. In this regard, some on-street parking might be a more realistic option, even though I can foresee there being as much correspondence and contention involved in the reintroduction of parking as there was in its removal.

Our speed limit policy is currently under review.

Unfortunately, neither a yellow box junction, nor a KEEP CLEAR marking could be provided in Maybury Hill to ease the flow of traffic out of Park Road. These markings are only to be used adjacent to the side road to allow traffic to turn right from the major road into the side road or from the side road into the major road. They are not to be used opposite a side road.

## **2. Question from: Cllr Anne- Marie Barker, Woking Borough Council**

Following the recent serious accident at the junction of Arthurs' Bridge Road / Well Lane and Lockfield Drive in Horsell will the Highways Department undertake a safety audit in order to see if safety can be improved on this important route to and from Horsell.

### **Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

Unfortunately, we do not have the full details of the incident that took place on 28 June 2010, assuming that this is the one referred to by Councillor Barker, although we have had initial discussions with Surrey Police about it.

The signal phasing does not permit conflicting flows of traffic and if drivers drive with due care and attention, abide by the traffic signals and the prohibited manoeuvres at the junction, no collisions should occur.

That having been said, we will discuss the junction and the collisions that have occurred there, at the Casualty Reduction Working Group on 21 July and will speak with our colleagues who deal with traffic signals.

Safety Audits are only undertaken on designs for proposed schemes and afterwards when those new schemes have been introduced. They are not undertaken following all road traffic collisions. However, if the collision results in a fatality an assessment of various aspects of the location, such as the condition of the carriageway, for instance, is undertaken. However, this is a significantly different assessment to the formal Road Safety Audits for designs and implemented schemes mentioned earlier, which consider the likely effects of the scheme and any potential problems that it may cause. No safety audit is proposed for this junction, although it will be discussed, as stated above.

**3. Question from Ms Sandra Manton**

Why have the bollards in Warbury Lane been re-instated with like for like, (bearing in mind the last two sets in this format were knocked down within 24 hours of being erected), all of the new sets have been knocked down. I thought it had been agreed that the first set of bollards outside Ringlestone Farm were to be of sterner material so they could not be knocked down so easily. Half way up the hill of the one-way section where one of the bollards has been taken right out of the ground there is a massive hole which many drivers have gone down and burst their tyres. The white lines and arrows agreed for the safety of motorists on the two way section of Warbury Lane and Chobham Road still have not been done. There have been two accidents here in the last four weeks.

I am very grateful for the bollards being re-placed as when all bollards were there, the traffic flow was much safer for walkers, cyclist and horse riders and the cottages at the top of Warbury Lane. This is because the larger vans and lorries who use this as a rat-run could not come down the road, and the ones that did were slower. It saddens me that, as resources are so limited, they have not been done cost effectively and long lasting.

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

The bollards in Warbury Lane have not all been replaced like for like, as a visual inspection clearly shows. Although we acknowledge that most of the bollards have been hit and have received varying degrees of damage, not all of them have been knocked down. The first and last sets of bollards ie outside Ringlestone Farm and close to Hill Place Farm, were replaced with steel-cored posts, which are specifically intended for this type of use. They were installed correctly, but even so, they have suffered much more damage than was expected. The damage to the outer casing was envisaged but the steel cores have suffered heavy, deliberate and sustained damage.

The sets of bollards in the middle were replaced like for like and two have been sheared off at the base.

Given the funding that was available, the use of these steel cored bollards was cost effective because all other affordable and suitable types of bollards would not have been able to withstand the abuse and damage that these have. A more robust scheme could possibly be put in but not with the available maintenance budget. A scheme involving kerbs and square section steel posts, similar to those used in Chertsey Road and Oyster Lane, Byfleet might be feasible but this would constitute an item in its own right within our Integrated Transport Scheme programme. Warbury Lane currently sits 33rd on that list of 48 schemes. We currently have no funding for this programme and do not expect to receive any for the next 4 years or so. When funding is made available again, the items on the programme will need to be reassessed and Warbury Lane's position within the programme may change. This matter will also be discussed with the Surrey Heath Local Committee in greater detail when the Warbury Lane item is reach on our Integrated Transport Programme due to the proximity with the Surrey Heath border.

The order for the lining work was placed with our contractor and although some initial vegetation clearance work was undertaken by our community gang to allow

the lining in the one-way section to be done, our contractor has not yet done the work. We have chased this work and will continue to do so. We also need to carry out a heavy flail along the one-way section, which will require a temporary road closure and we will endeavour to get the lining work done at the same time.

#### **4. Question from Ms Louise Morales**

Could I ask the committee if there could be a lower rate for a skip hire licence for voluntary organisation/ short periods of hire or those that are not needing inspection, with a higher charge if site visits are needed as elsewhere in the country?

I need a skip for only 2 hours, parked on unused grass at the end of our road - which belongs to highways and is licenced by SCC for up to 28 days. For this licence in Surrey I need to pay £123.75. Virtually all of the others outside of London charge less than £40, several are only £10!

Could you take the time to compare the cost of a skip licence in other areas?

Are we really that much more inefficient than all the other councils in the country?

Or is Surrey just taxing residents associations who want to tidy up their own street?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

A lower rate for skip hire licences for particular groups would entail a fundamental review of how the fees and charges are derived and a change in county council policy. This is not under the remit of the Local Committee and would need to be considered by Cabinet. Advice on how to do this is set out on the following web page

[http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTLE\\_RTF/Have+your+say+-+Asking+questions+at+Cabinet+and+Committee+meetings?opendocument](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTLE_RTF/Have+your+say+-+Asking+questions+at+Cabinet+and+Committee+meetings?opendocument)

Alternatively please speak to your local county councillor.

A cost review has recently taken place to look at licence charges for skips to be placed on the highway to ensure that they reflect the actual cost involved in administering and enforcing licenses. This included looking at charges set by other authorities and the new costs will bring us more in line.

#### **5. Question from Mr Tim Keeping, Chairman of the Woking Town Centre Partnership**

I write in my capacity as Chairman of the Woking Town Centre Partnership. At a recent board meeting it was noted that the planned repairs and improvement works to Commercial Way by Surrey County Council were no longer proceeding. It was felt by all partners present that the poor state of repair of this area has a seriously detrimental effect on the experience of the town centre visitor and is presenting a significant barrier to attracting new business to the town.

This was further reinforced by focus group research carried out on behalf of the Partnership to seek to understand the views of Woking residents who do not currently see their local town centre as a place to visit, shop and spend leisure

time. Unsolicited comments on the public realm in Commercial Way include “Smelly and to be avoided”, “intimidating”.

As many of the partners in the Town Centre Partnership continue to invest and improve the appearance and attractiveness of Woking as a place to visit, I would urge the County Council to reconsider the decision to cancel these works and play a part in giving the residents and visitors to Woking a town centre to be proud of.

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

From a highway perspective the County Council had proposals, linked with the Cycle Woking Project, to remove two of the damaged tree planters in Commercial Way and it is assumed that Mr Keeping's question relates to these proposals. Removal of the planters, along with other associated works, were estimated to cost approximately £50,000 and were due to be funded by surplus revenue raised from the Borough Council operated Controlled Parking Zone during 2009/10. Unfortunately much of this money was allocated to cover other costs and Members of the Local Committee were asked to prioritise schemes in the Cycle Woking programme. Members decided that the Commercial Way scheme should be deferred and recent cuts in funding mean that we are unlikely to be in a position to undertake these works for the foreseeable future.

Surrey Highways do have a commitment to make safe any highway defects that are reported to us in Commercial Way and we do undertake works as and when they are identified. Limited budgets limit the scope of works that can be undertaken from our maintenance money resulting in functional repairs such as replaced cracked paving slabs with tarmacadam.

The developer led Gateway Project involving redevelopment of Albion House and the Commercial Way frontage would resolve many of the issues although it is assumed the current economic climate will dictate when this development takes place.

Comment from Woking Borough Council:

The focus group comments are interesting and undoubtedly influenced by the selected participants who we understand were not necessarily a wide cross section of Woking residents. Licenced facilities are provided currently by Woking Borough Council within Commercial Way and continue to be in demand to serve a further cross section of our Town Centre workers and residents. In the future and subject to development proposals, improvements will undoubtedly be made to the facilities provided in the Commercial Way area.

LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(WOKING)

**MEMBER QUESTIONS**  
**7 July 2010**

**1. Questions from Cllr Glynis Preshaw, Woking Borough Council**

The estimated cost of the A322 Bagshot Road pedestrian/cycle crossing outside the Total garage in Brookwood (known locally as Fishwick Island) was £25,000 (Local Committee Meeting 22 October 2009 Woking Cycling Town – Bid to Cycling England – Annex C Agenda item 8). As a result of increased traffic congestion and the serious concerns of local residents and road users regarding the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists a Road Safety Audit was commissioned. The Audit report recommends a number of remedial measures to combat the problems caused by the island. What costs were incurred in commissioning and carrying out the audit and subsequent report? What is the cost of the proposed remedial measures to the refuge and the possible rephasing of the Brookwood traffic lights? If these measures do not solve the problems caused by the island what would be the cost of removing the refuge and returning the road to its original condition? At a time when financial resources are so scarce and the County Highways Budget has been slashed how will the recommended works be financed?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

A Road Safety Audit is normally requested on 'minor improvement' schemes and the pedestrian / cycle island is no different and therefore was the subject of a Stage 2 (pre-construction) and Stage 3 (post construction) Audits and therefore was not commissioned due to the concerns raised by residents.

The cost of carrying out the Road Safety Audit at Stage 2 and Stage 3 was approximately £500. This was met by the Cycling England funding for the scheme.

The estimated costs of carrying out the recommendations within the Road Safety report (Stage 3) are £3,000. The majority of these costs are the traffic management whereby the Brookwood Cross Roads traffic lights are switched off and the junction is placed under a temporary 4-phase traffic signal control. These works would also be carried out on a Saturday.

## Annex 3                      Draft to be agreed on 2 September 2010

The estimated costs to re-phase the traffic signals are up to £3,000. This would provide a longer phase for southbound traffic (towards Guildford/Brookwood Lye Road) and the right turn into Connaught Road would go after or during the southbound flow, where at present it does not.

The costs of removing the island, drop kerbs and reinstating the carriageway and footway together with relocating signs is estimated at £10,000. Again, the majority of these costs are within the traffic management, but this would be over two days (Saturday and Sunday).

With reference to funding, there is no budget allocated for the recommendations contained within the Road Safety Audit (Stage 3), therefore to carry out these works funding would need to be drawn from the Minor Improvements to the Network budget that forms part of the Cycle Woking programme for 2010/11. This would mean that a scheme or schemes to the value of £3,000 would not be implemented this financial year.

In relation to the removal of the island and associated dropped kerbs etc, this has not been budgeted for during 2010/11 and funding does not exist to carry out this work at the present time.

### **2. Questions 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) The refreshment of road markings on Knaphill High Street. (This road had been prioritised for major maintenance, but now we are told no money has been allocated.) Is there any further indication of when Knaphill High Street will receive major maintenance, and if this is not for the foreseeable future will the road markings be restored before major maintenance?

### **Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

- a) All of the signage in Warbury Lane is in order. However, despite an order having been raised for our contractor for the lining work to be undertaken and some initial vegetation removal by the Community Gang to facilitate the lining work, this has still not been undertaken by our contractor. We are continuing to press for this work to be done.

Warbury Lane is currently ranked 33rd on our work programme of 48 schemes. There is no Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) budget this year and there is unlikely to be one for the next 4 years or so. The bollards were replaced at the end of the last financial year using funds that would otherwise have constituted an underspend. The bollards at the beginning and end of the one-way section were replaced using steel-cored bollards for greater strength. They were installed correctly but even so, they have clearly sustained severe and deliberate damage. Two sets of the intermediate bollards were replaced on a like for like basis and in each location, one bollard has been completely sheared off at the base.

A heavy flail to remove a lot of the vegetation along the one-way section is due to be undertaken. It will be included in a programme of flailing but we are awaiting costs from our contractor to determine how much of this programme can be undertaken. There is no intention to reduce the scope of the flailing work to be done in Warbury Lane but until we know overall costs and, therefore, what can be done, we cannot issue a works order. The flailing will require a temporary road closure and we will endeavour to get the lining work done at the same time.

An agenda item was taken to the Surrey Heath Local Committee meeting in February and the resolution from the Local Committee (Woking) meeting that Cllr Smith refers to in her question was quoted in full, for information. The agenda is available on the SCC website, although the minutes are not. Clearly, this matter will be discussed with the Surrey Heath Local Committee in greater detail when the Warbury Lane item is reached on our Integrated Transport Programme. When funding is made available again, the items on our ITS programme will undoubtedly have to be re-assessed and this may alter their ranking. However, it is clear that it will be a number of years yet before Warbury Lane is considered.

b) Regrettably Knaphill High Street was one of the roads dropped from this year's programme after the April review. The twenty or so such deletions will be at the top of the rolling programme for next year's works, but it is not possible to guarantee what will be achievable in 2011-12.

That being the case, the question of road markings is a pertinent one. It is our view that in the circumstances we should undertake refreshment of markings, both in High Street and the top (red) section of Broadway (which is to be done together with the High Street in the major maintenance plan). This has been included in the list of lining works proposed for this year, which is being priced up, and will be confirmed shortly.

### **3. Questions from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council**

#### **Question 1:**

During the snow fall last December a resident found the salt/sand container at the bottom of Horsell Rise full of water because the lid does not fit. It was reported to SCC (Ref 83050597). The matter has still not been addressed. Please could you explain what is happening?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

All grit bins will be reviewed by the County Council's Asset Planning Group in advance of the winter season and this will include the number and condition of all such bins within the Woking Borough. We have had problems with water ingress with the type of bin that has used in Horsell Rise and as a result no longer use them. It is highly likely that this one been will be replaced in advance of the winter season as a result of the review.



**Question 2:**

Could you please let me know when the damage to the footway at the corner of Brewery Road and Chobham Road, and outside Barclays Bank in Horsell will be repaired?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

Footway Damage at Corner of Brewery Road and Chobham Road - Highway defects are ordered on a prioritisation basis with any safety related defects given priority over more routine repairs . We placed an order to repair this particular section of footway some months ago but, because the usable area of footway is still reasonably wide, it is deemed to be less urgent to repair than many of the other orders issued. The Maintenance Engineer for Woking has raised this outstanding job with colleagues who prioritise Ringway's workload and they will endeavour to undertake repairs as soon as they can.

Footway Damage outside Barclay's Bank - The Community Highways Officer (CHO) for this area has chased EDF on a number of occasions over their need to undertake repairs on this section of footway. EDF have acknowledged the problem is theirs and have agreed to undertake the works but clearly they have not been undertaken as of yet. The CHO will put further pressure on the utility company to undertake these repairs.

**4. Questions from Will Forster, Surrey County Council**

**Question 1:**

As I understand, British Gas commenced roadworks on White Rose Lane in April 2009 and these works were scheduled to last ten months.

Please can local residents and I have an update on when these roadworks will come to an end and an explanation for the delay?

To ensure residents have as much advanced warning as possible, please will the County Council list the schedule of planned roadworks currently known that will take place in Woking Borough in the next four months?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

Officers are looking into this and will provide a written answer to Mr Forster outside the meeting. With regard to the schedule of roadworks, a paper will be tabled on this under public engagement item 5.

**Question 2:**

Please could the County Council clarify why the 675 School Special Bus Service between Windlesham and Send only starts and finishes at Loop Road in Kingfield not St Bede's School in Send as advertised?

Will the County Council ensure that the 675 Service runs its full advertised route so children attending St Bede's School in Send can be accommodated after being displaced by the withdrawal of the Pegasus Bus Service?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

Service 675 has not operated to/from St. Bede's School in Send since the Pegasus service was introduced. It was not recognised that the service was still being advertised somewhere to the effect that it does. The provider of the 675 is different to that when the Send part of the route last ran ; enquiries can be made of them whether their vehicle and driver would have the time to run through to Send, but if there was an additional cost implication for extending the route, no funding has been provided to Passenger Transport Group to replace Pegasus routes carrying non-statutorily entitled students.

**Question 3:**

There are three loading only bays on the junction of Chertsey Road and the High Street under the Albion Square Canopy have been proposed to become overnight taxi ranks.

The Borough Council has now made their designation order to allow the above proposal to be valid. When does the County Council plan to amend the signs and bay markings to allow the bays to be used as overnight taxi ranks?

Also, what if any are the current traffic restrictions on the High Street below the Albion Square Canopy?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

It had been hoped that the signing and lining changes for these overnight taxi ranks would be included in the work for the various amendments in Woking that the Parking Strategy and Implementation Group reported to Local Committee in February. It would appear that there is no longer a budget to allow these amendments to be progressed and implemented and as a result, the local highways team will endeavour to carry out these changes, although at the current time, we cannot say when this will take place. We will advise Councillor Forster when we have more of an idea when the work will be done"

**5. Question from Cllr Richard Wilson, Woking Borough Council**

The recent back to back roadworks along the A245 in West Byfleet caused severe delays for motorists in The Byfleets and into Elmbridge. Whilst it is recognised that utility companies need access to our highways, much of this disruption was caused by very poor traffic management. What traffic management guidance is given to utilities, in particular taking into account traffic flow variances during the day along busy through routes in the Borough such as the A245?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

All traffic management at utility works and at highway works by highways authorities must comply with the detailed requirements of both Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual and also the Code of Practice for Safety at Street Works and Road Works.

In addition, there is a condition applied to all approvals for the use of temporary traffic signals granted by the county council, requiring that on designated Traffic Routes and during traffic sensitive hours (generally 07:30 to 09:30 and 16:30 to 18:30), such signals must be manually operated by a competent operative to ensure that traffic flows are adequately managed and balanced according to the predominant traffic flow.

With regard to recent events at West Byfleet, works by Southern Gas Networks (SGN) on Parvis Road and Old Woking Road, and works on behalf of both EDF Energy and the Broadoaks development were planned in consultation with the Streetworks Team, coordinated to avoid any extra traffic that may have been generated by the Seven Hills Road closure, to minimise disruption and to complete the works as quickly and efficiently as possible

Unfortunately additional works by Thames Water, which they considered to be emergency works requiring urgent action, were started whilst the SGN scheme was ongoing, despite officers requests to delay these works. The designation of urgent works means that different requirement for advance notification apply, and the authority's powers to direct how and when the works are undertaken cannot be applied in the same way. This was further compounded by yet another set of temporary traffic signals required to deal with an emergency gas leak, and again there was little that we could do to challenge these works under the circumstances. Ideally, the main SGN scheme at Parvis Road / Old Woking Road would have been closed down until both emergency works were completed, but this was not feasible on this occasion, as the SGN works had been temporarily halted because the proposed method of working to get their new main across the main junction was no longer possible and had to be reviewed. The alternative required an emergency road closure to divert traffic away from the junction, to enable them to excavate for the new main. This meant that no works were being carried out, despite the traffic management remaining in place, which understandably caused some concern amongst residents and businesses in the area. Disappointingly, SGN did not provide an information board on site advising of these issues.

So, whilst every effort was made to plan and coordinate the SGN scheme in West Byfleet with Seven Hills Road, the Broadoak development works and associated electrical works by EDF Energy, ultimately emergency works over which we have little control resulted in significant problems and congestion in the area. We continued to pressure Thames Water and SGN throughout to complete their emergency works as quickly as possible, whilst also working with SGN to resolve their difficulties on the main scheme. The emergency works have now both been cleared, and SGN will restart the next phase of their works following the reopening of Seven Hills Road. We will continue to monitor their progress as required.

**6. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council**

Would the Local Highways Manager please advise us what arrangements will be put in place within the next two weeks for the handing of important matters and issues that members of this committee wish to raise on Highways?

Would he also please advise us of the position regarding a number of properties adjacent to Lockfield Drive which are suffering from unacceptable vibration now that the Lockfield Drive road surface is so poor?

Will he also please advise what extra funding is being made available from the County's very significant cash reserves to repair and resurfacing the growing number of sub-standard road surfaces in the Borough.

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

Andrew Milne will be covering the duties of the Woking Local Highways Manager until appointments are made under the new Surrey Highways Structure. Members should continue to channel email enquires through [wah@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surreycc.gov.uk)

With regard to Lockfield Drive we have resurfaced a number of sections of the road in recent times. A further section, at the Arthur's Bridge Road junction, is due to be resurfaced within the next few weeks, and this has been funded from the small additional budget we received from central government to assist with winter weather damage. We will look to undertake further resurfacing works on Lockfield Drive as and when funding allows.

With regard to noise and vibration I would point that the problems in Lockfield Drive relate to surface delamination whereby the top 20mm of the carriageway has stripped away. Unfortunately patching works are ineffective in dealing with this type of problem with the only option being expensive full carriageway resurfacing. Whilst surface delamination may cause increased road noise we are unaware of any deep potholes or major damage to the carriageway that would be severe enough to structurally effect nearby residential properties.

We are working to the approved published highways budget. Surrey County Council have, however, been fortunate to receive additional funding in the form of £1.5m from central government to deal with damage to the carriageway caused by the extreme winter weather. A proportion of this money (£100,000) has been allocated to the Woking area and will fund carriageway repairs to Walton Road and a further section of Lockfield Drive.

**7. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council**

How many times has the Highways Repair Team been called out to mend potholes on Bonsey Lane in the past 12 months?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee**

Highway Repair gangs have visited Bonsey Lane on five occasions in the last twelve months, as follows:

10 August 2009; 25 January 2010; 19/22 February 2010; 4 March 2010; 7 April 2010.

**8. Question from Mr Geoff Marlow, Surrey County Council**

As a result of a bus shelter at West Byfleet being destroyed by a lorry many months ago the people of West Byfleet have to stand unsheltered in inclement weather while waiting for a bus to Woking and other places. Can I have confirmation that the damaged shelter belongs to Adshell or a company which has taken over from them? Whose responsibility is it to fix this shelter? If this shelter was in the middle of Woking would its owners still be allowed to ignore it. Is there a contract between either WBC or SCC and the owners regarding this shelter? Can we cancel the contract? Is there any way we can get this shelter repaired before next winter?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

The contract with Clear Channel was formalised by Highways Officers around 1997/98. Woking Borough Council's responsibility for highways, traffic and transportation maintenance and improvements ended in 2002, following the withdrawal of the highway agency by Surrey County Council. However, the bus shelter contract remained in the ownership of Woking Borough Council. Surrey County Council highways officers are no longer involved in its management.

The former bus shelter at Rosemount Parade, West Byfleet was one that was owned by Clear Channel, as part of a Borough-wide contract with Woking Borough Council. The management of this contract, together with what shelters are provided, what happens when they are accidentally demolished and pursuing third parties for any damage claims that might arise from damage to shelters are not within the responsibilities of the County Council. The bus shelter contract is owned by Woking Borough Council.

Clear Channel were required to provide a set number of shelters free of charge to Woking Borough Council, this has been satisfied and benefited residents since the start of the contract. Clear Channel are under no obligation to replace bus shelters demolished in road traffic accidents. This contract has enabled Woking Borough Council to provide bus shelters since 1998 at no cost. Woking Borough Council are continuing to liaise with Clear Channel regarding the installation of a shelter at this location.

**9. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council**

Following the recent sad death of Alec Bedser, the former international cricketer who with his twin brother Eric lived in Woking most of their lives what action is required to seek permission to rename the roundabout at 'Brook House common' the 'Bedser Roundabout'?

**Whilst not in the remit of the local committee, the Chairman has asked an officer who has given the following response:**

It is the County Council, as Highway Authority, who are responsibility for considering all requests for signage on the highway.

Whilst the Brook House Roundabout may not be as widely identified as some of the larger roundabouts or junctions in the Borough renaming it to the Bedser Roundabout would still be likely to cause confusion to drivers and local residents. Roundabout names are often associated with a nearby landmark, public house or nearby area. The Brook House roundabout links with the nearby Brook House office complex and Brook House Common which aids driver navigation. Bedser Roundabout would not fit with these principles.

Perhaps renaming of a local sporting amenity would be more appropriate but if a junction is considered the preferred option a few other roundabouts in the area have no current name such as the one on the Littlewick Road.

I should also point out that any renaming would require new signing either via revised advance direction signs on the approach or nameplate signs on the roundabout itself. New signs, particularly if incorporated in new direction signing are likely to be relatively expensive and it should be pointed out that the County Council have no budget for such works.