

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 7.30pm on 20 October 2010
at
Surrey County Council Offices
Quadrant Court, 35 Guildford Road, Woking

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mr Ben Carasco (Horsell) - Chairman
Mr Mohammed Amin (Woking Central)
Mrs Liz Bowes (Pyrford)
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 Mohammed Bashir (Maybury and Sheerwater)
Cllr Tony Branagan (Horsell West)
Cllr Bryan Cross (Goldsworth East)
Cllr Derek McCrum (Kingfield and Westfield)
Cllr Glynis Preshaw (Brookwood)
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]

45/10 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Elizabeth Compton.

46/10 Minutes of last meeting held on 2 September 2010 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 2 September 2010 were agreed and signed.

47/10 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest, but with regard to Item 9, Cllr Wilson noted that he was a governor at West Byfleet Junior School.

48/10 Chairman's Statement [Item 4]

The Chairman set out information for members of the public and members of the committee on the consultation arrangements for looking at cycling through Woking town centre prior to a report coming back to a future local committee meeting.

49/10 Petitions [Item 5]

1. Petition on improved traffic measures in Onslow Crescent, Woking [Item 5a]

Mrs Birch, Headteacher of St Dunstan's School introduced the petition which stated:

This petition is to Surrey County Council to introduce traffic calming measures in Onslow Crescent GU22 7AX to improve safety for children attending St. Dunstan's Catholic Primary School and residents. In particular, a one-way system starting at the Woking station end of Oriental Road and clear road markings (double yellow lines) on the opposite side of Onslow Crescent to the school are requested. Re-marking of the zigzags for emergency access outside the school entrances are also requested. The petition's aim is to prevent a serious accident occurring.

St Dunstan's is a two form entry catholic primary school with a 60 place independent nursery on site. Only 11% of pupils live within one mile. A special school is also located on the same road. The school make use of the church car park, which is always full. At the moment a voluntary one way system operates in the road, but not everyone is aware of it or adheres to it. The road can be used as a cut through to Old Woking Road. Cars and lorries mount the road putting pedestrians at risk.

The petitioners feel that the safety of the pupils are at risk and would like an independent assessment carried out. They feel it is morally wrong to wait for casualties before action is taken. They would like the recommendations from the Police to be taken on board.

The following points of clarification were given:

- The petitioners would like the one way system visible for all motorists. There is currently no evidence of the school on the Crescent.

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

- The area is often gridlocked at school drop off and pick up times. The problem is caused by a large amount of cars arriving in a short space of time. The voluntary one-way system has been in place for about 24 years. There is ample parking for staff.

It was agreed that a meeting would take place with the petitioners, local member and residents to discuss the issues, and a full response will be brought to the February 2011 Local Committee.

2. Petition on traffic calming for Old Woking High Street [Item 5b]

The petition was presented by Carl Wolters, and stated:
We call upon Surrey County Council to use the £20,000 promised in 2008 for traffic calming for Old Woking High Street.

Mr Wolters explained that this issue has been a concern of residents for the past few years. Vehicles tend to speed up from the Send roundabout towards Kingfield, which causes issues for people turning out of the High Street, for those wanting to cross the road, and for residents exiting out of Hipley Street and Poundfield Gardens.

The petitioners would like to see Surrey County Council re-examine traffic issues for Old Woking, to look at rumble strips, flashing speed signs and a crossing between Hipley Street and Manor Way.

It was noted that a proposal had been dropped in the past due to difficulties as it is an A road, but it was agreed that a response would be brought to the February 2011 Local Committee meeting.

50/10 Written Public Questions [Item 6]

Three written public questions were received. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 2 of these minutes. There were no supplementary questions.

51/10 Written Members' Questions [Item 7]

Eleven member questions were received. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 3 of these minutes.

Supplementary questions and responses are below:

Question 1: In response to Cllr Branagan it was noted that the scheme would be considered when the Local Transport Plan programme is looked at in February.

Question 2: Cllr Bashir requested that a petition with 500 signatures be noted as an objection to the proposed increase in residents parking permits.

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

Question 3: In response to Cllr Preshaw, Mr Lake confirmed that the current recommendation for residents parking permits is as it stands but views made during the consultation will be taken into account.

Question 4: Cllr Cross requested details of the £140k deficit, including the time period, as he understood there was a profit.

Question 6: In response to Mr Forster, officers agreed to see if the process could be improved to avoid this sort of confusion in the future.

Question 9: Highways officers agreed to speak to Cllr Cross outside the meeting regarding the specifics of Lockfield Drive and Bampton Way.

Executive Items

52/10 Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund [Item 8]

The Chairman invited the four supporting Members to introduce their bids.

Mr Amin introduced the bid for prevention of young people from becoming NEET from Bishop David Brown School. Cllr Bashir introduced the bid for an internet community radio station for Sheerwater and Maybury. Mr Amin introduced the bid to help improve financial literacy in Lakeview. Mrs Bowes introduced the bid from the Partnership for the Regeneration of Old Woking.

All four bids submitted fulfilled the criteria for the fund, and the total amount of these bids did not exceed £200k. Therefore the committee agreed that all bids should be submitted to the panel, but wished to reflect a priority order to them. The priority order was established by each member indicating their preferred order of bids, which was then tallied up.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i. To consider all the bids detailed in paragraph 2.4 of the report
- ii. To submit all four of the bids received to the Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund Panel:
- iii. That the bids be submitted in the following priority order:
 1. Old Woking
 2. Bishop David Brown
 3. Lakeview
 4. Internet radio

53/10 Surrey County Council Voluntary Funding in Woking [Item 9]

Monica Wambu introduced the report which set out the County Council's funding to the voluntary, community and faith sector in Woking. She noted a correction to the report at 2.3, advising that the decision had been taken

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

recently to maintain the Community Buildings Grant in 2011-12. One jointly funded organisation is Woking Association of Voluntary Service (WAVS), and Sylvie Marshall Director of WAVS explained some of the work they do. This included placing 123 volunteers with community groups within the first 6 months of this year, carrying out 333 CRB checks for voluntary groups, providing funding advice to 35 organisations and working with others on a child poverty campaign and financial literacy classes.

During discussions, the following points were noted:

- A lot more is coming to the voluntary sector, but it is an area which could lose funding.
- It would be useful to have an annual report to include transparency of what has been cut from the council.
- CAB is not funded by SCC but it does fund training of staff through welfare rights.
- If grants are unspent then this needs to be discussed with the relevant contact officer. Member approval would be required to spend the money elsewhere.
- It would be useful to understand the criteria for the grants and to look at grants in Woking jointly with the borough council.

Members felt it would be useful to meet with officers following this meeting to discuss a joint report with the borough council to get a clearer picture of all grants given to the voluntary sector in Woking and to look at working with the voluntary sector in Woking.

RESOLVED:

The committee noted the report and agreed that Cllr Kingsbury and Mrs Bowes would meet with officers before the next report on voluntary sector funding in Woking.

54/10 Review of on-street pay and display parking charges [Item 10]

David Curl introduced the report. He noted that the changes referred to in paragraph 2.3 were introduced two years ago and annex 1 should note the special offers in Woking car parks at the moment. Annex 2 was amended to reflect the fact that there is no proposed change to parking charges or the operational times of the CPZ in West Byfleet.

Mr Forster requested that the report be deferred for the following reasons:

- The lack of enforcement in parking which needs to be looked into
- If there are changes on Sundays and bank holidays, these should not be the same in Sheerwater and Maybury.
- Should Woking be the same as Guildford
- If there is a deficit, why are the changes not applying to West Byfleet.

This proposal was seconded by Cllr Bashir.

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

Cllr Kingsbury was opposed to the proposal as these are short term on street parking. If people do not want to pay the increase they should park off street in the car parks.

David Curl confirmed that the report was asking for permission to consult and no decision would be taken until February 2011. The proposals are as agreed by Woking Borough Council Executive.

Mr Forster did not agree that this was proper consultation.

The committee voted on whether to defer the report and it was agreed by a vote of 5 for and 8 against not to defer the decision to February 2011.

Cllr Kingsbury proposed that an amendment to the recommendation should be made to approve the proposed changes subject to a report coming back to the Local Committee on 9 February with comments received. This was seconded by Cllr Branagan, and agreed by a vote of 8 for with 5 abstaining.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed the following subject to a report coming back to Local Committee (Woking) on 9 February 2011 with comments received:

- (i) approve the proposed changes to on street parking charges set out in Annexe 2 as amended.
- (ii) approve that the new parking charges in Annexe 2 are formally advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- (iii) Approve that the proposed introduction of on street charging on Sundays and Bank Holidays be formally advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- (iv) approve that any implementation costs associated with this proposal are funded by the Woking CPZ account.

55/10 Local Committee Funding: Members Allocation [Item 11]

An additional bid from Woking United Reformed Church was tabled as it arrived after the deadline, but the funding was required before the next formal meeting of the Local Committee.

Mr Marlow clarified some points regarding the bid from Evergreens.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

- (i) The following allocations from the members allocation budget for 2010/11 as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report and the tabled addition:
1. 1349 (Woking) Squadron, Airtraining Corps replacement Mini Bus - £3000
 2. Surrey Wildlife Trust- £1000
 3. Woking Recreational Boating for Handicapped - £950
 4. Horsell Afternoon WI - £688
 5. East Hill Gardeners - £500
 6. Woking Palace - £1500
 7. The Goldsworth Park Community Association- £1100
 8. Knaphill Residents Association- £885
 9. 1st Byfleet Scout Group - £2739
 10. Byfleet Village Football Club- £3000
 11. The Evergreens- £1500
 12. Woking Citizens Advice Bureau-£5000
 13. Woking United Reformed Church Youth Room- £3001
- (ii) Noted that there were no allocations approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 2 September 2010 and 20 October 2010.

56/10 Cycle Woking Budget [Item 12]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report and confirmed that funding for Cycle Woking was safe until 31/3/2011. Cycle England will be abolished from 31/3/11, but it has indicated that there will be an interim year for 11/12 for existing cycle towns.

The report was noted.

57/10 Response to petition on the cycle island at Brookwood Crossroads [Item 13]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report and explained there had been a site visit on 13 October for the petitioners and members of the committee, where it was suggested that a Keep Clear mark on the road could help assist drivers and be installed quickly, and the proposed rephrasing was not now considered necessary. The amended officer recommendation (i) now read:

(i) Agree that the pedestrian/cycle island is amended as recommended in the Road Safety Audit (stage 3) and **in addition the wording KEEP CLEAR is placed on the southbound carriageway adjacent to the island but the traffic signals at Brookwood Crossroads are not rephased.**

Cllr Preshaw proposed the following alternative recommendation (i), which was seconded by Mrs Liz Bowes:

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

- i) that the pedestrian/cycle island at the entrance to the Total Filling Station A322 Bagshot Road just North of the Brookwood crossroads be removed on the grounds of
 - a) Lack of consultation with residents and other interested parties prior to installation.
 - b) Menace – road safety around the island is being compromised regularly to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and the island has led to increased traffic congestion on the A322.
 - c) Traffic congestion and road safety concerns are only set to worsen if the refuge remains in view of the planned expansion of the Sainsbury's superstore in Redding Way and the proposed future development of land at Brookwood Farm to the rear of Coresbrook Way.
- ii) that following removal of the island measures are taken to ensure pedestrians and cyclists are directed to crossing the A322 at the traffic lights by signage and if deemed necessary metal barriers.

Mrs Smith was opposed to the alternative recommendation as on the site visit she saw pedestrians and cyclists using the crossing. She would like to obtain broader community opinion before the island is taken away. Railings put in to stop people crossing could get damaged. The island should not be taken out because some people break the law – it would be good to see some enforcement. She suggested that alternatives be looked, for example a camera, and wider consultation done before a decision is made whether the island is taken out.

Mr Forster disagreed with Cllr Preshaw's alternative recommendation. He felt that the amended officer recommendation could make an improvement. If this did not work, then it may be an option to look at the removal of the island, but not at this stage.

Cllr Kingsbury felt that the island restricts the number of people turning right into Connaught Road and the committee should listen to local people and therefore supports Cllr Preshaw's alternative recommendation.

Cllr Cross disagreed with both the amended officer recommendation and the alternative recommendation. Cars coming from Knaphill were close to the island. If the island is removed he is not convinced that people would use the traffic lights to cross the road. He is concerned about the island and thinks something else is needed, for example a pedestrian crossing.

The Committee voted on whether to replace the amended officer recommendation with the alternative recommendation from Cllr Preshaw. The committee agreed by a vote of 7 for and 5 against with Cllr Cross abstaining, which meant that the alternative recommendation proposed by Cllr Preshaw was the new substantive recommendation (i).

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed by a vote of 7 for and 5 against with one abstention:

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

- i) that the pedestrian/cycle island at the entrance to the Total Filling Station A322 Bagshot Road just North of the Brookwood crossroads be removed on the grounds of
 - a) Lack of consultation with residents and other interested parties prior to installation.
 - b) Menace – road safety around the island is being compromised regularly to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and the island has led to increased traffic congestion on the A322.
 - c) Traffic congestion and road safety concerns are only set to worsen if the refuge remains in view of the planned expansion of the Sainsbury's superstore in Redding Way and the proposed future development of land at Brookwood Farm to the rear of Coresbrook Way.
- ii) that following removal of the island measures are taken to ensure pedestrians and cyclists are directed to crossing the A322 at the traffic lights by signage and if deemed necessary metal barriers.

58/10 Response to petition on cycle signage in Brookwood [Item 14]

The officer recommendation was amended following a site visit with members and the petitioners on 13 October and this provided an acceptable solution to both councillors and residents. The amended officer recommendation (i) read:

- i. Agree that the cycle signs located on the Basingstoke Canal through Brookwood including Brookwood Country Park should remain, but the set of signs located at the Basingstoke Canal / Sheets Heath junction should be replaced with smaller size signs (non-reflective) **and placed on the ground as a trial.**

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i. that the cycle signs located on the Basingstoke Canal through Brookwood including Brookwood Country Park should remain, but the set of signs located at the Basingstoke Canal / Sheets Heath junction should be replaced with smaller size signs (non-reflective) and placed on the ground as a trial.

59/10 Proposed Kingfield School Shared Use Link [Item 15]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report looking at a shared use link for Kingfield School.

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

Mr Forster supported the proposal. In response to queries raised it was noted that legally cyclists are not allowed to use the crossing by the shops; people cycle along the pavement along Shackleford Road illegally, but it is not wide enough for shared use. If funding is available in the future this could perhaps be looked at.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i) That the proposed shared-use route connecting Shackleford Road with Kingfield Road as indicated in Annex A is approved.

60/10 Proposed Sythwood Shared Use Link [Item 16]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report and noted if funding was available in future there would be a plan to put in a toucan crossing. Until such a time there will be dropped kerbs and he would also like to put a green surface down.

Cllr Cross and Mr Forster both supported the idea of a toucan crossing if the funding became available.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i) That the proposed shared-use route connecting Tresillion Way with the existing shared-use route at the Salvation Army Hall as indicated in Annex A is approved.

61/10 Traffic Order for Hook Hill [Item 17]

Kevin Patching introduced the report.

Since the report was written, Network Rail confirmed that the width limit of the bridge was outside the scope of their work and was therefore not willing to fund the relocation of the width restrictions as previously thought.

The officer recommendation (ii) was therefore changed to:

- ii. A Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose an environmental 7.5 Tonne weight limit and a 6'6" width restriction over part of Hook Hill Lane,
 - a. **the northern extent to be finalised after further consultation with residents and Mayford Village Society, if the funding is available, or;**
 - b. **the northern extent remains in its current location if the necessary funding is not available;**

Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

Officers were asked to come back to Members with the costs of the relocation of the width restrictions.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- i. The Borough Council of Woking (Hook Hill Lane Railway Bridge, Mayford)(Weight and width restriction) Order No. 2 2000 is revoked;
- ii. A Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose an environmental 7.5 Tonne weight limit and a 6'6" width restriction over part of Hook Hill Lane,
 - a. the northern extent to be finalised after further consultation with residents and Mayford Village Society, if the funding is available, or;
 - b. the northern extent remains in its current location if the necessary funding is not available;
- iii. Any objections received during the statutory consultation process to be reported back to a future meeting of this committee for consideration

62/10 Update on topics for note [Item 18]

Carolyn Rowe noted an update on the Bus Review and set out the dates of the consultation sessions on the Bus Review within Woking and Knaphill libraries.

63/10 Forward Programme [Item 19]

Noted as in the report with the addition of the following reports to come to a future meeting:

1. Review of the timing of the CPZ zones – where they are and what times they operate. Cllr Bashir was asked to speak to David Curl outside the meeting.
2. Safety on the roads – joint report with the Police, to look at cyclists, pedestrians and motorists.

64/10 Exclusion of the Press and Public

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 9.55pm]

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

Love Food Hate Waste Campaign [Public Engagement Item 1]

Carmela Tomkins, local chef, explained the aims of the Love Food Hate Waste campaign, which aims to raise awareness of the need to reduce food waste. She then demonstrated how left over food could be easily turned into a fruit ripple. Recipes cards and a booklet containing hints and tips were made available to those present.

The Chairman thanked Carmela for her demonstration.

Open Public Question Session [Public Engagement Item 2]

Question 1: Mike Peel (Brookwood Residents Association)
Are there sufficient stocks of salt?

David Curl noted there had been a review of last winters gritting. There was a Government imposed ban of salt last year which meant from January only A roads were gritted. The depot salt bins are fully stocked and the primary and secondary gritting routes have been reviewed along with grit bin locations.

The Chairman asked for all questions relating to the increase in residents parking permits before giving a response.

Question 2: Cllr Ali (Sheerwater and Maybury)
Why has the increase in costs of residents parking permits been allowed to build up?

Question 3: Richard Thomas (West Byfleet)
10 years ago when CPZ was put into operation there was a large scheme which was not agreed locally. West Byfleet was in the second phase and people were not happy.

Question 4: Mohammed Zarif (Courtney Road)
Can each resident be guaranteed one car parking space on their street if the charges are raised?

Question 5: Nick Vivian (Bradford Gardens)
Parking charges apply from 11-3pm. The parking warden has only been seen between 11-11.30am, after which people park anywhere. The warden has said there are too many cars to book. If parking tickets were issued then this would help fill the deficit.

Question 6: Peter Fletcher (Station Road, West Byfleet)

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

No figures justify the 400% increase. Why should residents carry the burden for the rest of the county. There is no mention of concessions for pensioners. 10 years ago residents were told costs would not increase as it was just a measure to restrict commuter parking near the station. Needs to be more efficient.

Question 7: Dorothy Elliot (Station Road, West Byfleet)

Now you can only get visitor passes from Woking Borough Council. Could the parking people deliver them to help out the older people. If people have 3 visitors a day it will cost them £2.

Question 8: Christine Little

The parking problem is between 9.30 and 11.30am. People who will be affected are those who are at home during the day – pensioners and mums, not commuters.

Question 9: Susan Ogden, Station Road

Will concessions be possible?

David Curl, Surrey County Council's Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager responded to questions as follows:

The residents parking schemes were introduced by Woking Borough Council. Surrey County Council took over responsibility for on street parking six years ago. It is now time to review the costs of all services. Across Surrey there is a £400k deficit from on street parking, £140k of which comes from Woking. A decision has been made to consult on the proposed increased charges of £50 for the first permit and £75 for subsequent permits. All residents in Surrey who have permits have been written to. The consultation period is still open and residents were asked to make their views known through the contact details set out in the agenda.

It was confirmed that money from fines is collected by the borough council, and any surplus once they have taken their costs comes to the County Council.

Concessions may be possible and will be looked at during the consultation process.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that the borough had proposed increases in permit charges a number of times in the past couple of years but Surrey County Council wanted to do a countywide review rather than make individual changes. For some boroughs like Guildford this is a small increase as it has been incremental over the years.

Ian Lake, Cabinet Member for Transport said that his recommendation was for £50 for the first permit and £75 for the second. The consultation period of 28 days will not be extended, and ends on 29 October 2010.

Question 10: Fiona Morris (Brantwood Estate)

If the system is so expensive to operate, why don't you abandon it?

Question 11: Richard Thomas

The charges went through 10 years ago as the costs were minimal. If there was a consultation on abandoning the CPZ there would be objections from other people.

David Curl confirmed that that the Local Committee has the decision making power to amend the CPZ locally and parking reviews are carried out annually.

Ben Carasco encouraged residents to put their concerns through their local divisional member or directly into the consultation.

The Chairman explained that the Head of Surrey Highways had been invited to the meeting, but unfortunately was unable to attend as she was ill. He therefore extended the duration of the open public question time.

Question 12: Mr Hood (Firgrove)

The road has been flooded at least 6 times in the last year. It took 7 months to get the drains jetted, and since then it has flooded twice more.

David Curl explained that the jettors should report if there is a problem. If they have not reported a problem they will be sent back for a further look.

Question 13: Louise Morales (Priors Croft Residents Association)

The bus which went from Gloster Road to Woking High has been abolished. It now costs children £7 a day and 2 buses to get to school. Less than 20% of residents have cars. How will the council deal with truancy as a result?

David Curl agreed to ask Passenger Transport to respond outside the meeting.

Question 14: Richard McClutcheon (Woking Cycle Users Group)

I strongly object to the cycle island under item 13 being removed. It is helpful for cyclists and pedestrians.

Question 15: Anne Murray (Borough Councillor)

Residents of Horsell East need a safe place to cross Chobham Road. Plans were drawn up but not taken forward due to objections.

David Curl explained that funding is very limited for highways improvements at the moment. All schemes to be considered are prioritised and assessed. He suggested contacting the Woking Highways Team for further information.

Question 15: Jo Henneberg (Parent of child at St Dunstan's)

In advance of presenting a petition Mrs Henneberg asked whether residents had been spoken to and whether any decision had been made.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

Mrs Liz Bowes explained that no decision had been made but she had had a brief discussion with the Headteacher and some residents. A further meeting would be held to discuss the issue further following the presentation of the petition.

Question 16: Cllr Roberts (Byfleet)

When will the speed limit be changed on the A245 Parvis Road?

David Curl confirmed that the money had been allocated and it was planned to be done this financial year.

Question 17: Richard Thomas (West Byfleet)

Suggested that further staff are employed in the Streetworks Team paid for out of fines – could this be looked at?

David Curl agreed to report comments back to the Streetworks Team.

Question 18: Cycle Users Group (Speed Watch in Park Road)

Would the council consider reducing the speed limit in residential roads to 20mph?

Ian Lake explained that there would be a problem with enforcement, which is a Police issue. Speed limit policy is being looked at and there will be a new policy next week.

Question 19: Cllr Melanie Whitehand (Knaphill)

Now that the Brookwood Farm houses are complete, what is the progress on the Section 278 agreement?

Officers would respond to this outside the meeting.

Knaphill has many un-adopted roads. Will they have salt bins filled?

David Curl confirmed that Highways would only stock salt bins on public highway, and the developer would be responsible for this until the road is adopted.

The drainage on St Johns railway bridge gets clogged and flooded. Could the barriers be removed?

Officers would respond to this outside of the meeting.

Question 20: Louise Morales

Could the rest of the High Street in Old Woking and Gloster Road up to the footpath be considered for shared pedestrian and cyclist use.

Paul Fishwick stated that this could be looked at in the future.

Question 21: Mr Harris

The street lighting is inadequate in West Byfleet along Old Woking Road and Parvis Road due to the vegetation overhang.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

David Curl explained that the tree reduction budget had been reduced and SCC can now only prune trees which are dying or for safety issues. When lights are replaced as part of the street lighting PFI, overhanging trees will be cleared. Cllr Wilson agreed to liaise with Mr Harris outside the meeting.

The Chairman invited members of the committee to comment:

Glynis Preshaw requested a further meeting with Jenny Isaac before February to address issues raised.

Diana Smith requested details of main officer contact for highways in Woking. It was confirmed that Andrew Milne would be the Woking contact.

Will Forster asked how far above the statutory duty were the county's roads. Ian Lake explained that they are trying to protect the network to stop it deteriorating further. Most roads are fit for purpose.

Mohammed Amin stated that there was not enough consultation on the residents permit charges, and 28 days was not long enough.

Ben Carasco requested a meeting between Highways and the Local Committee to look at mechanisms for interaction.

LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

20 OCTOBER 2010

1. Question from: James Osbourn, The Chobham Society

The Chobham to Knaphill road (Guildford Road / Chobham Road) is dangerous. The County's own accident figures show 13 involving injury in the last 3 years. Locals know that these figures are only the tip of the iceberg. Over Christmas the police have resorted to closing the road on numerous occasions as it became too dangerous

The road's shortcomings are obvious, the bends are dangerous with adverse camber, the hedges are overgrown restricting the view round the bends, particularly at the dangerous junctions with Carhouse Lane and Barrs Lane. The situation is made worse because there are no effective ditches water runs off the fields onto the road, and then freezes, as much of the road seems to be in a frost pocket.

Despite these known problems since well before Christmas the road seems to have be left out of the gritting schedule and as a result there were more accidents than usual. Plainly the road is inadequate for the amount of traffic it now takes and some radical improvement work is needed. In the interim a man with a shovel and some hedge cutting gear, could improve ditches to deal with the surface water drainage, and cut back the hedges, particularly at junctions, in order to help sight lines.

When can we expect to see some remedial action to help avoid further accidents?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Surrey Highways do carry out cyclic maintenance of highway drainage and there are limited budgets for ditching and flailing.

Work is being carried out on the ditches in this area before the winter. Those along Guildford Road, between Carhouse Lane and the new development, The Lakes, in the Castle Grove area are included.

On a recent site visit, the hedges in the vicinity of the Barrs Lane and Carhouse Lane junction were not seen to be causing any sight line issues and these are dealt with, by flailing, as part of our routine maintenance work. The alignment of the road itself appears to be the chief inhibitor of sightlines.

The road is on the gritting schedule. However, it is classed as a Priority 2 road and during the exceptional weather in late 2009 / early 2010, our resources had to be concentrated on Priority 1 routes. Under more usual winter conditions, the road would receive attention.

The road is subject to routine inspection and repair work is requested as required. However, there are no plans to undertake any other improvement works.

2. Question from: Robert Shatwell

Following your meeting in Sept regarding the shared cycle/pedestrian access scheme where it was agreed to set up and advertise a scheme whereby people could report incidents involving cyclists and pedestrians within the town centre, could you please advise as to what steps have been taken?

I have been to the council offices on 2 occasions and have been told to report the matter to the police. When I attended the police station they were not interested unless I knew, or could identify the offender.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

In response to a request from Woking's Local Committee, a mechanism for reporting any incidents involving cyclists in the town will be made available from Monday 25 October 2010, as follows;

- An electronic form will be posted on the Cycle Woking website www.cyclewoking.org.uk
- Alternatively, members of the public can pick up a hard copy form from the Civic Offices, Woking Library and Quadrant Court
- Or phone Woking Borough Council's contact centre on 01483 755855 to report the details to a member of staff.

I can only apologise for you being redirected to the police station. The police in Woking have also been notified about the 'Reporting Form' but as the form is available from the Borough Council Offices you should not be redirected in the future.

3. Question from: Cllr. Muzaffar Ali

Why is Surrey county council proposing CPZ charges amounting to 500% increase under the current economically depressed climate and without giving due regards to some of it's residents who are living under deprivation, high unemployment, ill health and shorter life expectancy in comparison to their neighbouring wards. Why is it using one yard stick for all when there is clear economic disparity within the various wards?" I am of course directly referring to the ward I represent, Maybury & Sheerwater.

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

A consultation process is underway across Surrey about whether the Council should set a uniform charge for residents parking permits. The decision to do this was made by the Surrey County Council Cabinet on the 15th September following an initial briefing with Local Committee Chairman.

The scale of this consultation process has meant that the views of the majority of Councillors across Surrey could not be sought in advance, however their comments are welcomed as part of the current consultation on this proposal.

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

The consultation has involved writing to all residents with resident parking permits in Surrey as well as displaying street and newspaper notices to highlight the changes.

Parking permits are not usually means tested when the price is set, however this is something the Council will consider as part of the consultation process

It is expected the Surrey County Council Cabinet will review the consultation responses and make a decision on the way forward in December.

LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)

MEMBER QUESTIONS

20 OCTOBER 2010

1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Residents have expressed concerns at the number of accidents that have occurred at the Arthur's Bridge Road, Well Lane, Lockfield Drive junction and also the danger represented particularly with schoolchildren crossing at the junction.

Would the Highway Authority consider reducing the width of the carriageway to one lane on each side for the full length of the present two lanes?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

You will no doubt be aware that this junction has been the subject of questions and discussion at Local Committee before and at its meeting on 22 October 2009, officers reported a proposal, albeit at short notice, to reduce the Knaphill / St John's bound lanes to a single lane through the junction. This would involve the removal of some of the traffic signal detector loops on the approach to the junction and the intention had been to undertake this as part of a forthcoming resurfacing scheme. Such maintenance work near traffic signals necessarily requires these signal loops to be removed as part of the resurfacing and the loops are reinstated afterwards. Unfortunately, it transpired that the maintenance scheme did not extend far enough to remove all of the signal loops and funding had not been authorised to cover the cost of the additional work that would have been needed to remove the remaining loops and reconfigure the controller.

Subsequently, at a site visit and during a Casualty Reduction Working Group meeting, the reduction of running lanes through the junction was discussed further. There is no real objection to this but we would need to make sure that we would not be simply swapping one set of problems for another.

All signal installations within Surrey are designed to the relevant guidelines and standards and with safety in mind. Linked to the safety of a signal installation is its efficiency because if a set of signals causes unreasonable delays (or what motorists consider to be unreasonable), there is a greater likelihood of drivers failing to stop at a red light because otherwise, they will be held up at the signals for a period that they consider to be excessive. It is not clear if this is already taking place here as a result of the changes that were made to the signals, in response to a petition considered in 2007, whereby pedestrians are now only given a signal to cross when there is an "all-red" phase for traffic. That is, all traffic is stopped whereas traffic could previously exit Well Lane when pedestrians crossed, the intention being that this traffic then stopped at the crossing (this did

not always happen, hence the changes). Following the serious collision at the junction in June this year, we discussed with our colleagues who deal with traffic signals if there was any merit in extending the clearance time so that one flow of traffic would have plenty of time to clear the junction before the other traffic flow commenced. Our colleagues advised us that these timings are already set to UK standards and that increasing them was proven to increase the risk of red light violations due to additional delays, congestion and the fact that regular drivers seeing this as additional "safe" time (thereby nullifying any changes).

When the previous junction layout was changed to the current signal controlled junction, it was inevitable that delays would be introduced because of the need to accommodate the turning manoeuvres out of Well Lane as well as the existing pedestrian crossing. (It is worth noting that pedestrian / vehicle conflicts existed before the junction was signalised and the crossing was on its own). In order to "offset" any delays that signalising a junction can create, it is usual to provide multiple approach lanes that can accommodate more traffic during the green periods than one lane can and this is the reason for two lanes on Lockfield Drive on each approach to this junction. If only one lane was provided, less traffic would be able to pass through the junction in a given period and the queue length would extend back towards the town in one direction and Harelands roundabout, at the junction with Parley Drive, in the other.

Our proposal to reduce the Knaphill / St John's bound direction to a single lane was based on the assumption that queue lengths were unlikely to extend so far as to interfere with the Victoria Way signals in the town. We would need to be sure that if the other direction was similarly reduced, queuing traffic would not interfere with the Harelands roundabout, although this is more likely than queues back to Victoria Way because the roundabout is closer to the signals.

We are happy to recommend that this junction should be incorporated into our Local Transport Plan (ie highway improvements) programme, which might ultimately see some specific funding allocated for these lane changes to take place. These changes are likely to be the most beneficial measures we could take at this junction. Simply reducing the speed limit is unlikely to have much of an effect on actual vehicle speeds, whereas reducing the number of lanes and "confining" traffic a bit more should have an effect. It would certainly eliminate the racing and overtaking that occurs in the two-lane sections. However, we need to be clear that if the 2 lanes are reduced to 1, it will probably be something of a "trade-off", because reverting to a single lane could swap the problems associated with two lanes for those associated with an increase in queue length, ie an increase in delay, with possible red-running, as mentioned earlier.

2. Question from Cllr Mohammed Bashir, Woking Borough Council

Regarding the Cabinet Member for Transport Decision Making Meeting on 15th September 2010 on residents' parking permits for Controlled Parking Zones, why was only the Chair of the Woking Local Committee consulted?

Why were no other Woking County Councillors, or no Woking Borough Councillors formally consulted?

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

A consultation process is underway across Surrey about whether the Council should set a uniform charge for residents parking permits. The decision to do this was made by the Surrey County Council Cabinet on the 15th September following an initial briefing with Local Committee Chairman.

The scale of this consultation process has meant that the views of the majority of Councillors across Surrey could not be sought in advance, however their comments are welcomed as part of the current consultation on this proposal.

The consultation has involved writing to all residents with resident parking permits in Surrey as well as displaying street and newspaper notices to highlight the changes.

It is expected the Surrey County Council Cabinet will review the consultation responses and make a decision on the way forward in December.

3. Question from Cllr Glynis Preshaw, Woking Borough Council

The decision taken at the SCC Cabinet meeting on 15th September following the Review of On-Street Parking Permit Costs to increase the cost of annual residents' parking permits to a set fee of £50 for the first permit and £75 for any subsequent permits would appear to have been taken unilaterally with a total lack of prior consultation with Surrey residents or their representatives. I sent an email to Rikki Hill, copied to Sarah Goodman Local Committee and Partnership Officer (Woking), on 12th September in time for the Cabinet Meeting on the 15th expressing my concerns about the proposed increased cost of residents' parking permits in my ward. The CPZ in Brookwood only applies for one hour Monday to Friday between 1pm and 2pm. I have received no acknowledgement or reply. Was my email passed on to the Cabinet Member for Transport? What, if any, other representations were made regarding the proposed increases to Cabinet and did they elicit a response?

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

A consultation process is underway across Surrey about whether the Council should set a uniform charge for residents parking permits. The decision to do this was made by the Surrey County Council Cabinet on the 15th September following an initial consultation with Local Committee Chairman.

The scale of this consultation process has meant that the views of the majority of Councillors across Surrey could not be sought in advance, however their comments are welcomed as part of the current consultation on this proposal.

The consultation has involved writing to all residents in Surrey with resident parking permits as well as displaying street and newspaper notices.

It is expected the Surrey County Council Cabinet will review the consultation responses and make a decision on the way forward in December. Your comments, made to the Parking Team and The Cabinet Member for Transport in advance of the 15th September will be considered as part of the consultation process.

4. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

- a) Would the Chairman of the Local committee please advise me of the number of CPZ parking permits currently in force and valid in the Borough (on a Borough ward by ward basis)?
- b) Would he also please advise the amount of additional income, per annum, that is likely to be generate from residents in this Borough should the proposed charges be enforced.

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

Approximately 2000 parking permits have been issued in Woking Borough to residents this year. This figure includes second permits, however the number of these per household was not available in time for the meeting.

It is anticipated that if this proposal went ahead fewer permits would be sold in Woking, possibly up to 25% less. Taking this into account, an increase in the cost of a resident permit from £10 to £50 could mean income increases from about £20,000 to £75,000 per year.

It should be noted that Woking Borough Council currently manage parking enforcement in Woking as agent for Surrey County Council. This operation runs at a deficit of about £140,000 per year, partly because the charge for resident permits is too low.

5. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

At the last Local Committee meeting on 2 September 2010, it was agreed that the word SLOW on Kingfield Road would be re-instated following resurfacing of the road two years ago. When is this going to happen?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

I am sorry it has taken so long to replace this road marking following the resurfacing scheme. We are currently looking into why this happened and plan to have the SLOW marking reinstated by the end of November. It is also planned to refresh road markings, particularly near junction around Hook Heath and St Johns at the same time.

6. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

When the County Council gave legal permission for the A247 Kingfield Road in between Claremont Avenue and Westfield Avenue to be closed for 6 months in relation to the Hoe Valley Scheme, why was no proper explanation of the closure given?

Many Local residents had the perception that this closure was for 6 months, rather than a closure sometime during that 6 month period.

If at the same time as advertising the legally allowed closure, the County Council had attached notes from Woking Borough Council about the Hoe Valley Scheme this confusion would have been avoided. Why did the Borough and County Councils not issue a joint statement and explanation on the closure?

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

Surrey County Council does not usually carry out consultation for temporary road closures other than the statutory requirement for notices published in the press and copies posted on site in the vicinity of the affected area. The party requesting the closure, in this case, Woking Borough Council, undertakes any further consultation and issues explanatory statements. Additional notes from third parties are not attached to the statutory notice although every effort is made to make them as clear as possible.

We are not sure where the 6 month period has come from because, as the following extract from the statutory notice states, the closure Order lasts for 12 months and in the "Hoe Valley News" newsletter, issued by WBC in September 2010, it states "Kingfield Road Bridge will be closed for four months from early 2011."

"The Order is required to enable contractors acting on behalf of Woking Borough Council to carry out works in connection with the Hoe Valley Flood Alleviation Scheme (this scheme includes the replacement of the existing Elm Bridge with a completely new bridge). The Order will come into operation on Monday 6 September 2010 for a period of twelve months. It is anticipated that the works will take twelve months to complete. However the closures, imposition of one-way system and suspension of the existing one-way system will only operate when the relevant traffic signs are displayed and in accordance with the conditions described above in this Notice."

We would have expected that by a combination of the consultation that has been carried out by WBC and the newsletters that have been issued, along with the coverage that this scheme has received in the local press, residents would be aware of what is involved with this scheme.

7. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

The recent rains brought flooding once again to Arthur's Bridge Road, between the junctions with Abbey Road and Kirby Road. I had to drive through the flooding on two occasions.

I have had correspondence from a resident whose home is in the area that floods. It appears that cement was brushed down the drains by the contractor's staff while clearing away during work in the Arthur's Bridge area 2/3 years ago.

What remedial action is intended to prevent future flooding?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Some of the gullies in the vicinity of Arthurs Bridge Road / Abbey Road have already been emptied / cleaned as part of our routine maintenance. Others in the area are still to be done but should be attended to in the next week or so. We will also ensure that the drainage pipes are clear and will jet them as required.

It should be noted that in certain circumstances, with exceptional rainfall in a short period, even clear gullies and pipe work can struggle to cope and short term, localised flooding is still possible.

8. Question from Cllr Mohammed Bashir, Woking Borough Council

Three loading only bays in Chertsey Road, by the Albion Square Canopy in Woking Town Centre are due to become overnight taxi ranks. When will Surrey County Council amend the sign and bay markings to allow these bays to be used by taxis?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

These taxi bays did not require Local Committee approval, since they are introduced by a Designation Order made by Woking Borough Council and no specific funding has ever been made available for them. It was always intended to implement them along with the items reported to Local Committee on 3 February 2010 as "Item 9 – Annual Review of On Street Parking in Woking", which received approval at February's meeting but for which funding was only identified and approved at the meeting on 2 September 2010.

The County Council's Parking Strategy and Implementation Group are now processing these changes, which require a period of statutory consultation, after which the relevant Traffic Order can be amended and only then can changes be made on street. It is intended that the amendments reported in February will be introduced by the end of the financial year and this will include the signing and lining changes for the taxi ranks in Chertsey Road.

9. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

Would the Chairman of the Local Committee please advise me of the progress on the resurfacing/repairs to the following roads:

- a) Lockfield Drive - between the junction with Amstel Way to the Littlewick Road
- b) Bampton Way - either side of the junction with Alerton Close
- c) Horsell High Street - between the junction with Bullbeggars Lane and Littlewick Road

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

Lockfield Drive appears on a provisional list for surface dressing in 2011/12. Please note, however, that funding for this list has not yet been identified and it should not be presumed the work will actually be undertaken.

Bampton Way is not programmed for any work.

Horsell High Street (Horsell Birch) is not currently planned for any work, although some local repairs have already been undertaken to the worst sections of road.

10. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

When can residents in St Johns and Hook Heath expect to see white lining refreshed (particularly roundabouts) in their area as the lack of such lining is now a dangerous hazard?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

Refer to answer under question 5 - it is planned to refresh road markings, particularly near junction around Hook Heath and St Johns by the end of November.

11. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

During this summer alone there has been two traffic accidents on the road junctions in Sutton Green, one on the New Lane, Sutton Green Road junction and another at the Blanchards Hill, Sutton Green Road and Whitmoor Lane junction.

Would it please be possible for the Safer Woking Partnership to conduct a safety review into those junctions and act accordingly in order to avoid a serious accident?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The two collisions referred to do not, as yet, appear in the collision data available to us. It can sometimes be several months before the data appears on our system. Currently, it contains details of collisions up to the end of June 2010. The collisions will not appear unless personal injuries were sustained and they were reported to and recorded by Surrey Police.

We will include these two locations on the agenda of the next Woking Casualty Reduction Working Group, due to be held in January 2011. However, we normally only consider locations where there have been repeated accidents. That is not the case here. In the last 3-year period, there has only been one personal injury collision at each location. One involved a vehicle reversing from a private driveway onto the highway and being hit by another vehicle and the other involved a car swerving to avoid hitting a fox and losing control (no other vehicle involved).

We do not know the detail of the collisions that took place over the summer but based on the recorded details of the incidents in the last 3 years, it is uncertain whether any kind of pattern will be identified.

If a pattern can be identified, along with and engineering measures that could be undertaken at either location, those proposals will have to be included and

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 9 February 2011

prioritized within our work programme and will be dealt with as funds are allocated.