

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.00pm on 29 June 2011
at
Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square,
Woking GU21 6YL

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mrs Liz Bowes (Pyrford) - Chairman
Mr Mohammed Amin (Woking Central)
Mr Will Forster (Woking South)
Mrs Linda Kemeny (St Johns and Brookwood)
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 Liam Lyons (Mount Hermon West)
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]

30/11 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Ben Carasco.

31/11 Minutes of the last meeting held on 28 March 2011 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Woking) held on 28 March 2011 were agreed and signed.

32/11 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

Under Standing Order 61 Mrs Bowes, Cllr Kingsbury and Cllr Wilson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 13. Cllr Forster declared a personal interest in items 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

33/11 Petitions [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

34/11 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

Two 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.

35/11 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

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

There was one supplementary question:

Question 2: Mrs Smith asked Andrew Milne to actively pursue CCTV as an option in Knaphill.

Executive Items

36/11 Response to Petition to Marjorie Richardson Centre [Item 7]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 7.

Andrew Milne introduced the response to the petition which was submitted to the Local Committee on 9 February 2011.

In response to Mr Forster it was noted that Highways do not envisage any safety or traffic management issues, and the Police would be consulted before any works takes place.

In response to Cllr Kingsbury it was confirmed that two buses would still be able to pass each other.

Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

The local committee thanked officers for the response and noted the report.

37/11 Traffic Regulation Order for High Street, Woking [Item 8]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 8.

Andrew Milne introduced the report. Members welcomed the report and noted paragraph 2.3 which confirmed that if Surrey Police close Chertsey Road for public order reasons, then traffic can be directed along the High Street.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee:

- (i) Approved the advertising of the necessary Traffic Regulation Order;
- (ii) Agreed that any objections should be considered and resolved by the Area Team Manager for the North West area in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman in accordance with the Council's constitution.

38/11 Community Pride Fund [Item 9]

Members agreed to review, at a private meeting towards the end of the financial year, any funding left in order to agree where this should be spent.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee:

- (i) agreed funding is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division
- (ii) noted that individual Members allocate their funding based on the principles detailed in Annex A
- (iii) noted that Members should contact the Area Maintenance Engineer to discuss any specific requirements and arrange for the work activities to be managed on their behalf.

39/11 Highways Update [Item 10]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 10.

Andrew Milne introduced the item and commented that the developer funding within the report was based on the best information available at the time of writing and was subject to change.

Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

In response to Cllr Cross it was agreed that a meeting would be organised to discuss traffic management in Vale Farm Road before any money is spent.

Members queried the status of the schemes identified to be potentially funded by developer funding. Additional information was requested on the funding source of these schemes and which development the funds were associated with.

The Local Committee:

- (i) noted the ITS highways and developer funded schemes being progressed;
- (ii) noted the revised highways schemes list;
- (iii) noted that a further Highways Update is to be brought back to the next meeting of this committee.

40/11 HGV Operators Licence [Item 11]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 11.

Members requested that if an HGV licence application falls near a divisional boundary then both/all county councillors should be consulted, and also asked whether there could be further training for new members. It was agreed to take this back to relevant officers for a response outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

The Local Committee noted:

- (i) There is now an established system in place for notifying and consulting Members of applications in their divisions.
- (ii) Training for Members was carried out in September and November 2009. This was made available to all County Councillors.
- (iii) The contents of the annual information report.

41/11 Traffic Regulation Orders and Public Notices for Development Related Highway Works associated with Barratt Development at Land on Guildford Road, Woking [Item 12]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 12.

Greg Devine introduced the report and explained the grounds on which the committee could make their decision. Officer opinion was that there were no grounds on which the decision could not be taken.

In response to Cllr Cross regarding a comment about preventing vehicles turning right out of the aggregates yard, Greg explained that this part of the

Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

scheme was not part of the committee's decision, but was agreed at planning. However, Greg explained that some vehicles have to turn right as they cannot get under the arch due to height restrictions. Road markings will be re-introduced to try and prevent this movement.

Cllr Lyons broadly welcomed the proposal. Officers confirmed that it was not possible to make small alterations to the design as this was agreed at the planning stage. Police consultation will be carried out when the traffic order is made, but officers had also met with them on site and they were happy with the proposal.

Mr Forster indicated that he would abstain from the vote but understood the legal argument for making the decision.

Following a site visit, Cllr Kingsbury stated that he was happy with the proposal but requested a review after 12 months. In response Greg Devine agreed to add a clause in the highway agreement between Surrey County Council and the developer to request a further safety audit after 12 months of operation.

RESOLVED:

Subject to Woking Borough Council granting planning permission for the proposed Guildford Road lay-by extension and accepting details submitted pursuant to planning conditions, the Committee agreed (by a vote of 10 for and 3 abstentions from Mr Forster and Cllrs Cross and Lyons):

- (a) The publication of Public Notices to remove two pelican crossings on the A320 Guildford Road and Station Approach, as described below, and
- (b) The advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders to restrict the use of the proposed Guildford Road Lay-by to loading At Any Time and daytime Controlled Parking Zone pay-and-display parking, as described below, and
- (c) That any significant objections received be considered by the Planning and Development Group Manager, in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman/Vice Chairman who shall decide whether the Traffic Regulation Orders may be confirmed and shall subsequently report that decision to Committee, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, and
- (d) That if no significant objections are received or remain, the Traffic Regulation Orders be made, and
- (e) To endorse Woking Borough Council's proposal to operate the northern section of the new lay-by as a taxi rank outside of daytime Controlled Parking Zone hours, as described below.

42/11 Traffic Regulation Order for Development Related Highways Works associated with the Housing Development on Land at Rydens Way, Old Woking [Item 13]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 13, Mrs Bowes, Cllr Kingsbury and Cllr Wilson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 13.

In the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman, Mrs Bowes proposed that Mr Marlow should chair the meeting for item 13. This was seconded by Mrs Kemeny and agreed by the committee. Mrs Bowes and Cllrs Kingsbury and Wilson then left the room.

Greg Devine introduced the report. An officer amendment was made to paragraph 1.3, which removed reference to pedal cycles. The order would therefore allow the public to still be able to ride pedal cycles over the existing link road following its conversion to soft landscaping.

Cllr Lyons questioned the timing of the report in relation to the outcome of the village green application. In response Greg Devine explained that if the developer wished to progress then we needed to as well. The village green application does not constitute a material change.

Cllr Lyons proposed an amendment to the end of recommendation c to readTraffic Regulation Order be made **provided that none of the land on which the replacement link road will be has been designated a village green.**

This was seconded by Cllr Cross.

Greg Devine explained that the replacement link road could be part of the village green if successful. He confirmed that this amendment was acceptable if that was the decision of the committee.

In response to Mrs Kemeny asking whether the committee had the right to delay the developer, Greg explained that the developer could still construct the development. The amendment would ensure that if the village green application was successful then the existing link road could still be used. The terms of the highways agreement means that the developer builds at his own risk.

The committee voted on the proposed amendment which was agreed by a vote of 9 for and one abstention, and therefore became the substantive recommendation c.

The amendment will allow the order to be advertised and significant objections to be determined, but would not allow the order to be made until the outcome of the application is known, which is likely to be September 2011.

RESOLVED:

Subject to the replacement link road being constructed to the Council's standards and there being a legal mechanism to secure it as part of the public highway, the committee agreed (by a vote of 9 for and one abstention):

- (a) The advertising of the prohibition of driving Traffic Regulation Order described above (as amended), and
- (b) That any significant objections received be considered by the Planning and Development Group Manager, in consultation with the acting Chairman who shall decide whether the TRO may be confirmed and shall subsequently report that decision to Committee, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, and
- (c) That if no significant objections are received or remain and once a legal mechanism exists to secure the replacement link road as part of the public highway, and the developer constructs the replacement link road to the Council's standards, the Traffic Regulation Order be made provided that none of the land on which the replacement link road will be, has been designated a village green.

43/11 Local Committee Public Engagement Protocol, Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group, Youth Task Group and Member Representation on External Bodies [Item 14]

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in item 14.

Sarah Goodman introduced the report and made amendments to paragraphs 1.15 and the first sentence of para 1.18 which would now read:

1.15 The Task Group will contain **eight** appointees, **four** county and **four** borough councillors. The Task Group may also consult with the relevant divisional member.

1.18 The Task Group will contain four appointees – **two County Councillors from the Local Committee and two Woking Borough Councillors.**

In response to Mrs Smith it was confirmed that the borough representatives would be agreed by the borough council and the Woking Partnership representatives would be agreed by the Woking Partnership.

In response to Cllr Lyons concern that the parking group would be county council top heavy, Cllr Kingsbury explained that it was sensible to combine the task group with the existing members of the Woking Borough Council CPZ group who are Cllrs Branagan, Kingsbury, Johnson and Lyons.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed:

Public Questions:

- (i) that the committee will offer an opportunity for public engagement and informal questions before each formal local committee meeting commences (subject to review);
- (ii) that written public questions, dealt with as part of the formal agenda, are accepted up to 12.00 noon four working days before the day of the meeting;
- (iii) that the committee may accept up to eight written public questions, and that the Chairman may use his/her discretion to regard a single question that has been divided into a number of sub-questions as several different questions within the allowable total number that may be asked at the meeting;
- (iv) that in addition to the electorate and local businesses, any young person under 18 who lives within the area may ask one question at the discretion of the Chairman, within the total allowable number which may be asked at the meeting;

Petitions:

- (v) that the committee accepts a petition containing 50 or more signatures, although in exceptional circumstances the Chairman may use his/her discretion to accept petitions with fewer signatures in cases where it would not be appropriate to get 50 signatures, for example where a proposed scheme affects fewer than 50 properties;
- (vi) that Members of the committee be allowed, at the discretion of the Chairman, to ask the petitioner questions of clarity. If the petition refers to an item on the agenda then Members discussion on the item needs to take place at the relevant part of the agenda;
- (vii) Public speaking on Rights of Way applications:
that the committee notes the county council's standing orders concerning public participation on Rights of Way applications, which also apply to local committees (outlined at Annex 1);

Civil Parking Enforcement Joint Member Working Group:

- (viii) To establish a Civil Parking Enforcement joint member working group (as amended), and appoint Geoff Marlow, Ben Carasco, Will Forster and Diana Smith as the county council members to the group.

Youth Task Group:

- (ix) To establish a Youth Task Group (as amended), and appoint Diana Smith and Linda Kemeny as the county council members to the group.
- (x) To note the following Member representatives:

Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

- a. The Woking Partnership – Liz Bowes with Will Forster as substitute
- b. Youth Lead – Will Forster
- c. Woking Cycle Forum, (and Cycle Woking Board if appropriate) – Will Forster

44/11 Members Allocation 2010/11 Overview [Item 15]

The committee noted the report.

45/11 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocations and Community Safety Funding [Item 16]

RESOLVED:

The local committee:

- i. agreed to delegate the power to approve revenue bids up to £1,000 to the Community Partnerships Manager and Community Partnerships Team Leader (West) between meetings (up to two bids per member, between each meeting), subject to consultation with and agreement of the local member and the majority of county local committee members
- ii. Considered and approved the following expenditure from the members' allocation budget 201/12 as set out in para 3.1:
 1. Pyrford Village Hall- £1,999
 2. Horsell Allotment Association- £994
 3. Ribat Community Gardening project - £2,500
 4. Fosters Lane (Knaphill Association)- £3,682
 5. Horsell Village Show Committee - £1,000
 6. Woking Eid in the Park - £3,170
 7. Save Surrey Credit Union - £5,904
- iii. Noted that no allocations were approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 28 March 2011 and 29 June 2011
- iv. Agreed that the community safety funding [£2500] delegated to the local committee be transferred to the Community Safety Partnership
- v. Agreed that the Community Partnership Manager manages and authorises expenditure from the budget delegated to the local committee in accordance with the local committee's decision
- vi. Noted that the funding of £12,000 which is ring fenced for the use of the community safety partnerships subject to domestic abuse outreach being provided, will be paid to the Surrey Community Safety Unit who are now managing and administering the funding to the Domestic Abuse Outreach providers in Woking borough

46/11 Forward Programme [Item 17]

Noted as in the report with the addition of a public report on section 106 monies at the next formal meeting, and reports on the Olympics at the meetings in December and February, as well as October 2011.

47/11 Exclusion of the Press and Public

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 9.50pm]

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

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

Question 1: Cllr Louise Morales

Section 6 of the Highways Act 1980 states that no trees, shrubs, grass verge should be planted as to hinder the reasonable use of the highway. There are plans in Old Woking to put trees and grass verges in the middle of the road. Why, therefore, is the council allowing the highways department to break the law?

It was agreed that a written answer would be provided outside the meeting.

Question 2: Cllr Simon Bellord

Roads in South Woking are being used by HGVs for training purposes. Members of the public are concerned, especially with the diversion now in place. Is the highways authority aware this is a problem and can anything be done?

Cllr Bellord also asked a supplementay to his formal written question on the junction of Gorsewood Road and Hermitage Road asking if anything could be done?

It was agreed that written answers would be provided outside the meeting.

Question 3: Mr Hargrave (Vale Farm Road)

As a big society citizen I am asking about the legality of lines and signs in Vale Farm Road. On Monday there was some re-lining work which still does not conform with statute. What can be done about this?

It was agreed that Mr Hargrave would provide further information outside the meeting to enable officers to be able to respond to him.

Question 4: Cllr Melanie Whitehand

Residents walk their children to school along Robin Hood Road. A mirror has been requested for the blind bend, but we have been informed that it is not appropriate for this location. Could extra signage be put up along this stretch of road to warn motorists that there could be extra foot traffic on the road?

It was agreed that Highways would look at other possibilities and respond outside the meeting.

Question 5: Cllr Anne-Marie Barker

The cycle crossing by Brewery Road is not complete. Why is this and will there be any barriers?

It was agreed that this would be talked through with the councillor outside the meeting.

Question 6: Cllr Louise Morales

The traffic calming information on the Surrey County Council website recommends the width of road needed for cyclists to be easily overtaken. Why are developers still putting in plans that are narrower than the recommended?

Andrew Milne responded that there are guidelines, but schemes are looked at on a case by case basis. It was agreed that further information would be provided outside the meeting.

2. Presentation by Surrey County Council and May Gurney on the new Highways Contract [Public Engagement Item 2]

Mark Borland and Rob Semaganda gave a presentation to the committee.

In response to member questions the following was noted:

a) Regarding white lining, the contract has a specification of type two, which is thicker lining than has been put down recently so will last longer. Members were asked to let Andrew Milne's team know of any areas requiring urgent re-lining.

b) Potholes can be recorded directly on the Surrey County Council website (www.surreycc.gov.uk and click on report it). Tracking information is given to the person that reports it.

c) The back log of works should be complete by end of July 11.

d) Regular programme meetings are held with the utilities. Officers are working with the Environment and Transport Select Committee to see how central Government can be influenced to give local authorities more powers in relation to utilities.

e) Ditch clearance is covered by the contract and members should liaise with Highways over any issues. If the Woking Borough Council tree officer identifies a drainage issue, then they should be asked to contact highways.

f) It was confirmed that Lockfield Drive would be done this year and officers will look at why this is not appearing on the list of planned works.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

- g) Skanska is a 25 year PFI contract. The contract allows Skanska to deal with electricity connections etc. EDF only need to be used if there is a problem with the junction box.

The Chairman thanked Rob and Mark for their presentation.

3. **Community Safety Annual Report** [Public Engagement Item 3]

The Chairman welcomed Camilla Edmiston and Insp John Davies to the meeting. After a brief introduction, the Chairman invited questions from members of the committee and members of the public.

The following comments/answers were noted:

- a) Insp Davies agreed to respond to Cllr Preshaw outside the meeting regarding the increase in robbery figures.
- b) If members are aware of specific community safety issues in their area, then they should report them to the appropriate agency. Members were asked to note that in addition to the neighbourhood Police team, the borough is also served by other police departments including TPT and Road Safety.
- c) Street Angels were congratulated. In response to Cllr Cross it was agreed to look at whether taxis could use the bus lay by after the buses have stopped running in Chertsey Road.
- d) It was noted that work was on going regarding the recent spate of burglaries in Maybury and Sheerwater.
- e) Members and the public were encouraged to help ensure residents' cars are left secure without laptops, sat navs etc on show.

The Chairman thanked the officers for their comprehensive report.

4. **Fire and Rescue Annual Report** [Public Engagement Item 4]

Alan Clark briefly introduced the report.

The following comments/answers were noted:

- a) The PSP will go live next week. For the first two years there will be no changes in Woking.
- b) The service is going through change and how schools education will be delivered in the future is being looked at. Fire Fighters based at the station will continue to deliver general education, and will support Junior Citizen for year 6 students.

Members congratulated the service on their results and thanked the officer for the report.

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

29 JUNE 2011

1. Question from: Catherine Grace

We want to know if the councillors of our local committee are going to vote in favour of installing speed tables or cushions around the blind bend in Brewery Road where we have suffered numerous accidents due to speeding traffic. We have submitted the petition asking for this, we are all in favour of it so when are you going to vote to allocate funding to this persistent and serious problem. Can a vote please be taken at the next meeting?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Local Committee (Woking) has been advised by Surrey Highways that Brewery Road is scheduled for surface dressing this financial year. It is anticipated that this work, together with renewal of all road markings, will be completed in July.

The surface dressing will enhance the skid resistance of the road, and contribute towards safety by reducing the likelihood of vehicles leaving the carriageway.

It is noted that only one personal injury accident has been recorded in the vicinity of the bend in Brewery Road in the last five year period, and that no personal injury accidents have been recorded since the introduction of bollards on the outside radius of the bend, together with Vehicle Activated signs to warn drivers when they are exceeding the speed limit.

It is however recognised that local residents remain concerned about safety, particularly in relation to a number of non-injury related accidents that have occurred in the vicinity of the bend, causing damage to private property.

In view of this, Committee have asked that a further speed survey is carried out at two locations in proximity to the bend after the surfacing work has been completed, and that these locations are decided upon between local residents and the local member.

On conclusion of this survey, and assessment of the speed data in conjunction with the known accident data, Surrey Highways will be asked to present a report to Committee making recommendations as to whether speed reducing measures are in fact justifiable.

2. Question from: Cllr Simon Bellord

The junction where Gorsewood Road joins Hermitage Rd, the A324 at the Brackenwood Rd end gets very congested. Unlike at the other end near Wicks there is no roundabout. The A324 is very busy all of the time and when a vehicle intends to turn right onto the A324 at this junction this regularly results in a long wait for the vehicles behind. There is adequate room at this junction to create a

separate turning right lane which would alleviate this congestion considerably. There is considerable support for this in the area and it would be easy to demonstrate this. Can you please advise if this junction is likely to be improved and when this is likely to happen?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

When right turn lanes are provided, the through running lanes and the right turn lane itself, should be at least 3m wide. In certain circumstances, the right turn lane can be reduced to 2.5m but this would not be appropriate at this location given the type of traffic that the A324 carries. If each of the lanes should be 3m wide, this obviously requires a 9m wide carriageway, whereas the width of the A324 at this junction is only 6.7m.

Consequently, it would not be possible to provide a dedicated right turn lane without undertaking significant carriageway widening and we currently have no plans to undertake any work at this junction.

MEMBER QUESTIONS**29 JUNE 2011****1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council**

Restricted Parking Signs - Old Malt Way

While canvassing at the recent election, the above mentioned issue was brought to my attention. It was first raised some 4 years ago. The Divisional Member and Area Manager NW were advised accordingly by email on 31 March.

Old Malt Way is a very narrow cul-de-sac with 2 x 2 parking bays near the junction with Brewery Road. The majority of residents agreed to a restricted parking zone. There is a single yellow marking on the highway throughout Old Malt Way. I was advised there is commuter parking in those bays from 0630 to 1830 hours Monday to Friday making exiting from homes difficult.

All that is missing are signs stating "Restricted Parking between the hours of 0630 and 1830 hours"

When will this simple Highway Maintenance be acted upon to give the residents some quality of life?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

These lack of these posts and signs has been highlighted by the County Council's Parking Strategy and Implementation Group and their provision was included in a list of remedial work that was passed, earlier this year, to Woking Borough Council to undertake in their capacity as agent for parking administration and enforcement.

The Borough Council's contractor usually deals with just sign replacement and WBC is concerned about excavating for the posts on the highway. The Parking Team is arranging for the necessary utility equipment searches to be done; these searches provide details of where utility apparatus runs underground so that excavation in these areas can be avoided or at least carried out with the requisite care. Once this information has been gathered and WBC have purchased the posts, the work can be undertaken and is expected that the provision of the posts and signs in Old Malt Way will take place over the summer.

2. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

The minutes of the Local Committee meeting that took place on October 14th 2004 record in relation to the Bus Gate at the Brookwood Hospital Estate: "in the recent consultation ... 66% of local people who expressed an opinion, wanted the bus gate removed and 33% wanted it to remain ... Reasons given for the gate staying included safety issues, speeding, bus priority and original planning issues.

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 12 October 2011

The bollards were installed as a condition on the Brookwood hospital site development and to meet the requirements of the Local Transport Plan.”

The bus bollards have been out of action for significant periods since then, including a large part of 2011. This follows previous problems with ‘tailgating’, which means contractors have to reset the bollards. More serious difficulty occurs when spare parts are needed and the sub-contractors seem unable to obtain them in reasonable time from the manufacturer of the bollards. (I understand that the requirement for spare parts has been caused by vandalism more often than mechanical unreliability.)

Would the local highways manager agree that conditions have not changed since the report to this committee and the decision to retain the bus gates made in 2004 and that during prolonged periods when the bollards are not in use and drivers become accustomed to being able to go through the bus gate there is significant danger for pedestrians and legitimate road users?

What measures are the Local Highways manager pursuing for improving SCCs response to this problem? Some suggestions have included:

CCTV to record and so deter vandals and drivers going illegally through the gates, either when they are down or when ‘tailgating’ buses.

Altering the contract for the maintenance of these gates so that SCC deals directly with the manufacturer, not a sub-contractor.

Ensuring that the default position of the gates when they are not operational is up rather than down, even though this would mean that buses leaving and going to Sainsbury would have a longer and more inconvenient journey.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

Opening up The Vyne spur road would certainly give rise to the potential for vehicle / vehicle and pedestrian / vehicle conflict at the junction with Broadway and possibly further afield. Clearly, this potential also exists if the bollards are out of use for any period.

The use of CCTV to monitor vandalism should be possible, since this is already one of the purposes of numerous, existing cameras around the Borough. Their use for enforcement of the "No Entry except for buses" prohibition needs more investigation, as it is understood that if the CCTV footage is monitored and "enforced" by Woking Borough Council staff rather than Surrey Police staff, there would be a need to decriminalise the prohibition. The use of CCTV to enforce the prohibition along High Street, Woking (under the canopy) was also mentioned during discussions about the need to re-draft that particular Traffic Regulation Order.

It is entirely likely that CCTV cameras will be used to enforce prohibitions that are "resource hungry" as far as conventional, police enforcement is concerned. At the very least, much more discussion with Surrey Police and Woking Borough Council will be needed. However, if decriminalisation is required, this will need to be a County wide policy rather than a local one.

Altering the maintenance contract and the issue of the default position of the bollards are points that we will need to discuss with Surrey County Council's

Traffic Systems Group, which looks after this bus gate and with the manufacturer of the bollards. We will do this and contact Councillor Smith at a later date.

3. Question from Ben Carasco, Surrey County Council

The public is aware that there is potential for some Highways improvements in Woking, as a result of funding from developers. Can they be advised of the timetable for making the relevant information public so that residents wishing to promote specific schemes can do so? This is potentially relevant to two trouble spots in my Division.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee

The information in relation to developer contributions received under s106 is public information and is available from the local planning authority. The information in relation to the spending of such monies, and the highways and transportation schemes to which such monies are to be applied to, is also public information and is available from the County Council.

At present there is no formal system for the promotion of highway and transportation schemes by members of the public but the work being undertaken in relation to the preparation of the planning authority's LDF Infrastructure Schedules will provide an opportunity for the public to promote highway and transportation schemes in their locality, as such Schedules will be made available for public consultation.

The local planning authority are required, as part of their Local Development Framework, to include an Infrastructure Schedule which includes all of their and the County's infrastructure requirements until 2026. This document will include, from a County Council standpoint, all service requirements, including highways and transportation, which are necessary to mitigate the impact of the prospective housing development in the local planning authority's area, up to 2026. The necessary detailed work to provide the information has begun and we are awaiting confirmation of the proposed timescales for the publication of the LDF Infrastructure Schedule from Woking Borough Council.

Currently the s106 agreement attached to any planning permission is required to confirm the highway and transportation improvements that the monies, secured under the terms of the Agreement, are to be spent on and it is that description that normally determines the scope of the resulting works.

Highway and transportation improvements to mitigate the effects of any proposed development are normally recommended by the Highway Authority, to the local planning authority, prior to the determination of the planning application, such improvements being drawn from existing and/or proposed schemes or other proposals in the locality of the development.