

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)  
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 9 February 2011  
at  
Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square,  
Woking GU21 6YL

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 Tony Branagan (Horsell West)  
Cllr Bryan Cross (Goldsworth East)  
Cllr Rob Leach (Goldsworth East)  
Cllr Liam Lyons (Mount Hermon West)  
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]

**01/11 Apologies for absence [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Elizabeth Compton. Cllr Rob Leach substituted for Cllr Mohammed Bashir and Cllr Liam Lyons substituted for Cllr Derek McCrum.

**02/11 Minutes of the last two meetings held on 20 October 2010 and 30 November 2010 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last two meetings of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 20 October 2010 and 30 November 2010 were agreed and signed.

**03/11 Declarations of interests [Item 3]**

Under Standing Order 61 Mrs Diana Smith and Mr Geoff Marlow both declared a personal interest in Item 9. Cllr Rob Leach declared a personal interest in item 4a.

**04/11 Petitions [Item 4]**

**Petition for a drop off point outside the Marjorie Richardson Centre, Woking [Item 4a]**

Under Standing Order 61 Cllr Rob Leach declared a personal interest in this item.

Kay Neville introduced the petition which asked for a drop off point outside the Marjorie Richardson Centre in Woking. It was explained that the centre had been there for 25 years and is open for six days a week. There are difficulties with dropping off clients outside the building. They are disappointed that highway regulations do not permit a drop off point outside. The existing disabled bays are currently misused. The officer response states that the manager was happy with the proposed solution of extra disabled parking bays, but this was not the case. A drop off point outside would make a large difference to attracting new customers to the centre. The petitioners asked whether there was anything else that could be done to help with access.

In response Andrew Milne explained that there are a lot of restrictions on the public highway and officers had hoped that extended disabled bays would be a useful solution. He agreed to consider it further to see if any other solutions could be sought and would talk to the petitioners between now and the next meeting.

The petitioner clarified that regular users come to the centre three or four times a week. If these regular users are unable to be dropped off directly outside the centre then they will often go back home. This is because many users have difficulty walking any distance.

It was agreed that a report would be brought back to a future meeting.

**Petition against a permanent one way system and double yellow lines in Onslow Crescent [Item 4b]**

The Chairman noted that the committee received a petition on this issue at the October 2010 meeting. Using Chairman's discretion he decided that whilst it was noted that the further petition on the same subject has been presented within the 6 month period as provided for in Standing Order 65.6, he would allow the petition to be heard to enable it to be considered at the same time as the response to the previous petition on this subject received on 20 October 2010 – Item 7 on this agenda.

The petition was presented by Tony Metcalf, and stated:  
'We, being either residents or users of the road of Onslow Crescent, Woking, confirm that we are utterly opposed to any plan by the local authority or any petition to the local authority to alter the traffic flow through the Crescent to a permanent one way system. We are also utterly opposed to the introduction of double yellow line restrictions to parking on the Crescent.'

Mr Metcalf explained that the residents of the crescent were shocked by the petition which was put together by the school, which ignored the fact that the problems are caused by those on the school run, and consider the school petition as a selfish way of passing the buck. Residents are not convinced that those on the school run would comply with a voluntary or compulsory one way system. The solution must lay with the school.

The committee agreed to consider this petition under Item 7 on the agenda "Response to petition asking for improved traffic measures in Onslow Crescent".

**Petition on the traffic island opposite Total Garage, Brookwood [Item 4c]**

The petition was presented by Norman Johns and stated:  
"This traffic island was put in to make life easier for pedestrians and cyclists particularly those following the towpath along the Basingstoke Canal. Woking Local Committee at their meeting on 20 October 2010 decided by a narrow majority that it should be removed because it causes some inconvenience to motorists particularly those turning right at the traffic lights nearby.

We the undersigned urge the Local Committee to reconsider and to recall that decision. We also urge the Committee not to install barriers to prevent crossing at this point because these will present a serious danger to cyclists using the road. We believe that any problems for motorists can be addressed by a re-phasing of the lights and other minor improvements. The loss of this crossing point will significantly affect pedestrians and cyclists who would otherwise need to deviate to the traffic lights and wait for 2 phases of the lights in order to cross this busy road. Evidence shows that many more pedestrians and cyclists use the traffic island than cross at the lights."

## Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

Mr Johns stated that users were not consulted when the decision to remove the island was made. Many people currently use the crossing and a letter from Sustrans refers to it as a key link. The report considered by the Local Committee on this issue in October 2010 (Item 13 Annex A) was referred to, specific reference was made to the road safety audit, consultations and the phasing of the traffic lights. There has been a 53% increase in cyclists in Woking, and there were queues at the traffic lights before the island was constructed. The lights need rephasing not the island removing.

The Chairman used his discretion to deal with the petition at the meeting. Members were reminded that there was a detailed discussion on the traffic island at the meeting on 20 October – page 7 and 8 of the minutes of that meeting refers. Members were asked, therefore, to focus their comments on evaluating whether the petitioner had raised any new significant or substantial points which had not been considered previously.

Cllr Preshaw noted she was surprised and disappointed with the petition and suggested that the petition contained nothing new that was significant or substantial and therefore it was unnecessary to debate the issue again. Now that funding had been identified she was keen that the work was undertaken as soon as possible.

Cllr Lyons said that he thought the petitioner raised serious concerns. This included a serious lack of consultation prior to the last debate and a fuller consultation was required in the interest of democracy. Comments from Surrey Police are brief and informal. The island failed its stage 3 safety audit. Further consultation is required.

Mr Forster commented that the previous petition received asked to remove the island as not many people used it. This petition countered that view. He said that there was not public consultation before the island was put in and the committee could be about to make the same mistake again by removing it without consultation. Section 106 monies would be used to remove the island in late March/April. He said he would want a decision referred or further discussion at this meeting. There is an issue of using the 106 monies for this.

Ben Carasco stated to members that how Cycle Woking allocate their funds is not in the remit of the local committee. Carolyn Rowe confirmed that committee saw an information report on the Cycle Woking budget at the last meeting. In the past the committee has allocated some of its funding to Cycle Woking and reports had therefore been received previously.

Mrs Smith said that the new issue raised by the petitioner was that there is evidence to show that many more people use the island than the traffic lights and are also using the tow path. Do we know whether the people using the path include a higher proportion of young people, including those going to and from school? What information are the petitioners getting regarding whether the schools are being consulted.

Cllr Cross said that the vote was tight before and would like to hear more about the failed safety audit, as well as hear both sides of the issue. If

## Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

section 106 monies is being used, what else could this funding be spent on?

Cllr Wilson stated that the full wording of the petition refers to rephrasing the lights and asked if this happened whether there would be a knock on effect.

Andrew Milne explained that Brookwood junction is a sensitive spot and where phasing has been altered in the past it has been to the detriment of highway users. The phasing could be adjusted but could result in a worsening of the situation.

Cllr Kingsbury referred to the comments made in the question from Father Alexis. In response to the question from the Chairman asking whether anything new that was significant or substantial had been raised, he thought the answer was no. The committee has been talking about the issue since last July and Cycle Woking have been asked to find the funding to remove the island which they have done. The committee now need to make a decision on whether anything new that is significant or substantial has been raised and resolve the issue.

The Chairman asked Andrew Milne to comment on whether anything new that is significant or substantial had been raised.

Andrew Milne explained that looking at it from a highways and safety point of view, he did not believe that Mr Johns raised any issues that were significant or substantial that were different to the information that the committee had when it made its original decision.

Mrs Smith wanted to ask the petitioner a point of clarification, but the Chairman indicated that this should have been done at the appropriate time before the member debate.

### **RESOLVED**

It was agreed in a named vote that the petitioner raised nothing new that was significant or substantial, and therefore the decision made on 20 October 2010 to remove the island was upheld.

Vote:

Those that agreed nothing significant or substantial had been raised by the petitioner:

Mr Carasco, Cllr Kingsbury, Cllr Wilson, Cllr Preshaw, Cllr Branagan, Mrs Bowes, Mr Marlow. (7)

Those that did not agree that nothing significant or substantial had been raised by the petitioner:

Mrs Smith, Mr Forster, Cllr Lyons, Mr Amin, Cllr Cross, Cllr Leach. (6)

### **06/11 Written Public Questions [Item 5]**

Nine written public questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in annex 2 of these minutes.

Supplementary questions and responses are below:

Question 9: Michelle Chinery asked how the issue of reduced road width as a result of the additional cycle lane would be addressed. Officers agreed to confirm outside the meeting, but it was thought that the cycle lane was using a grass verge rather than road space.

Members of the committee raised generally the issue of consultation on highway schemes.

#### **07/11 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]**

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

Supplementary questions and responses are below:

Question 1: Cllr Branagan noted it was a disappointing answer as the issue has been ongoing for over 10 years.

Question 3: Mrs Smith requested that when the information becomes available from the Police it is also circulated to Ben Carasco and Lavinia Sealy.

Question 4: In response to a question regarding timescales, Andrew Milne explained that it is not possible to give a specific timetable.

Question 6: It was noted that the response from the Safety Camera Partnership would be forwarded when available.

Cllr Lyons raised a point of order asking for answers to the public's supplementary questions, The Chairman indicated that an opportunity for this was given under the previous item.

#### **Executive Items**

#### **08/11 Response to petition asking for improved traffic measures in Onslow Crescent [Item 7]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report which was a response to a petition presented on 20 October 2010. The Chairman also noted that the petition received under item 4b on this agenda would be considered under this item.

Mrs Bowes commented that St Dunstons has been on site for many years and could see both sets of petitioners points of view and therefore thought that compromise was the only solution. In response to a question regarding the parking bays, it was noted that one parking bay will be removed, and a plate will be put up enabling the legal enforcement of the keep clear markings outside the school.

In response to Mr Forster, it was noted that the parking review was likely to be implemented on the ground around the end of March.

Cllr Wilson suggested zero tolerance if someone was parked blocking a residents drive, and the parents at the school need to be asked to park considerately.

In response to a request from Cllr Cross and Cllr Branagan, members considered whether it was appropriate to bring a monitoring report back to a future meeting, The committee recognised that there were two opposing views given by the two sets of petitioners and the issue was unlikely to be resolved.

**RESOLVED:**

The Committee noted and agreed the measures to be taken set out in the report

**09/11 Response to petition asking for traffic calming in Old Woking High Street [Item 8]**

Mr Forster noted he agreed with the officer recommendation in the report, but explained he thought the issue was to do with the volume of cars rather than an issue of speeding. He asked officers to ensure that they consult with residents and local councillors on any proposed scheme. Andrew Milne noted that officers always endeavour to carry out appropriate consultation.

**RESOLVED:**

The local committee agreed to:

- i) Note the contents of the report.
- ii) Approve the recommendation made in section 20 of the report.

**10/11 Surrey County Council Library Public Value Review [Item 9]**

Under Standing Order 61 Mrs Diana Smith and Mr Geoff Marlow both declared a personal interest in this item.

Peter Milton introduced the report. He noted that the Cabinet decision had been called in by the Safer and Stronger Select Committee and would now go back to Cabinet in March for decision. The Chairman noted that he would be happy to take additional comments after the meeting to the Select Committee.

The following member comments were made:

## Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

In response to Cllr Leach, Peter Milton confirmed that the Performing Arts Library in Dorking was safe.

Mr Forster objected to the axing of the mobile library completely and noted that there may be some elderly and disabled people that it should be retained for. The service in South Woking currently works well. Mr Forster also noted his concern about what would happen if volunteers could not be found to support the proposed community partnered libraries. Peter Milton explained that other avenues would be looked at and the decision would go back to Cabinet before any final decision was made.

In response to questions from Mrs Smith regarding when the mobile library service would go, and about the consultation process for the mobile libraries and whether managers of the vans would have an input, Peter Milton confirmed that there would be a letter consultation to all users, a range of solutions could be discussed (e-readers, community transport etc). The consultation could not start until it has been through Cabinet again. The consultation would last for 30 days and then solutions would be found for September 2011.

Mrs Smith also asked about a hub being created in Maybury and Sheerwater and it was confirmed that it was still an aspiration in the PVR that there would be continuing investment in libraries and were looking to find a solution for that community.

Geoff Marlow agreed with what was proposed and was in discussions about plans for Byfleet library from 1 September 2011.

### **RESOLVED:**

The local committee noted that the Cabinet decision had been called in by the Safer and Stronger Select Committee and would go back to Cabinet again in March. The Chairman requested that in addition to the comments made at the meeting, any further member comments could be made to him before the next meeting of the Safer and Stronger Select Committee in two weeks time.

The Local Committee also noted:

- (i) the contents of the report including the request to assist the Library Service in consulting with and engaging with local community groups and organisations on the viability of establishing a community partnership at Byfleet library.
- (ii) that the service will maintain published opening hours and avoid closures by recruiting up to the level of the budget allocated.

### **11/11 Highways Update [Item 10]**

Andrew Milne introduced this item and noted the following amendments (in bold) to the officer recommendations:



## Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman **and local member** to determine which schemes to progress in the 2011/12 financial year from the list previously approved by Committee, should funding become available for the next financial year;

v) Authorise the Area Team Manager to use any allocated revenue maintenance budget for 2011/12 as detailed in section 3.3 of this report **on the basis of this being £100k, and that, if the allocated budget varies significantly from this sum, that the ratio of expenditure will be agreed in consultation with the Local Committee Chair and Vice Chair.**

In response to a question on para 2.3, Andrew Milne confirmed that he would be writing to members of the committee asking for any needs for infrastructure improvements in their areas so that a record can be developed that could be matched to any available developer funds. It was noted that the distribution of developer funds is dependant on where development takes place.

Mrs Bowes raised concerns about the Maybury Hill junction in Old Woking. There is a lot of new building along Maybury Hill which is likely to result in about 300 additional cars. Concerns have been raised about the impact of this on Maybury Junction.

Mrs Bowes also raised an issue with a parking sign on Park Road, which would be referred to the Parking Team outside the meeting.

In response to some specific queries on drainage and ditching works it was noted that the list was not exhaustive, and what had not been completed this year would be carried forward to next year.

Mrs Smith requested that any developer funding which becomes available should first be linked to the schemes identified in the priority list if possible. It was noted that the contract for roads signs and markings is currently out for tender.

In response to Cllr Wilson it was noted that the £20k in table 1 has been set aside for the specific delivery of the on street parking review.

Mr Forster proposed an amendment to iv) to add the words in bold below to help ensure transparency:

Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager, **after consultation with an all membership local committee working group**, to determine which schemes to progress in the 2011/12 financial year from the list previously approved.

Mrs Smith seconded the amendment which was then debated by the committee.

Cllr Kingsbury, Mr Carasco and Mr Marlow sought clarification on the list in appendix 1. Andrew Milne explained that the prioritisation process looked at the sites put forward and considered significant factors. Committee are

## Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

able to vary the priority list if they agree to choose one factor as being more important than another.

Mr Forster explained that the proposal of an all member working group would enable all members to be involved in the decision.

Cllr Branagan was keen to involve the wider committee.

Mrs Bowes was against the amendment as she is the only member on the committee representing the Pyrford area.

Mr Marlow noted it was hard for him to attend day time meetings.

Cllr Cross explained that the all member process had worked well in Woking in previous years.

Carolyn Rowe advised members to consider whether the number of members meetings required was proportionate to the amount of funding available.

Andrew Milne asked the committee to recognise the reduction in Surrey Highways staffing under the new structure, which meant that there were limits to the numbers of meetings which could be supported. It was also noted that previous methods of engagement were not necessarily sustainable and there are other ways that member views could be taken into account.

The amended recommendation was put to the vote and was agreed by a vote of 8 for, 3 against and 2 abstentions, therefore the amended recommendation was now the substantive recommendation for decision.

Mrs Bowes asked how proportionality in divisions could be ensured, and members suggested that it could be partly achieved through using borough substitutes.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note progress with delivery of highways schemes;
- (ii) Note the positions of its highways schemes and revenue maintenance budgets;
- (iii) Authorise the Area Team Manager to reallocate any residual 2010/11 revenue maintenance funds as necessary within the approved categories to prevent any potential underspend;
- (iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager, **after consultation with an all membership local committee working group**, to determine which schemes to progress in the 2011/12 financial year from the list previously approved by Committee, should funding become available for the next financial year;
- (v) Authorise the Area Team Manager to use any allocated revenue maintenance budget for 2011/12 as detailed in section 3.3 of this report **on the basis of this being £100k, and that, if the allocated budget varies significantly from this sum, that the ratio of**

Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

**expenditure will be agreed in consultation with the Local Committee Chair and Vice Chair**

- (vi) Note commencement of the new highways contract on 28 April 2011, and the potential for variation of indicative scheme costs resulting from this;
- (vii) A further Highways Update report is brought back to the next meeting of this committee

**12/11 Local Committee Funding: Members Allocation [Item 11]**

An amended tabled report was circulated. Sarah Goodman updated members on the changes. The first related to the bid from Peer Productions. SCC Services for Young People support Peer Productions locally by offering them a highly subsidised rate to use Woking Youth Arts Centre. Regarding the alcohol bid, officers advised that staffing costs should not be funded therefore the amount recommended was reduced from £5,198 to £3,598.

The amended report also took account of the request from Mrs Smith to reduce her request for funding from £12,500 for grit bins to £7,500 and was therefore now requesting 3 grit bins. The locations in the report are in priority order so she would be looking to have grit bins at Sparvell Road, Queens Road and Strathcona Gardens. If for some reason a grit bin was not able to be placed at one of the top three locations, then the funding would be used for a grit bin at Lane End Drive. The request for a grit bin at Bittern Drive was withdrawn.

Members requested further detail and justification on the bid from Kingfield School for the trim trail due to the amount requested. This would be obtained and circulated in time for the March meeting of the committee.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee agreed:

- i. The following allocations from the members allocation budget for 2010/11 as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the amended tabled report including the reallocation as set out in para 3.2.
  - 1. Mayford Village entry signs - £1,118
  - 2. Neighbourly Help Around Mayford (NHAM) - £1,133
  - 3. **Peer Productions - £3,598**
  - 4. West Byfleet Bowls Club - £2,200
  - 5. West Byfleet Nursery Garden - £2,000
  - 6. 1<sup>st</sup> West Byfleet Scout Group camping equipment - £2,000
  - 7. Request for Grit Bins (Liz Bowes) - £10,000
  - 8. **Request for Grit Bins (Diana Smith) - £7,500**

**The decision on Kingfield Primary School for £10,000 was deferred to the next meeting.**

Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

ii) Noted that there were no allocations approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 20 October 2010 and 9 February 2011.

**13/11 Update on topics for note [Item 12]**

Cllr Kingsbury reminded the Committee that the consultation on cycling in the town centre finishes on 27<sup>th</sup> February and explained the ways that members of the public could input into this consultation.

Cllr Lyons mentioned a letter in the Evening Standard regarding on street parking. The Chairman asked him to give his views to an officer outside of the meeting.

[10.35pm Cllr Lyons left the meeting].

**14/11 Forward Programme [Item 13]**

Noted as in the report

The Chairman agreed to see if the committee could meet four times per year instead of three.

**15/11 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

---

**Chairman**

[The meeting ended at 10.40pm]

## Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

### 1. Open Public Question Session [Public Engagement Item 1]

**Question 1:** Kathryn Dodington

There have been temporary traffic lights all week at Brookwood Crossroads causing mayhem. Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council were not aware of them.

Andrew Milne explained that they were there due to emergency works being carried out by the utilities. The County Council cannot stop these from going ahead, but try to police them as best they can.

**Question 2:** Cllr Melanie Whitehand (Borough Councillor)

Regarding the adoption of the old Brookwood hospital site - residents have been waiting since 2003 and need it signed off. It is not acceptable that this is on a back burner and not a priority. Residents are being denied full services. I have written to Greg Devine and Cllr Lake after Christmas but have still not had a response.

It was explained that this was a Development Control matter and officers would take it back and get a response outside the meeting.

**Question 3:** Graham Christie (Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association)

Recently I understand that an SCC Spokesperson commented upon local radio that £47M was the amount of S106 monies outstanding. Details were not supplied.

Please confirm : a. What specific projects are covered by the S106 money (if there is a problem with a WBC list can you supply a 3 Villages List please )

b. How much money has been recovered from developers ( and is banked ) ready for disbursement , how much is anticipated being recovered and when, and last how money is unpaid and if so what steps are being taken to recover it?

c. What steps are being taken to ensure that binding S106 Agreements are entered into wherever possible.

Carolyn Rowe explained that the county and the borough are working together to draw information on 106 monies together. The figure of £47m was not recognised. A report on 106 monies will be brought to a future meeting.

**Question 4:** Graham Christie (Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association)

Several SCC funded libraries are under threat of closure and/or removal of SCC employed staff. It is understood that the statistics utilised to judge the viability of a library are based upon book borrowings.

As several libraries are the heart of the community and are much more than book borrowing centres please confirm what steps have been taken to evaluate their activities other than book borrowing?

Byfleet Library is under threat at present despite this library apparently having good national book borrowing figures. The said Library was substantially refurbished just a year ago.

Peter Milton explained that there had been a public value review (PVR) of the library service. Twelve criteria were used to look at the libraries – the detail of these can be found on the Surrey County Council website – [www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk).

Byfleet library has 29,500 book issues (the bottom quartile figure is 46,000) and a total of 20,000 visits (bottom quartile is 34,800). The rate of decline of use is 12.5% of visits per year.

**Question 5:** Michelle Chinery

The people of Sythwood have not been consulted on the cycleway.

Ben Carasco noted that this had been asked as a formal question and would be dealt with later in the agenda.

**Question 6:** Mr Marshall

I was here 5 months ago asking the same question – when will the SLOW sign that was painted on the road in Kingfield be reinstated?

Andrew Milne noted that an answer to this is given in the written member questions.

**Question 7:** Mary Painter (Horsell)

Regarding the Woking Town Centre Library, Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council are in discussions regarding the restaurant in front of the library. I have concerns as a library user, and have not seen any consultation to find out the views of the library users. I would like to ask why the county and borough councils are proceeding with this and why do the councillors feel unable to bring the discussion to a halt?

Peter Milton explained that discussions are ongoing. The proposal is that the frontage would be separated from the library. The County Council are currently in discussion with the borough council – any plan would need to provide enough funding into the library to improve the experience for library users.

**Question 8:** Melanie Whitehand (Hook Heath)

St Johns Bridge was put for assessment in 2005. Since then there have been temporary lights in place and there are issues with drainage. When will the assessment take place?

Andrew Milne agreed to take this question back to the structures team and get a response to Mrs Whitehand outside of the meeting.

**Question 9:** Jo Henneberg

I have put together a petition to the local committee on Onslow Crescent. Are you aware of how difficult it is to access information from Highways in Woking? The petition was a slow and unsuccessful process. Could there be more courtesy and a better fit for purpose mechanism when people ask a question?

Andrew Milne apologised that Mrs Henneberg had not had a positive experience. Regarding the petition it was noted that Highways had met with the petitioner and the school. If there is a specific issue, then Andrew is happy to discuss this outside the meeting. There is a lot of information on the website, and if issues are sent in to the West Area Highways email address ([wah@surrecc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surrecc.gov.uk)) they are logged to ensure a response.

**Question 10:** Nick Flemming

The Cycle Woking signs in Sheets Heath Common and the SSSI are inappropriate. I believe that it has been agreed that they will be removed – when?

Andrew Milne agreed to raise this with officers and get a response to Mr Flemming outside the meeting.

**2. Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund [Public Engagement Item 2]**

The Chairman noted the success that Woking had for its bids to the Small Disadvantaged Areas Fund. Woking received £57k of the £200k available. He thanked the members that were involved in putting the bids together.

**3. Adult Social Care in Woking [Public Engagement Item 3]**

Michael Gosling, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care introduced the item. It is important that people understand the message that the service is being brought into the district and borough areas where people live.

Sarah Mitchell, Director of Adult Social Care gave a presentation on Adult Social Care. The service are trying to give people more choice, but with support at community settings. The county is serviced by 11 borough based locality teams, which in many cases are co-located with colleagues from other agencies.

## Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

The service are looking at what it would mean to create community budgets and they would like to have a conversation with members and GPs regarding what is the right budget for the need in the local areas.

In response to questions, the following comments were made:

1. The dementia figures are predicted figures for 65+. The figures for carers are an estimate of the number of people who are informal carers. SCC will not be supporting all carers.
2. Work has been ongoing to identify different care pathways to support the desire to support people in their own homes.
3. Regarding clearer and more accessible information, a lot of work has been going on to develop Surrey Information Point which has just gone live on the web. This will provide users with a menu of local providers and links to other websites. There is also a media strategy to help get the information to those who are not on the web, which includes information on the back of buses.
4. In response to a question regarding how the percentage growth figures in the presentation were obtained, it was agreed that these would be clarified outside of the meeting.
5. In response to a question from the Alzheimer's Society regarding care for under 65's it was explained that work is on going to look at potential numbers. The service will be looking at cost avoidance of not providing for this group and the implications of it – this will look at financial viability as well as whether it is right for individuals.

The Chairman thanked Sarah Mitchell and Michael Gosling for attending the meeting.

### **4. Surrey Fire and Rescue Public Safety Plan [Public Engagement Item 4]**

The Chairman explained that the consultation on the Public Service Plan (PSP) ended on 4 March 2011, and any further comments other than those made during the meeting should be sent through to Sarah Goodman by this date so they could be submitted.

Kay Hammond, Cabinet Member for Community Safety explained that the Public Service Plan covered a 10 year period and performance would be reviewed annually.

Assistant Chief Officer Simon Moore explained the proposals set out within the draft Public Safety Plan. This included a proposal for Woking Fire Station to have one engine based there rather than two.

Comments made following the presentation, along with officer responses are set out below:

Will Forster agreed with parts of the plan, for example the part regarding the retained fire fighters. He noted that the plan hits Woking hard as it is going from two engines to one. His gut reaction is that Woking needs two engines. Historically Woking has had higher fires than average. He noted concerns that he had heard that the online consultation was not working. He also asked where in Woking the fire station should ideally be located.



In response, Simon Moore said that he was unaware of issues with the online consultation, but would look into it; regarding location of the Fire Station, he would come back outside of the meeting.

Geoff Marlow asked about locations in Woking where it would not be normal for an engine from Woking fire station to be the first to arrive.

Simon Moore explained that fire engines are fitted with automatic vehicle location technology which means the nearest engine to an incident responds to a call. Engines attending an incident in Woking can also come from Cobham, Chobham, Guildford and Camberley.

Bryan Cross asked whether it would be possible to have two fire engines based in Woking during the day, and one at night, as it is easier and quicker for engines to travel at night.

It was agreed to take this away as a comment as part of the consultation.

Public Comments:

Richard Ewings (Horsell) was against one engine being removed from Woking. There are some instances where fire crews are not able to enter a building until second crew is on site. It would be more effective if both engines arrived at the same time. Woking Town Centre is rapidly expanding with more challenges to fire fighters, eg high rise buildings. Speed and efficiency is paramount especially for high rise buildings. He asked how one engine based in Woking would be able to deal with this.

In response it was noted that the number of engines required depends on the severity of the incident. For high rise incidents, three or four engines are typically required. High rise buildings are constructed and designed in such a way as to recognise that immediate intervention is not always possible. The PSP does consider that response will not just come from one fire station. Currently, the second appliance is not always in Woking.

Mrs Morales asked that given the number of high rise buildings in Woking would it be advisable to give additional information to people in flats regarding fire procedures, whether they are council or privately owned.

Simon Moore explained that there is a lot of legislation covering this area. If a building is in multiple occupation then up to date fire regulations and advice need to be in place. In case of a fire in high rise buildings it is advisable to stay put if it is not your flat that is on fire. The responsibility for advice is with the landlord. The Fire Service offers home fire risk checks, and they are keen to get into homes of vulnerable residents to ensure that they have working smoke detectors and to give advice.

Cllr Richard Wilson noted that he would speak to Woking Borough Council Housing Services Manager regarding advice given to tenants.

The Chairman thanked Kay Hammond and Simon Moore for attending.

**WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS****9 FEBRUARY 2011****1. Question from: Richard Thomas**

What action has SCC taken against the Gas board over their work at Victoria arch where I think they started at 6pm where the agreed time was 8pm causing Woking to be closed for the evening?

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

Surrey County Council have not taken any legal action against Southern Gas Networks in relation to this incident. Unfortunately, although clear instructions on timings of works were given at site meetings, the level of written evidence to support these instructions was insufficient to undertake a successful prosecution. This issue is now being addressed in conjunction with the authority's legal team to ensure that the appropriate methods of recording such instructions are followed in future.

However, the incident has been addressed with the regional manager for Southern Gas Networks, and we are currently undertaking increased levels of monitoring of SGN's works in order to address a number of performance issues.

**The following 7 questions received are on the traffic island opposite the Total filling station on the A322. The answers are given at the end of question 8:**

**2. Question from: Kathryn Dodington**

At the Local Partnerships Meeting on 20-October-2010 there was a democratic vote taken on the future of the new traffic island (known locally as Fishwick Island) on the A322 adjacent to the bridge over the Basingstoke Canal. I was very much part of the group that opposed the retention of Fishwick Island for all the reasons discussed at the meeting. To date Fishwick Island still remains as do all the reasons for the removal of it - in fact I attempted to use the island in November 2010 when I was nearly run over by a car travelling around the island southwards (and turning right into Connaught Road) in the northbound lane; this was reported to Surrey Police at the time. Please will the committee confirm that the democratic vote that was taken on 20-October-2010 to remove Fishwick Island with no caveats still stands and that the actions from that decision will be carried out as agreed and that nothing at all will stand in the way of the democratic vote so taken on 20-October-2010. Please will the committee confirm the date of the removal of Fishwick Island. I would add that there is already a perfectly safe way to cross the A322 (which I now exclusively use following my near accident) which is via the Toucan

Crossing at the traffic lights, only some 20 meters south of the said Fishwick Island.

**Answer given after question 8.**

**3. Question from: Jenny Stonor**

As has been publicly stated by Norman Johns of the Woking Cyclist Users' Group, safety is of paramount importance and must be the only consideration with regard to the fate of the central island refuge on the A322 in Brookwood. Why, therefore, is it not recommended that the cyclist/pedestrian phase on the traffic lights, just twenty metres or so along the road, be used to cross the road with additional safety to that offered by the island refuge?"

**Answer given after question 8.**

**4. Question from: Angela Grundy**

Can the residents of Brookwood who signed the removal petition last year be assured and have confirmation from the Local Committee that the removal of the cycle island that was agreed by a committee vote in October will not be compromised by the introduction of a cyclist led petition to keep the island. This petition is inaccurate, misleading and has many anonymous signatures and no reference addresses attached. This is a cyclist led initiative which is likely to have been signed by many that have never even been to or know where the island is situated. When will the Committees actions be carried out and the Island be removed?

**Answer given after question 8.**

**5. Question from: Mike Peel**

Local Brookwood residents were and are still outraged with the construction of Fishwick Island without any consultation. Its introduction has made a dangerous and difficult crossroads and accident black spot even more dangerous. It was agreed by this committee to have it removed last year and we are still waiting. Given that the decision has been democratically reached and agreed why then has the removal of Fishwick Island become a political points scoring football, with the Liberal Democrats actively campaigning and backing the cyclists petition to keep the island, when the petition is inaccurate and misleading? Is this what local politics and democracy has been reduced to in Woking with the resident's wishes being ignored? The Liberal Democrats have no mandate from the people of Brookwood to represent them and should be vigorously ensuring the safety of all users, be they pedestrians, cyclists or vehicle users instead of playing games.

**Answer given after question 8.**

**6. Question from: Stephen Brooks**

Could you confirm that the Local Committee's decision to remove the unwanted & unsafe traffic island on the A322 at Brookwood is to be carried out as soon as possible now that funding has been made available & that a new petition raised by a few non-local & anonymous signatories will not affect their decision?

**Answer given after question 8.**

**7. Question from: Nic Flemming**

What is the Surrey Council Council's liability for serious or fatal accidents at the A322 traffic island opposite the Total Garage (Fina Garage) given that they have been repeatedly warned by the local residents that the island increases risk for all road users, including cyclists and has the Council taken out insurance against possible prosecution for wilful or criminal negligence in the event of such an accident caused by the island?"

**Answer given after question 8.**

**8. Question from: Father Alexis**

Some time ago we were told that the Fishwick Island Folly outside the garage on the Bagshot Road, A322, at Brookwood was going to be removed. Then we heard that there were no funds to do so. However, there seem to have been funds enough to spend on it, when a more reasonable way to have spent the money would have been to mend the potholes in the same road a little nearer the railway bridge, which one is forced to drive over because the lanes are narrow there.

I pass the Fishwick Folly three or four times a day, and members of our congregation (we have daily services at Saint Edward's) mention the same problems as I see: - lorries finding it difficult to get into the petrol station, and causing blockages; cars unable to get into an almost empty right-turn lane properly, and so going the wrong way round the Fishwick Folly; people driving over the kerbs around it - probably not doing much good to their suspension. Those of us who are "good" being held up when we want to turn into Brookwood Village towards Pirbright, because we cannot get into the right lane, and missing the lights.

When is something going to be done - or will it take a serious accident to wake up the roads department and have the island removed? It may be that some cyclists have found it useful, but how many are the cyclists that use that road compared with the motorists? How many of them are local residents?

Please do not delay any further in removing the island. It surely will not cost as much to remove it as it did to erect it there.

**Answer to questions 2-8 from Chairman on behalf of the committee:**

The canal towpath forms part of the Saturn Trail and National Cycle Network 221, and is crossed by the A322 Bagshot Road at this location. The island was installed to enable people (walkers, cyclists and wheelchair users) to be able to connect to the two Northern sides of the upgraded canal towpath along the desire line.

On the 20 October 2010, following a petition presented to this Local Committee, it was agreed that the island should be removed.

The Cycle Working Board have agreed to release £10,000 to enable the required works to be completed by the Highways Authority. Discussions are ongoing with contractors to programme these works, and, subject to resources, it is anticipated that the island may be removed in March, or early April.

It is noted that a recent Road Safety Report has recommended if the island is removed new signing is provided at the junction locations of the canal towpath with the A322 Bagshot Road to guide people to the existing light controlled crossing. These measures would be implemented at the same time as the island's removal.

Surrey County Council has a legal duty to ensure the highway is maintained in such a manner that it enables the 'safe passing and re-passing' of highway users. It is equally the case that highway users are responsible for ensuring their adherence to, and compliance with, highways law.

The liability for an accident at any location, should it occur, is dependent upon the specific circumstances. For example, at this location, if a driver chooses to pass the island on the wrong side of the road, contrary to the keep left sign, this is an offence, and, if an accident unfortunately resulted, the driver would be held liable.

**9. Question from: Michelle Chinery OBE**

Why has there been no consultation with residents in relation to the Sythwood shared use link and has an impact assessment been carried out?

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

The new shared use link in Sythwood on the northern side between the Salvation Hall and Tresilian Way covers a section where originally there was no pedestrian or cycleway facility and people were forced to cross the road.

The remainder to the new route, where works are currently ongoing, will be to widen the existing facility into the verge.

This new shared use link, when completed will connect up the existing shared use route outside of the Salvation Hall with the shared use routes around Goldsworth Park Lake. Similar signing to that observed around the Goldsworth Park Lake will be erected within the new link and the existing street lights will be relocated to the back of the shared use area.

With reference to consultation with local residents, this new shared use link does not have any direct frontages to consult with, except for the Sythwood Primary School which is located opposite and supported the proposed link, whereby a new light controlled crossing could be installed near the school,

## Annex 2            Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

connecting the northern and southern sides, in the future (subject to funding and approval from this Local Committee).

As this new link is an extension of existing facilities, and no equalities issues had arisen from these existing facilities, a formal equalities impact assessment was not considered necessary. This link provides positive benefits for all highways users, and in particular enables pedestrians and wheelchair users to continue their journey without interruption, whereas without this facility it was necessary to cross Sythwood twice to utilise the footway.

**MEMBER QUESTIONS****9 FEBRUARY 2011****1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council****SPEEDING TRAFFIC ON BREWERY ROAD**

A site visit took place on 20 Jan 2011 to introduce the new Highway Manager for NW Surrey to the problems of speeding traffic on Brewery Road.

Mrs Grace a local resident detailed the scenario of accidents, which are now occurring more frequently the last occasion being 12 Dec 2010 and has accumulated evidence over a 10 year period.

Residents while accepting there is no money for the measures needed to remedy the speeding traffic and that there are priorities are unwilling to accept anything less than physical measures as the only answer to speeding traffic. What can be done to remedy this long ongoing issue?

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

We acknowledge the residents' deep concerns about vehicle speeds along Brewery Road and around the bend in particular and met with residents on 20 January 2011.

We have committed to review the information that the residents have collated about incidents that have taken place in the road and will use this as part of our usual assessment process, which will be in collaboration with Surrey Police. This information will help us to identify any solution required.

We understand that Surrey Police's new Casualty Reduction Officer for Woking will shortly be in post and Brewery Road will be at the top of the list of speeding issues that we will discuss with him.

The issue of speeding, generally, has been raised with the Safer Woking Partnership.

**2. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council****CONSISTENT DISRUPTION ON TRIGGS LANE**

May the Committee be advised of all occasions in which temporary traffic signals have been used in Triggs Lane during 2009 and 2010.

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

According to our records, temporary traffic lights have been employed in Triggs Lane on three occasions in 2009, and four times in 2010, as follows:

- 6 January 2009 - 3 days, water main replacement following leak outside 'Chelston' (south of bridge).
- 10 March 2009 - 1 day, carriageway repairs in area around bridge.
- 28 July 2009 - 7days, emergency repairs to electrical supply cable, outside 'Chermor' (south of bridge).
- 4 March 2010 – 1 day, water leak by junction with Cavendish Road.

## Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

- 26 March 2010 – 6 days, collapsed manhole followed by Thames Water pipe repairs, north side of bridge.
- 24 May 2010 – 1 day, emergency electrical fault, outside 'Chermor'.
- 29 June 2010 – 8 days, emergency electrical fault, outside 'Penryn' (opposite Triggs Close).
- There was also a temporary road closure on 6 April 2009 for a Police incident.

As the above data shows, nearly all of the works were for utility company emergencies. While we endeavour to minimise disruption, we cannot prevent such works from being undertaken. It was particularly unfortunate that works in March 2010 coincided with planned works under Victoria Arch, as Triggs Lane was on the diversion route. We do try to ensure that works do not conflict with others in the vicinity, or overrun without good reason, but there are so many arising that it is not always possible.

Please note: The current planned SGN gas works, in Triggs Lane, near The Triangle, with temporary lights, that started at the end of January this year, were scheduled for completion in two weeks.

### **3. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council**

For how many days has the Chobham Road in between the Garibaldi Crossroads in Knaphill and Chobham Village been closed during December and January this year? What were the reasons, in terms of weather conditions and number of accidents, and will this be sufficient for the categorisation of the Chobham Road as a secondary rather than primary salting route to be reviewed?

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

We do not have any records on our systems of when the road was closed, although we believe that Surrey Police did intervene during the particularly severe weather in December. We have contacted Surrey Police to ask for the number of times / dates etc when they closed the road for safety reasons. If we do not get this information in time for the meeting, we will pass it on to Councillor Smith when it comes to hand.

This information will help us to determine if there is a significant history of such incidents, in which case, the matter will be referred to Asset Management for consideration of the road being categorised as a Priority 1 route rather than its current Priority 2 status.

### **4. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council**

In October 2010 a local resident wrote to me saying: 'During the recent wet weather it has become an ordeal to use the bus stop outside Waitrose in Bampton Way Goldsworth Park (travelling towards Woking) as passing traffic throws up so much water from the puddles formed in the road that those queuing for a bus have to hide behind the glass screen (ie go back into the rain) to protect themselves from being splashed! This is very difficult for the wheelchair users in the queue.

The problem is the breaking up of the road surface in the space marked for buses to stop - there has been a lot of patching but the surface is no longer even and puddles form very quickly. Could I therefore ask that urgent consideration be given to resurfacing the small area at the bus stop before the rain becomes even more frequent than it has been in the last couple of weeks.'



On 10 November 2010 the Community Highways Officer told me that the area had been measured up and he believed the order would soon be placed for remedial work, though there was some doubt about the source of funding.

Please could we have an update on how funding can be found for this repair and when the work will be done?

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

As indicated in the question, it has been recognised that there is a problem with surface water ponding in the area of the bus stop, and the ideal solution will be to skim off and relay a level surface so that water will easily run off into the nearby gully.

On further inspection, and concerns over traffic noise and vibration, it has also been noted that the carriageway itself along Bampton Way adjacent to Torridon Close and Alterton Close, including opposite the bus stop, is starting to break up. As with the bus stop, essential repairs have been carried out, but the desired long-term solution is to relay the surface in the affected area, rather than a succession of small patches.

It would be most cost effective to do it all at the same time. However, we are coming to the end of the financial year, and of the current contract, and it is looking unlikely that we will be able to get that done before April. It would naturally fit into the next Local Structural Repair programme, as too big a job for a patching gang (a mini-planer would be required), but not big enough to be classed as a scheme.

That being the case, we will indeed see if it is possible to at least do something with the bus stop to prevent ponding in the short term, and keep any holes filled.

**5. Question from Cllr Glynis Preshaw, Woking Borough Council**

Connaught Road in Brookwood was resurfaced last summer. Residents have complained about gravel/chippings from the road surface accumulating along the kerbs and on the pavements.

If these chippings are thrown up by passing cars they may cause injury to pedestrians and cyclists. Could the road and pavements be swept and in those areas where the new road surface appears to be breaking up could the contractors be requested to make good their poor workmanship?

Residents in Connaught Road, Brookwood have drawn attention to localised flooding caused by some of the drains and gutters alongside the road being in need of clearing. This has been exacerbated by the accumulation of loose gravel from the road surface. Could the necessary works be undertaken to clear the drains and gutters as soon as possible?

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

Many of the roads treated during the last surface dressing programme have experienced noticeable stone loss after the December snows, Connaught Road included.

Some loose material is to be expected. Most is swept up prior to reapplication of road markings, and the remainder is either bedded in by traffic or swept up by routine cyclical road cleansing. However, the snow and ice has had a deteriorating effect, which we have reported back to our contractors.

In the first instance, they have agreed to carry out an extra programme of sweeping to pick up loose chippings. This will happen very shortly, though we have not yet been given actual dates. Furthermore, we are assessing and

monitoring the roads in question to check that the loss of material is not affecting the overall integrity of the surface.

Regarding Connaught Road specifically, there is one reported location in particular where the level is very flat, to the extent that stone in the channel alongside the kerb edge is enough to hinder the flow of surface water to the next gully, resulting in ponding, and some water running over the footway.

After sweeping, if any embedded material is still causing an obstruction, we will get it removed to restore the flow. We will also check the gullies themselves, although they should be able to take quite a lot of debris in the bottom of the pots before there is any significant blockage to the connecting pipes.

#### **6. Question from Cllr Glynis Preshaw, Woking Borough Council**

A Brookwood resident has contacted me with serious road safety concerns regarding the traffic lights at the Pirbright Arch. Quoting from his email to me "Drivers regularly ignore the red light at the Pirbright railway tunnel end of Connaught Road during busy periods. I have witnessed one, two, three or even more cars passing through a red light, thus making it difficult for pedestrians to cross safely over to the new walkway. The sensors for the Pirbright railway tunnel traffic lights do not detect bicycles, which can lead to the dangerous situation of a cyclist passing a green light, which turns to red whilst the cyclist is in the tunnel. They then have the misfortune to encounter motor traffic also on a green light but travelling in the opposite direction. This happens during quiet periods such as school holidays or late at night when the volume of cars is lower and cyclists must rely on the sensors correctly detecting them." Is it possible to address these problems? I have also emailed the local police team and am awaiting a response from them.

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

Unfortunately, red light violation is a problem, to some degree or other, at almost every signal installation in the UK, not just in Surrey. Where this has demonstrably resulted in personal injury collisions, red light violation cameras can be installed but the collision history is unlikely to permit such a camera at this location. However, we have referred this to our colleagues in the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership and if an answer is available in time, this will be reported orally at the committee meeting.

The period between one flow of traffic losing its green signal and the next flow receiving it (the intergreen period) is 6 seconds but this can be extended by vehicle presence on the detector loops in the tunnel. These detector loops, which are buried in the road surface, rely upon magnetic induction to work. They are configured and capable of detecting cycles but can only do so if the cycles have an adequate ferrous content, which can be a problem with some modern cycles that are made from alloys, composites, glass fibre etc. The sensors can "go out of tune", analogous to a radio losing its signal. However, since receiving this question, our traffic signals colleagues have arranged for their contractor to attend site and increase the sensitivity of the detector loops.

Whilst it is quite possible for a driver to receive a green signal before a cyclist fully clears the tunnel but the green signal only means that the driver may proceed only if the way is clear. If a cyclist is still proceeding through the tunnel, the way is not clear.

The intergreen period could be extended but experience has shown that this is likely to exacerbate the problem. Regular drivers would see this additional time as

“safe” time to clear the junction and delays and congestion would increase, as would red light violation and the likelihood of collisions.

**7. Question from Will Forster Surrey County Council**

Please would the County Council inform the Local Committee and members of the public what measures have been taken to ensure safety and reduce disruption during the closure of the Elm Bridges on the A247 Kingfield Road as part of the Hoe Valley Scheme?

As part of this what, if any utility works and road resurfacing schemes are planned during the time of the Hoe Valley Scheme on nearby roads?

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

The full closure of A247 Kingfield Road at Elm Bridges is considered to be the safest method of dealing with the bridge replacement work. It is also considered to be less disruptive.

Clearly, there are aspects of the bridge replacement where a full closure is unavoidable. There are, however, phases of the work when, for limited periods, temporary traffic lights could be used to allow alternate, single lanes of traffic to pass over the bridge. That having been said, a full closure will allow Woking Borough Council's contractor to carry out more work in a given time, for instance working on the parapet walls on both sides of the road at the same time, rather than on each side alternately if traffic had to be accommodated. The use of temporary signals would, therefore, extend the overall period of disruption.

Whilst the carriageway will be closed, pedestrian access over the Hoe Stream will be maintained via a temporary path that, from the end of Claremont Avenue, will skirt to the north of the Hoe into the grounds of the leisure centre before crossing the Hoe on a temporary bridge to the east of the existing leisure centre access bridges. This temporary footbridge is also required as an alternative when the leisure centre access bridges are replaced.

As part of the diversion route, we have requested that access for residents of Wych Hill, between the A320 and the closure, is via Claremont Avenue because we do not want to permit any access into Wych Hill from the Turnoak Roundabout. Experience suggests that as soon as any access is permitted, such as that for residents, all classes of vehicle will take a chance to see if there is a way through. The concern here is that if any non-resident vehicles, particularly large ones, enter from the roundabout, there will be nowhere for them to easily and safely turn around, remembering that the first part of Turnoak Avenue is private and not highway, Claremont Avenue is one-way southbound and that the Claremont Avenue / Wych Hill Lane junction is not laid out for vehicles to turn around like this.

The extent of the closure is actually quite limited and within that area all the utility companies' equipment will effectively be renewed. This is because it first has to be diverted on to a temporary bridge that will carry the equipment whilst the Elm Bridge is replaced; this will allow services to be maintained to properties in the area. The utility equipment will then be diverted back onto the replacement bridge, obviously with new equipment over the bridge itself.

Given the limited extent of the closure, it is not possible to take advantage of it to carry out additional works in the affected length of road. Further a field, our Streetworks Team will ensure that no other planned utility or resurfacing work will take place that will affect traffic flow on the diversion route. Clearly, any emergency works, by their very nature, cannot be planned for and will be dealt with if and when they arise.

**8. Question from Will Forster Surrey County Council**

Since being elected, I have pursued the County Council's Highways team to ensure both Bonsey Lane and White Rose Lane are resurfaced.

Bonsey Lane was resurfaced on 29 and 30 January, which was very welcome and I was pleased that the Council did this much needed work but also that they agreed to undertake the work on a weekend as requested.

White Rose Lane is scheduled to be resurfaced this year, and I have requested the work take place in January to avoid the Hoe Valley Scheme works. Following my request the resurfacing was planned in late January, what has happened to change these well made plans?

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

Thank you for your comments regarding Bonsey Lane. We also were pleased to be able to get it done, having just missed the cut in previous years' programmes. As to White Rose Lane, we can confirm that the section from Heathside Crescent to approximately 30 metres south of Ashwood Road is on the Surface Treatment Programme for 2011-12. In preparation for that, it was scheduled for pre-patching in the week 24 to 31 January this year. However, a combination of circumstances has evoked a shift in timing.

Because the current contract with Ringway expires in April, not all the planned pre-patching work could be achieved before that date, and within the remaining budget. As the subsequent surfacing work could not be done until after Kingfield Road is reopened (due end of August) without unacceptable further disruption to traffic, it was decided that the pre-patching could also sensibly be delayed, to allow use of current resources on roads to be dressed earlier in the year.

Also, there was a requirement on SGN gas to carry out some remedial work following mains replacement.

The result is that the pre-patching will now be done by the new contractors, May Gurney, soon after the Kingfield Road closure ends, with the intention to complete the surface treatment before the winter.

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

On previous occasions I have asked when white lines will be refreshed in West Woking, in particular St. Johns and Hook Heath. Also as mentioned before, the lack of white lining in these areas is fast becoming hazardous. When can residents in this area expect to see their white lines refreshed?

**Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee, relating to both Questions 9 and 10**

There has been a programme of machine laid and hand laid lining in progress across the County, but unfortunately not all completed. Weather permitting, there may be some more done in March or April, and in recognition that there are some specific locations that need urgent attention, we are compiling a shortlist for Woking, Runnymede and Surrey Heath, for priority treatment.

That list includes the SLOW marking in Kingfield Road mentioned in Question 10, as well as, for example, the roundabout in St Johns that was missed last time, and the KEEP CLEAR at the junction of Hook Heath Avenue and Holly Bank Road. Whatever remains outstanding will of course be carried over to the 2011-12 programme.

Please also be advised that as a result of rethinking our procurement strategy, after the existing all-encompassing contract is terminated in April, road markings

Annex 3            Draft to be agreed on 28 March 2011

will be managed through a stand-alone contract direct with the operating company, which should enable better control and responsiveness.

**10. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury Woking Borough Council**

At an earlier Local Committee Meeting, a Kingfield resident requested the replacement of the word 'SLOW' on Kingfield Road (just before Beaconsfield Road) which sign was lost during resurfacing and never reinstated. The resident was promised early action. When will this work be done?

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

Answer included in response to Question 9.