

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.30pm on 28 March 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 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]

16/11 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Elizabeth Compton.

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

17/11 Minutes of the last meeting held on 9 February 2011 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 9 February 2011 were agreed and signed.

18/11 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

Under Standing Order 61 Cllr Preshaw declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 7, Cllr Bashir declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 8 and Cllr Cross declared a personal interest in item 6 and item 10.

19/11 Petitions [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

20/11 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

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

There were no supplementary questions.

21/11 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

Seven 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: Ben Carasco confirmed that potholes are still being fixed on roads that are due to be resurfaced.

Question 2: Iain Reeve explained that he did not believe that any Cycle Woking projects had been delayed due to resources going into the consultation.

Question 3: Iain Reeve confirmed that the initiative to hand out cycle clips and lights would restart now the consultation had finished and believed that this initiative encouraged both new and existing cyclists.

Question 5: Iain Reeve explained that all users need to be consulted before the wheeling channels are installed.

Question 7: Regarding accidents that occurred on Chobham Road during the snow and icy conditions and whether Bisley Parish Council or Lavinia Sealy had been consulted, it was agreed that a response would be given outside the meeting. In addition Ben Carasco stated that himself, Lavinia Sealy and Diana Smith should put in a combined case for the re categorisation of Chobham Road into a Priority 1 route.

Non-Executive Item

22/11 Application for a Map Modification Order to add a Footpath to the Definitive Map and Statement for Surrey between Footpath No 102 (Woking) and Footpath No 28 (Woking) at Woking Golf Club [Item 7]

Under Standing Order 61 Cllr Preshaw declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item. Before she left the room, Cllr Preshaw explained that both herself and her husband had provided written evidence in support of the footpath. They moved to the area in July 1989 and since then have used the footpath on a regular basis. Her husband also cycled along it until the path was fenced off in 2009. They both assumed that it was a footpath, and neither of them have ever been challenged. Cllr Preshaw then left the room.

Mr Wright, who had previously registered to speak on the item was invited to speak for up to 3 minutes against the recommendation.

Mr Wright explained that he has been a member of the golf club for 36 years and is well versed with the boundaries of the course. The club has worked with Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council to signpost and maintain the public footpath over the course. Existing footpaths 102 and 28 are well established and there is no need or justification to create another footpath which would only save members of the public a few extra minutes. The car park was fenced in but fell into disrepair. This was redone in 2009, since when vandalism has decreased. Although security is irrelevant in determining this, it is a concern. In recent times people have been challenged by staff and requested to stay on the footpaths.

Mr Tarring, as the applicant, was invited to speak for up to three minutes in response to the issues raised by Mr Wright.

Mr Tarring stated that he did not have a lot more to add to the report. There has been evidence of a path along this route for 100 years, and he has walked the footpath hundreds of times since 1972, and has not once been challenged. He explained that he did not see it as adding an additional footpath, but reinstating one that has been there for many years.

Sue Briant clarified the following points made by the speakers. The path has been shown on maps back to 1916, but these are only evidence of a route on the ground. It is not shown as a right of way on the 1932 or 1952 draft of the definitive map. The route is recoded as a footpath on the 1912 Ordnance Survey (OS) map. It was confirmed that members are limited to what can be taken into account when making the decision, and security is not one of these issues.

Mrs Briant explained that members have a duty to determine this and explained the factors that could and could not be taken into account. There is map evidence to show it is designated as a route on the OS map of 1912

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

but is not a route on the definitive map. The public continued to use the route until the fence was put up.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed (by a vote of 12 for with none against and no abstentions) that:

- i. A Map Modification Order be made to add a public footpath between Footpath No. 102 (Woking) and Footpath No. 28 (Woking) at Woking Golf Club to the definitive map and statement for Surrey. The route will be known as public footpath no. 415 (Woking).
- ii. In the event that one or more objection is received and maintained, that the order and supporting documentation be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to decide the matter.

[Cllr Preshaw returned to the meeting.]

Executive Items

23/11 Cycle Woking – Shared Space within Woking Town Centre [Item 8 amended]

Under Standing Order 61 Cllr Bashir declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the item and left the room.

Iain Reeve introduced the report which set out the results of the consultation. He explained that officers believed that concerns expressed during the consultation regarding the shared space raised valid fear and therefore officers recommended that cycling in the town square should be time limited.

Ben Carasco ensured that all members of the committee had the amended report which had been published and sent to members in front of them, and reminded members of the public that this item was for members of the committee only to debate. He then briefed members on the equalities issues in paragraph 8 of the amended report which included the need for the committee to have due regard to the impact on the elderly, young children and the range of disabled people who would be using the areas of the town being discussed, both positive and negative, when making their decision.

Mrs Bowes has listened and talked to many groups of people about this issue and felt that cyclists have the choice to dismount and walk their bikes, however, people with disabilities have no choice. She therefore proposed to amend the traffic regulation order to prohibit cycling in Woking town centre in areas A and B on the map. This was seconded by Mr Marlow.

Mr Forster disagreed with the amendment as he thought the report was well researched and did not highlight any current safety issues.

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

Mrs Smith disagreed with the amendment as she thought it was a balanced report, and whilst she recognised that there is real fear, this is not evidenced. Equalities issues go several ways and a number of disabled people use bicycles. Young people, as well as those who don't have access to a car, make use of the shared use area. The consultation showed that the majority of people want shared use. Mrs Smith indicated she would be willing to go with the officer compromise.

The Chairman took a vote on the amendment for a total ban on cycling in areas A and B. There were 3 votes for, 8 against and one abstention, therefore the committee was directed back to the original officer recommendation.

Mr Forster stated that in his opinion the evidence showed that there are no real factors to prohibit cyclists. Nothing new is being introduced as the order has been in place for two years. He asked councillors to take a view on the evidence and continue the order unamended.

Mrs Smith would support the compromise given the strong feelings, even though it is irrational. It might be useful to revisit in the future if circumstances change, for example the proposed library redevelopment. It would be helpful if Surrey County Council could continue to work with the disability groups.

Cllr Preshaw was pleased that the officer recommendations went some way to addressing concerns but did not feel it went far enough. She would like to see the restrictions extended from town square along Gloucester Walk and extended to 7 days a week. She also raised concerns about cycling along Commercial Way between Chapel Street and Church Path due to the amount of clutter which is there at the moment. Therefore she would also like cyclists to dismount at this point during the hours suggested for town square.

Cllr Cross indicated that he would abstain from the vote on the current proposal and made a number of comments. He asked why there was no mention in the consultation of the planning permission for the library entrance in Gloucester Walk. Although the Police have said there have been no reported incidents, he noted that all councillors have received an email saying there has been incidents. The report stated that 1500 people take their bikes into the town centre, but Cllr Cross thought that the majority of these journeys ended in the town. The ban on cycling between 10.30am and 4pm may not be long enough and will be hard to enforce. Cllr Cross was looking for more of a compromise than was currently being debated.

In response, Dominic Forbes explained that the library was not included in the consultation as Gloucester Walk is wide and has sufficient width for pedestrians and cyclists, but recognises councillors concerns. The suggested timings relate to the existing restrictions for motorised vehicles in the town centre, but they could be altered. It was recognised that a number of the cyclists go to the train station.

Cllr McCrum stated that he does not feel that Gloucester Walk is wide enough and hoped all issues regarding width, the trees and cycle racks

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

were looked at before planning permission was granted. He would like the proposed town square restrictions extended to Gloucester Walk. Cllr McCrum also raised concerns about days when there are events or fairs in the town, and thought cycling should not be allowed on these days. He would support the restrictions between 10.30am and 4pm.

Cllr Branagan agreed that a compromise needed to be reached. He noted that in the previous 10 days, the majority of correspondence had been from cyclists. Cllr Branagan had concerns with cycling along Gloucester Walk.

Cllr Wilson noted that a lot of good work had been done on cycling in Woking, but he did agree with the problems in town square and Gloucester Walk. The roads are dangerous and a compromise needs to be reached. He would like to see the length of the ban extended slightly, but not enough to discourage commuters. Cllr Wilson noted his concern about how this would be enforced. Regarding the blue area on the map, Cllr Wilson noted the possible problem with the planters, but felt this could be sorted.

Regarding the education campaign, Iain Reeve explained that he had spoken to the Police and they are happy to help, although they cannot guarantee resources.

Mr Carasco said he was sympathetic to the points raised. Regarding area A, the key parts for discussion were Gloucester Walk and Town Square (Peacock Walk is lightly used). He noted some concerns over the timing and would like to see the ban extended to Sundays. The issue with area B was mainly about street clutter, without it there would be enough space. A balance needed to be reached to promote cycling and build on what has been achieved.

Cllr Kingsbury raised concerns about cycling along Gloucester Walk and Town Square. He noted that two weeks ago Woking Borough Executive asked officers to look at making Commercial Way safer by removing the planters etc. He therefore proposed splitting recommendation (i) into two parts one covering area A and the other area B as follows below. This was seconded by Cllr Branagan and the timings amended to ban cycling from 10am until 4pm on Monday to Sunday to help accommodate school children and commuters:

Proposed by Cllr Kingsbury and seconded by Cllr Branagan:

(i) That the existing permanent order allowing cycling (dual use with pedestrians) within the town centre on designated streets as attached in Annex D (Areas A coloured yellow and B coloured blue) is amended to allow cycling all of the time in Area A except Town Square **and Gloucester Walk up to the Civic Offices** where it would be restricted to before **10:00am** and after 4pm (Monday to **Sunday**) i.e. no cycling between **10.00am** and 4pm. This was agreed by a vote of 7 for, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

Cllr Kingsbury further proposed a new (ii):

ii) Cycling would be allowed all of the time in Area B. This was seconded by Mr Forster

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

Cllr Preshaw stated she would like to see the cycling ban extended to the area of Commercial Way (Area B) between Chapel Street and Church Path

Mr Forster noted that cycling in area B was the most supported in the consultation.

Cllr McCrum noted that the clutter in Commercial Way would be removed in due course, and thought that splitting Commercial Way would be confusing to people.

In response to Mrs Smith, Dominic Forbes confirmed that it would take approximately 6 months for the order to be changed and would cost a few thousand pounds.

Mr Carasco stated that a decision on Commercial Way could not be taken on the assumption that work would be carried out to remove the clutter along this stretch, as this work is not within the remit of the Local Committee.

Cllr Kingsbury noted that in addition to the works being looked at by the borough council, some work to remove the A boards could also be undertaken.

Cllr McCrum would be happy to support cycling in area B on the understanding that the A boards would be removed immediately and further improvements would be made to Commercial Way in the fullness of time.

Mr Amin thought that Commercial Way was not safe for shared use given the cabins selling food and the tables and chairs.

The Committee took a vote on proposed (ii). This was not agreed as the vote was 5 for, 5 against and 2 abstentions. The Chairman used his casting vote against the motion and therefore the motion fell. Therefore a new (ii) was proposed by Cllr Preshaw.

Proposed by Cllr Preshaw:

ii) That the restrictions agreed under (i) be extended to Commercial Way between Chapel Street and Church Path and in the event that improvements are made to Commercial Way that this decision is reconsidered by this Committee. This was seconded by Cllr Cross.

Iain Reeve explained to members that until the traffic order is amended, which could take 6-12 months, the current arrangements would continue to apply. This would give time to address the clutter.

Mr Forster indicated he would not support the motion as the clutter is not currently causing any problems.

Cllr Cross felt as the amendment would not be implemented for some time, there would be time for Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council to work together to declutter the area.

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

The committee voted on Cllr Preshaw's motion (ii) and it was agreed by a vote of 4 for, 4 against and 4 abstentions with the Chairman using his casting vote in favour of the motion.

Regarding recommendation (iv), Cllr Forster asked for full information on funding for this scheme to be provided to local committee members. This was seconded by Mrs Smith.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

(By a vote of 7 for, 2 against and 3 abstentions)

- i. That the existing permanent order allowing cycling (dual use with pedestrians) within the town centre on designated streets as attached in Annex D (Areas A coloured yellow and B coloured blue) is amended to allow cycling all of the time in Area A except Town Square **and Gloucester Walk up to the Civic Offices** where it would be restricted to before **10:00am** and after 4pm (Monday to **Sunday**) i.e. no cycling between **10.00am** and 4pm.

(By a vote of 4 for, 4 against and 4 abstentions. The Chairman used his casting vote for the motion and so the following was agreed)

- ii. **That the restrictions agreed under (i) be extended to Commercial Way between Chapel Street and Church Path and in the event that improvements are made to Commercial Way that this decision is reconsidered by this Committee.**
- iii. That the Local Committee delegate authority to the Cycle Woking Programme Manager in consultation with the Local Member and Chairman to proceed with the necessary traffic order, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver this project.

(Agreed by a vote of 10 for and 2 abstentions)

- iv. **That funding for this scheme comes from Cycle Woking Section 106 funding and that full information be provided to this Local Committee.**
- v. That a report is submitted to this Committee in approximately 12 months time, indicating any incidents within the town centre.

[Cllr Bashir returned to the meeting and the meeting adjourned for 5 minutes until 9.30pm.]

24/11 On Street 'Pay and Display' Parking Charges in Woking Borough – Review of Charges [Item 9]

David Curl introduced the report and noted that charges would only be increased in zone 1. There had been one objection to the order which was

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

in 2 parts and was set out in the report. It was noted that the date in recommendation (iii) needed to be changed from 1 April 2011 to 11 April 2011 to take account of the call in period.

In response to Mrs Bowes request to defer the item until the Surrey County Council consultation on parking is over, David Curl explained that this could be done, but the Woking parking account was currently in deficit and delaying the decision would result in the deficit continuing. The account is running at a deficit, partly because the cost of residents parking permits and on street parking costs have not been raised for 5 years.

Mr Forster stated he agreed that the item should be delayed. He asked how it would be possible to implement the increase on the ground on 11 April 2011, and why there was no increase in West Byfleet. In response it was noted that the committee agreed back on October 2010 not to include West Byfleet.

Cllr Cross asked what the current balance was on the account.

In response to a question from Cllr Kingsbury regarding consultation, it was noted that notices were put up around zone 1 in Woking.

In response to Cllr Preshaw, it was confirmed that the increase in residents parking permits would help reduce the deficit.

Mr Marlow commented that it should not have been left so long to make the increase.

Regarding the concern Mrs Smith raised regarding parking bays on Sundays and yellow lines, it was noted that it would be good to include a review of these as part of the next parking review in Woking.

Cllr Kingsbury explained that the borough council had endorsed the changes a couple of years ago. Mr Marlow was concerned that the county had been informed of this agreement two years ago, but it had taken this long to action it. Ben Carasco agreed to raise this with Ian Lake.

Cllr Cross asked for legal officers comments regarding Mr Stranks' objection. David Curl confirmed that he had discussed this with the legal order team during the preparation of the report and the recommendations and the reasons behind it are considered robust, however all decisions are subject to challenge.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

(By a vote of 12 for and 1 abstention)

- i) Approve an increase in the hourly on street parking charge for Woking Town Centre Zone 1 from £1 to £1.40.

(By a vote of 6 for, 5 against and 2 abstentions)

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

- ii) Approve new on street parking charges of £1.40 per hour on Sundays and Bank Holidays in Town Centre Zone 1 between 08.30 to 18.30

(By a vote of 9 for, 2 against and 2 abstentions)

- iii) Approve that the new charges are introduced from **11 April 2011**.

25/11 Woking Youth Service Delivery Plan [Item 10]

David Waine introduced the report which set out the Youth Service Delivery Plan for 2011/12. It was noted that more detailed information on the plan was available to members on request. David explained that if further in year cuts are made, then officers will come back to members with proposals for dealing with them.

In response to queries raised by Cllr McCrum, it was agreed that the youth service would continue to engage with stakeholders to see how they can contribute to work in south Woking, and would ensure that Cllr McCrum and Mr Forster are included within this, specifically regarding Barnsbury.

In response to Cllr Wilson regarding provision for children that go to Fullbrook, David Waine explained that they would be keen to enter discussions in where youth work could be provided in Byfleet now there is a full time worker covering the area. Youth workers also work within the Fullbrook School, so young people are able to access provision directly through the school.

Mrs Smith asked a question regarding the transformation project. It was noted that David Waine was not in a position to give an update on this.

Mr Forster asked a question regarding what would happen if there was no buy in to the youth centre and how borough leisure services could feed in. He also asked for more action in south Woking, and more events for young Asian women. David Waine was not in a position to give an update on the transformation project, but explained that sessions had been put together at the request of young Asian women to address their needs, but this has been discreet at their request.

In response to Cllr Kingsbury, it was noted that the service regularly meet with staff from the Ypod.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee agreed the targets and priorities for youth service delivery in Woking in 2011-12 as outlined in section 2 of the report

27/11 Local Committee Funding: Members Allocation [Item 11]

A tabled addition was circulated which contained a bid which came in after the deadline, but required funding before the next meeting of the Local Committee.

Draft – To be agreed on 29 June 2011

Mrs Bowes suggested that any remaining funds, once the bids had been agreed, should be allocated to Woking Hospice for a one off cost. This was seconded by Mr Forster.

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 report **and the tabled addition.**
 1. Kingfield Primary School - £5000
 2. Pyrford Primary School - £2500
 3. Request for Grit Bins (Diana Smith) - £2500
 4. Request for Grit Bins (Liz Bowes)- £2500
 5. **The Counselling Partnership - £116**
 6. **The Woking Hospice - £305**
- ii. to note the allocation approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 9 February 2011 and 28 March 2011 set out in paragraph 4.

28/11 Forward Programme [Item 12]

Noted as in the report with suggested additions of items on the Olympics on 12 October 2011 and 8 February 2012, a report on encroachment on wide grass verges, and an item, if appropriate, jointly with the Disability Alliance on benefits.

It was also requested that the committee meet formally four times a year.

The Chairman noted that it was Carolyn's Rowe last meeting as Area Director and the committee expressed their thanks to her for all the support given over the past few years.

As the meeting was also the last for the municipal year, Cllr Wilson, on behalf of the committee, expressed thanks to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the committee.

29/11 Update on topics for note [Item 13]

Noted.

30/11 Exclusion of the Press and Public

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 10.30pm]

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

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

Question 1: Ian Wright (Woking Cycle Users Group)

Would the Local Committee welcome getting together a group of local people including cyclists and disabled people, following the meeting to find solutions to the issues raised with shared use?

Ben Carasco replied that yes, generally it would be good to get the wider community in Woking working together. However, he was unable to comment on the specific question in relation to shared use as it would pre-determine the decision on the committee item.

Question 2: Pauline Marshall

When planning petitions are submitted and the highway authority comments on them, the highways issues on adjacent land is not always apparent to the public. Can the council require that plans submitted make clear the relationship of a proposed development with the adjacent pavement, road or public footpath?

Dominic Forbes explained that when planning applications are submitted the plans show the general form and shape of the development. They won't always have all the detail in terms of crossing points. If the plans are not sufficient for Surrey County Council (SCC) to assess them, then we will seek additional plans. Regarding Airflow, SCC recommended no highways issues as change of hours is not an issue for highways. When an application gets planning permission they then have to seek a highways licence from SCC.

In a supplementary question Mrs Marshall stated that the crossing was not on the plans.

Dominic noted that if any changes are to be made to the roads, then a highways licence is required and this would only be granted if it was satisfactory to highways.

Question 3: Clive Wood (Surrey Disabled Peoples Partnership)

In light of the legitimate concerns raised by vulnerable pedestrians, do the committee feel it is ok to ask cyclists to push their bikes through the pedestrianised area of Woking town centre?

Ben Carasco explained that the committee was unable to answer this question as it would predetermine the decision on the agenda item.

Question 4: Mr Shatwell

Will the committee agree that the most important aspect is the safety of all residents and visitors to the borough. To allow cycling in a pedestrian area,

especially Gloucester Walk, will prejudice the safety of pedestrians and encourage cyclists to use other pedestrianised areas in Woking. Will the committee agree that terrible indictment on SCC/WBC that the roads are not safe to use. How can we make them safer for all road users?

Ben Carasco explained that the committee was unable to answer this question as it would predetermine the decision on the agenda item. The local committee should focus on the safety of all residents.

Question 5: John Wellsman (Guide dog user)

I have been blind all my life and the association has been training guide dogs for 80 years. Questions put back to the association relate to statistics. We don't have statistics, only experience. We have to be taught how to deal with static issues and mobile issues. Where is the evidence that Guide dogs is instilling fear into me?

Ben Carasco explained that the committee was unable to answer this question as it would predetermine the decision on the agenda item.

Question 6: Simon Leslie (Horsell)

Regarding my written question, when will you be able to provide me with options and worked up costings?

Ben Carasco hoped that this information would be available within a week or two.

Question 7: Ian Wright

Regarding proposals from officers to close the town square for cyclists, it was stated that 4.30pm was too late to encourage cycling for school travel and asked whether the committee would consider 3pm more appropriate.

Ben Carasco explained that the committee was unable to answer this question as it would predetermine the decision on the agenda item.

Question 8: Alan Blackburn

When members are voting, please could they consider the issue and not vote along part lines.

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**28 MARCH 2011****1. Question from: Richard P Hennessy**

The residents of Park Road have previously raised their concern to the Local Committee about the level of traffic and speeding on this residential road. Speed Watch volunteers have been working for more than two years devoting more than 460 hours and reporting around 1800 excessive speeders and feel that action has to be taken. We understand that budgets are very tight but would like to ask for a full assessment to be carried out to consider what measures, including 20 mph limits, chicanes, speed bumps etc. would be recommended if funds should become available at some future time.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

You will recall that the letter sent from Surrey County Council's Highways department dated 3 November 2010 outlined the differences between a 20mph limit and a 20mph zone; a 20mph limit is indicated using entry and repeater signs, whereas a 20mph zone is physically enforced using traffic calming. These requirements have not changed with the adoption of the new speed limit policy, which gives Local Committee and Cabinet Members greater flexibility to approve speed limits where these do not have the support of both the Police and Surrey Highways.

The Local Transport Note 1/07 "Traffic Calming", published by the Department for Transport in March 2007 states that for a 20mph zone, "it is doubtful that a 20mph zone on a single road would have a significant effect on speeds or accidents unless it was at least 500 metres in length with measures spaced less than 100 metres apart." It also suggests that traffic calming features should be spaced 60 to 70m apart. With Park Road being approximately 700m long, between Maybury Hill and Pembroke Road, it is clear that more features would be required than those in White Rose Lane.

The level of detailed assessment that would be required to give you the answers that you are seeking is normally carried out much closer to the intended construction period. If traffic calming features are being considered, the position of driveways will need to be noted and taken into account, as would the position of features such as manholes, hydrants and valve covers. This last statement assumes that a 20mph zone is appropriate.

In your letter from Surrey County Council Highways dated 27 April 2010, it was stated that there had been no personal injury collisions along Park Road in the 3 years prior to that date. The personal injury collisions data has been checked again and in the last 3 years there have been no such collisions. As a result, it is unlikely that a 20mph limit / zone will be appropriate.

Park Road has not previously been included on our works programme, although it has been on a list of scheme requests to be considered for inclusion in our programme. All prospective schemes for inclusion on our programme are scored and prioritised using a rating system that takes account of many factors including

accident statistics. Using this rating system, Park Road ranks very low in relation to other sites, and for this reason it is unlikely that Park Road would warrant funding for speed reduction works.

In view of this, we do not propose to carry out any further assessment of Park Road other than to ask the new Surrey Police Casualty Reduction Officer, who I understand is due to take up his post soon, to undertake a speed survey along the road.

I am sorry that I cannot offer a more positive response to your enquiry.

2. Question from: Kevin Davis

In the name of safety, it is good that Fishwick Island on the A322 has now been removed. I am dismayed that SCC has given people the opportunity to put their lives at risk by not forcing people to cross at the toucan crossing. The reason given is that railings have been known to be a contributory factor in cyclist fatal accidents in the past. Although I don't disagree that this is a fact, I do question why, with this fact established, the existing railings which cross the bridge have been left in place. In the vote at the October meeting, barriers were listed as an option to be installed if thought necessary. Clearly they are necessary as people will cross here without regard for their own or other's lives. I think SCC have failed here (again), the existing railings are around half a metre from the road, so the likelihood of crushing is minimised. On the removal of Fishwick Island, these railings (on the opposite side to the petrol station) should have been extended down as far as the cycle path which goes back on the canal. Evidence of previous railings can be seen at this point and the pavement is easily wide enough to accommodate this. Once and for all, will SCC look at this junction properly, considering all users from a safety aspect and solve safety issues at this junction before someone is fatally injured?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Additional guard railing was investigated and considered as part of the design process in the revision to the cycle route via the toucan crossing and removing the island. However the findings were that further railings, in addition to the revised signage and footway markings, were not appropriate in order to corral pedestrians or cyclists toward the signal controlled crossing.

On the western side of A322 Bagshot Road, access is required to the petrol station requiring intermittent gaps in any proposed guard railing. On the eastern side, the footway narrows to such a degree that any proposed guard railing could not be extended across the end of the cycle route, whilst maintaining adequate width for accessibility. Therefore, it would be left with an arrangement of guard railing that can be easily bypassed.

Within a 30mph speed limit, all street furniture must have a minimum of 0.5 metres lateral clearance to the edge of the live carriageway; hence why the existing railings on the bridge are located thus. Though even at this distance from the carriageway, any long and continuous length of barrier constitutes a very real danger to cyclists, as they can be trapped between vehicles and the guard railings, with many incidents across the country resulting in serious and fatal casualties.

The existing railings that cross the bridge are not guard railings but safety barrier, which are there to provide protection to the bridge parapet.

The following four questions are on the shared space within Woking town centre. The answers are given at the end of question 6.

3. Question from: Carole Frost

I live in Horsell and along with many others have welcomed the shared space scheme in Woking town centre. I find that now I have a safe journey from one side of Woking to the other. At the moment I am able to cross at Brewery Road car park, cycle up Gloucester Way, turn right at the town square, go down Peacock Walk and then go onto the cycle path that runs along Victoria Way. I work near the community hospital and use this route as well as when I go to church, the station and the leisure centre. An alternative route I use is to cross at the lights on Victoria Way at Chobham Road, continue on the town side of Chobham Road and across to Commercial Way where I can make my way across the market and back onto Victoria Way just before the arch, once again by this time on a cycle path. I am not the only one who benefits from these routes. To name but a few: students who go to Woking High and St. John the Baptist; people going from the Horsell side of town to the Football ground; and people going to the leisure centre. I am sure you all know there have been a number of accidents along the section from Chobham Road to Victoria Arch and to make cyclists use this route, I think, would show a great disregard for the lives of cyclists. "Car Fodder" is a phrase that comes to mind. If the vote goes against the continuation of the shared space scheme in the town centre, I would like to know what safe alternative will be put in place?

Answer given after question 6.

4. Question from: Ian Wright

My concern is with the Local Committee's discussion and decision making concerning shared use by pedestrians and cyclists of parts of Woking Town Centre following the consultation on the issue which closed at the end of February. This is item 8 on the agenda.

Given that Local Committee members will have read the detailed paper sent by Woking Cycle Users' Group to all of them and the fact that there is no evidence of any actual harm coming to any pedestrian (whether able bodied or disabled) from sharing the areas with cyclists, I anticipate and encourage the Local Committee to decide to make no changes to the present universal access arrangements.

However I recognise that some disabled groups in particular have a perception and a fear of danger from cyclists. Clearly it is not in the interests of vulnerable pedestrians to be subjected to any unnecessary fear and through this to feel that they cannot come into the town centre.

My question is therefore how Local Committee members believe that all groups (including cyclist groups and the disabled groups) may best work together to alleviate any fear arising from the shared use?

Answer given after question 6.

5. Question from: Jane Seymour

Woking took part in the Cycling England scheme to assist in encouraging cycling in Woking and so it became a "cycling town". As part of that scheme and in order to encourage cycling through the town without cyclists having to negotiate the dangers of Victoria Way or impede motorised traffic using it, permission was granted for cyclists to cycle through the pedestrianised town centre.

How can the Council justify considering removing that permission so that there would be no safe cycling route through the centre of the town when they have accepted money from Cycling England and bearing in mind there is potentially money available from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, distribution of which is likely to be influenced by what Councils have done in the past.

Answer given after question 6.

6. Question from: Stephen Millard

It appears that the Council is considering banning cycling in the town centre based only on the fears of another group, where there is no evidence of danger to support that fear and strong evidence that the fear is misplaced. I understand that the local consultation has failed to uncover any evidence of actual danger and has shown that Department for Transport guidance is clearly in favour of allowing cycling in pedestrianised areas such as Woking Town Centre. If cycling through the town centre is banned, have those committee members supporting a ban considered the following points: on what grounds could the cost of enforcing a cycling ban be justified; how could enforcement be carried out; what explanation could be given to 'offenders' to make them understand the reason for the ban and so make them happy to follow it; what penalty for breaking a ban would be appropriate given that the 'offender' is engaging in an activity which is considered safe and encouraged by published national government guidance?

Answer to questions 3-6 from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The combined Experimental and Permanent Orders allowing people to cycle within certain streets within the town centre has now been in place since 3 April 2009, a period of almost 24 months. Concerns have been raised about this arrangement and therefore it was appropriate to carry out a review including a consultation with the public and key stakeholders.

The results of this consultation and review are before the Local Committee tonight.

The Local Committee will discuss and debate the issue of shared space in the Town Centre and come to a reasoned and balanced decision.

Until a decision is made it would not be appropriate to comment on possible outcomes.

A fuller answer will be provided at the next Local Committee should that still be required.

7. Question from: Norman Johns

Increased clutter in the East end of Commercial way and on pavements in other part of the Town Centre has reduced the space and increased hazards on the pavements for disabled residents. Now that Surrey County Council has LTP2 in the transport plan as a tool with which to tackle this problem. May I be informed of the date when Residents can expect to see the removal of clutter to the advantage of all users of the Town Centre.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

It is our understanding that the concern expressed over increased clutter is primarily connected with street trading in Woking Town Centre, but also refers to accessibility for the disabled in general.

Surrey County Council LTP2 Accessibility Planning Strategy does contain a wide range of measures and plans to improve accessibility, both independently and in partnership with other agencies and organisations, such as Woking Borough Council and the Police.

Regarding Woking centre and Commercial Way specifically, the market stalls, burger bars and ice cream vans are licensed by Woking Borough Council, the exception being tables and chairs for established businesses such as Esquires and Weatherspoons, which are licensed and policed by ourselves. Woking Borough Council also endorse a restricted number of charity collections. There has indeed been an increase in the number of stalls in Commercial Way, particularly at weekends, following discussions between the Borough and the Town Centre Management Group, whose aim is to encourage a thriving commercial environment that will enable Woking to 'beat' the recession.

However, there are terms and conditions, agreed with ourselves as highway authority, to prevent such activities from obstructing the passage of highway users, disabled or otherwise. Unfortunately we do not have resources available to patrol the town during weekends, but any evidence of obstruction or hazards caused by street trading can be referred to ourselves or the Borough Council, by individuals or agencies such as the Woking Access Group and WAVS, to be addressed as required.

Detailed information is available on Woking Borough website under Town Centre Markets. Any questions regarding the licensing policy and operation of street trading should be directed to Ian Young, Woking Borough Markets Co-ordinator.

As regards other restrictions, we do periodic checks on advertising boards and encroachments, but that is a continuous battle, not helped by the fact that not all of the pavements are adopted highway.

It is not possible to give a date for the generic removal of clutter as requested, but any specific examples can be dealt with as described above.

8. Question from: Simon Leslie

I emailed County and Borough Members as long ago as 2 March 2011 about the problem of Excess Speeds and Road Safety in Brewery Road, Horsell. Unfortunately I have not received an acknowledgement or reply on behalf of the County.

Will Leading Borough Members please say what, if any discussions have taken place or are planned with WWF with a view to securing funding for speed abatement measures in Brewery Road under a section 106 agreement?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

I have been in touch with Mr Leslie and have received a subsequent response from him. I have also met Mr Leslie on site to explore matters further and have agreed a number of follow up actions.

The part of the question relating to the Section 106 agreement has been referred to Woking Borough Council and a response will be sent direct from them.

MEMBER QUESTIONS**28 MARCH 2011****1. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council**

Would the local Highways manager please advise when the following roads will be repaired or resurfaced:

Lockfield Drive (Amstell Way to Littlewick Road)
Horsell Birch
Bampton Way

The pot-holes and poor road surface in each of the above roads were reported to the council some time ago but as yet they have not been repaired/resurfaced and they are getting worse every week.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

Lockfield Drive and Horsell Birch are both down for surface treatment this coming financial year. Bampton Way has not yet been scheduled for repair but continues to be inspected, and any safety related defects will be treated in accordance with our asset management policy.

2. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

What has been the total cost to Cycle Woking, Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council both financially and in officer time for consulting and reviewing shared use in parts of Woking Town Centre?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

This is an estimate of the costs involved based on staff costs which are predominantly part of existing overhead costs.

Marketing, printing forms, etc totals - £600

8 Events (staff time) - £3,500.

Web work and analysis of hard copies etc - £900

Analysis by Corporate Strategy team - £3800

Total = £8,800

3. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Whilst consulting on shared use in parts of Woking Town Centre, Cycle Woking, Surrey County Council and Woking Borough Council staff handed out cycle clips and lights for bicycles amongst other items. Why was this initiative stopped?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

The original intention during the consultation events run in the Town Square was to provide an opportunity to consult the public and carry out an educational programme around being safe whilst cycling and walking during the 'winter' months whilst it is dark during the peak travel periods. This included handing out cycle related material. However, local concerns were expressed that handing out cycle related material whilst consulting the public at these events could be perceived as promoting cycling instead of taking a neutral stance. As there was not sufficient resource to run both the educational programme and the consultation separately at these open events in the Town Square it was decided to focus on the consultation.

4. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Please could Surrey County Council confirm how many accidents between motor vehicles and cyclists, and between motor vehicles and pedestrians have taken place in the last two years?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

For the last two years (01/01/2009 - 31/12/2010 inclusive) there were a total of 733 reported injury accidents involving a pedal cyclist but excluding those which involved a non-motorised vehicle. For the same period, there were 748 reported injury accidents involving a pedestrian but excluding those which involved a non-motorised vehicle. To give a context, there were a total of 7897 reported injury accidents in the same period

The wording is important, as it cannot be certain that incidents which involved a non motorised vehicle did not also involve a motorised one. It is also worth noting that the pedal cyclist was not necessarily injured in the collision, and was not necessarily hit by the motorised vehicle. Pedestrians recorded in accidents will always have some sort of injury.

This is the best information available without manually checking each individual record held which would be a difficult task.

5. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Please could the County Council explain the delay in installing wheeling channels in the subway under Woking Railway Station?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

During the consultation period in November/December 2010 relating to the wheeling channels, the local disabled group requested a demonstration of the type of channel to be used by supplying a sample section. The supplier, manufactured a sample and an on site demonstration was carried out on 17 February 2011. However, no one turned up from the disabled group to view the demonstration, which was disappointing. The supplier is now manufacturing the wheeling channels with installation in the near future.

6. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 29 June 2011

Following the answer to my question at the Local Committee in February, I note that the carriageway along Bampton Way near Torridon Close and Alterton Close has now been repaired, but the pooling of water at the bus stop opposite still means that the bus shelter is used almost as much for people to shelter behind in wet weather to avoid being splashed by traffic as to shelter under from the rain. Please can the pot-holes causing this ponding also be repaired?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

Patching work has been arranged and is intended for completion within the next two weeks. This location has also been added to our list of intended local structural repair works, and, dependent on other identified needs, will be scheduled for further works during the coming financial year.

7. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

Following the answer to my question at the Local Committee in February about closures to Chobham Road in Knaphill due to snow in December and January this year, has the information from Surrey Police about the number of days closure and their reasons for closing the road yet been received? Will the Chobham Road in Knaphill be referred to Asset Management for consideration for being categorised as a Priority 1 route, and what is the time-scale for the decision on recategorisation to be made and implemented?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

The information from Surrey Police was received and sent to Councillor Smith on 14 February. The upgrading of Chobham Road to P1 will be raised at the forthcoming Winter Service Review, but it is unlikely that the present categorisation will be amended.