

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)  
Meeting held at 6.00pm on 12 October 2011  
at  
Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square,  
Woking GU21 6YL

Members present:

Surrey County Council  
Mr Mohammed Amin (Woking Central)  
Mr Ben Carasco (Horsell)  
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 Muzaffar Ali (Maybury and Sheerwater)  
Cllr Bryan Cross (Goldsworth East)  
Cllr Ian Eastwood (Goldsworth West)  
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]

**48/11 Apologies for absence [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs Liz Bowes, Cllr Tony Branagan, Cllr Derek McCrum and the substitute Cllr Ashley Bowes. Cllr Ian Eastwood substituted for Cllr Derek McCrum and Cllr Muzaffar Ali substituted for the substitute Cllr Ashley Bowes.

In the absence of the Chair, Liz Bowes, this meeting was chaired by the Vice Chairman, Cllr John Kingsbury.

**49/11 Minutes of the last meeting held on 29 June 2011 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting of the local committee (Woking) held on 29 June 2011 were agreed and signed.

**50/11 Declarations of interests [Item 3]**

Under Standing Order 61, Mr Will Forster declared a personal interest in items 8, 9 and 10 on the agenda.

**51/11 Petitions [Item 4]**

**Petition 1 [4a]**

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mr Howard Joffe presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. This petition received 79 signatures:

“We have serious concerns about the type of driving that we are seeing on Albert Drive. I have no doubt that it is only a matter of time that someone will get killed along this stretch of road. We are now appealing to you to ensure that affirmative action is taken as soon as possible in order to put some kind of measure in place to ensure that people drive responsibly along this stretch of road.

Parking is also an issue around this part of Albert Drive. In a nutshell we have none. Residents have to park in the lay by which is nowhere near wide enough. My neighbours and I have been the victim of having damage done to our vehicles on more than one occasion. There are houses along Albert Drive that have got driveways and off street parking. We are situated on a green and have no driveways or parking. This issue also needs to be looked into as soon as possible.

According to Councillor Mohammed Iqbal at some stage funds were made available for the widening of the lay by areas. Clearly this was not seen as an urgent issue and the funds were used elsewhere. I have as a matter of urgency written to Jonathan Lord in order to keep him in the loop.

I would be grateful if you could please give these issues serious consideration. “

Mr Joffe made the following additional points. Local residents have had serious concerns about driver behaviour on Albert Drive for a long time. A young lady was almost killed in a serious recent incident. Rather than preventing speeding, drivers use the chicanes to see how fast they can drive, residents feel that they are doing more harm than good and if they were taken away they would help with the dangerous driving which is taking place on the road. Residents would like further measures introduced to reduce speeding along the road including the installation of speed cameras.

It was suggested that local people could get involved with a Community Speed Watch Programme. Mr Joffe explained that residents were

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

concerned that there might be reprisals if they got involved with such a programme.

He added that there was also a problem with a lack of appropriate provision for parking along Albert Drive which has meant that local residents' cars get damaged.

Cllr Ali asked for further clarification regarding what budgets could be allocated to address the issues.

Ben Carasco asked if there was a particular stretch of Albert Drive which officers should focus on to help address the problem. Mr Joffe said the fundamental problem was wreckless driving which took place along the whole road.

Members asked what measures he thought would help address the issues. Mr Joffe said he thought the removal of the chicanes and the installation of speed cameras would help provide a solution.

Andrew Milne, SCC Area Highways Manager, commented that an initial written response had been provided to the petitioner at the meeting and suggested that a report assessing driver behaviour in Albert Drive is prepared and presented to a future local committee. This might include appropriate solutions to address vehicle speeds will be identified and costed.

### **Petition 2 [4b]**

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Wendy Organ presented an e petition on behalf of local residents asking Surrey County Council to add a cyclepath on the A245 Parvis Road, West Byfleet. This petition received 147 Signatures.

Mrs Organ explained that she had created the petition three months ago after a close friend was killed and a teenager had been killed a few months prior to this. It is a very dangerous stretch of road for cyclists and there has been a long history of accidents along the road, a number of them fatal. She recognised that a new speed limit of 30mph had been put in place for stretches of the road but said that her friend had been killed after the new limit had been put in place and felt that the main issue was the width of the road. She was disappointed by the initial response that the release of money to fund a cycle path may be an issue.

Will Forster asked the petitioner if she was hoping that a temporary measure to enable shared use along the footpaths could be put in place to ensure greater safety for cyclists. She confirmed that she was keen for a solution to be put in place as soon as possible.

Mr Milne resolved to undertake a further response to the issues raised in the petition. This will be presented to a future local committee meeting.

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

Four 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 recorded below.

**Question 2:** Will Forster raised a supplementary question on behalf of Louise Morales, asking if SCC could not have considered that by authorising a number of works in the same area at the same time, issues would arise? Mr Milne responded that while SCC does coordinate highway works, it cannot predict every situation. There have been a lot of utility works in Woking recently, some of which have had to be carried out on an emergency basis, in addition to the works the highways authority itself has had to carry out.

**Question 3:** Ian Wright asked if the local committee would be prepared to reconsider the issue of shared use on Commercial Way if it was cleared of clutter. Mr Milne responded that on 28 March 2011, the local committee agreed that in the event improvements are made to Commercial Way, the decision would be reconsidered. This is covered further in Item 7.

### **53/11 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. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

**Question 1a:** Mrs Smith asked Mr Milne to confirm if it is the stretch of the Chobham Road which runs from the Garibaldi Crossroads to Chobham which has been upgraded to a P1 route.

**Question 1b:** Mrs Smith asked Mr Milne if the bins in Strathcona Gardens, Knaphill have been adopted by SCC.

**Question 3:** Cllr Bryan Cross asked how long it would take to get remedial work done as there has been a lot of public concern about loose chippings left on roads. Mr Milne explained that because of the nature of the work there will continue to be chippings even after two or three sweeps of the road. If there continue to be concerns, these should be raised with the SCC highways team who will raise the issues with its contractors.

### **Executive Items**

#### **54/11 Amendment to the Shared Space Traffic Regulation Order for Woking Town Centre – Consideration of Objections [Item 7]**

Andrew Milne introduced this report which summarised the response to the eight valid objections received to the amended shared space traffic regulation order for Woking Town Centre, following a formal consultation.

Annex A of the report summarises how each objection was considered and resolved. Mr Milne explained that these objections were considered at a meeting with the local committee chairman and

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

vice chairman and divisional member, Mohammed Amin, at a meeting on 26 September 2011.

He said that none of the objections contained any new information of a significant or substantial nature that was not known and considered at the time of making the decision. Therefore, the decision made by the local committee on 28 March 2011, to promote restricted hours, does not need reconsidering on the basis of the objections received.

Mr Milne explained that Surrey County Council will be undertaking works to remove some of the trees and planters in Commercial Way between Chapel Street and Church Path, which has been agreed with Woking Borough Council. Some of the trees have become overgrown and are not suitable for the urban area. Funding will be provided by SCC highways and include the Community Pride Fund from local member, Mohammed Amin. Subject to the completion of works to improve Commercial Way, the decision taken in March to restrict cycling in this area could be reconsidered by the local committee.

Cllr John Kingsbury said the Woking Borough Council Executive was considering a report at its meeting on the following evening, 13 October, to make substantial improvements to improve the Commercial Way Public Realm.

Cllr Cross asked what action could be taken to remove the Advertising Boards along Commercial Way and asked whose responsibility it was to grant licences to the fast food outlets. It was explained that the borough council was responsible for granting licences. Mr Milne said that the A board policy had been reviewed. Businesses along the road felt that removing the signs in these difficult economic times could have a negative impact on their businesses and they were not seen to pose a safety issue.

Mr Forster commented that in one particular location there was a long line of A boards and asked if it might be possible to ask the businesses concerned for more rent money. Cllr Kingsbury said that this was something which could be raised at the borough Executive meeting, and a formal request could be made to the county council.

Mr Forster asked for the review of restricted cycling on Commercial Way to be added to the local committee forward plan.

Cllr Lyons suggested that the borough council might be able to consider some alternative advertising support for local businesses in the area. Cllr Eastwood commented that once the trees had been removed, the A boards may no longer be necessary.

Members agreed to note the contents of the report.

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

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

Jan Haunton and Paul Fishwick introduced this report for the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. This is a new fund from the Department for Transport which aims to reduce carbon and promote economic growth by encouraging sustainable transport measures.

Surrey County Council has made two separate bids, the first submitted on the 15 April under the Key Component has been awarded £3.93M focusing on the towns of Woking, Guildford and Reigate and Banstead. In addition, the County Council is working on a Large Bid for a comprehensive package of behaviour change measures which will be developed over the autumn and submitted to Cabinet in December. The Large Bid totals some £16M of additional investment.

This report focuses on the Key Component for the grant funding which has been awarded to the County Council covering the period 2011/12 to 2014/15.

Cllr Kingsbury asked if the draft programme of work for 2011/12 outlined in Annex A of the report was specific to Woking, if it was fixed already, or if members could put forward other ideas for schemes.

In response, Mr Fishwick said that Annex A included schemes specific to Woking. However given the tight timescales to implement the programme, it will not be possible to add extra schemes for this financial year. , instead the committee will have an opportunity to put forward ideas for schemes in future years.

Not all the schemes outlined in the different elements are for Woking, element 1 lumps together Woking and Guildford, for example. He explained that the total for the schemes was more than the £350,000 allocated for Woking. This means that if any of the schemes slip behind, others could easily be brought on stream to ensure all the grant funding is spent.

Cllr Carasco said there was a need for proper public consultation on all the schemes and commented that mistakes had been made in the past with Cycle Woking, which could have been avoided if a more comprehensive public consultation had been conducted

Mr Forster and Cllr Lyons reinforced the need to engage local residents and cycle users. It was noted that the formation of a Task Group would help to address this.

In response, Mr Fishwick and Mr Haunton explained that officers were engaging with local businesses regarding their requirements and issues as part of the Large Bid for 2012 and beyond. The schemes in Annex 1 (page 60 of the report) have already been worked up and consulted on previously. For future schemes, under the new governance arrangements outlined in Annexes C and D, an LSTF member Task Group would be formed and Transport for Woking will be consulted. Woking Borough Council Executive had

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

recently established a new Cycle Working Group, which included a representative from disabled groups, who would be a consultative group to the Task Force.

Members asked for clarification regarding how the Task Group would operate.

Mr Fishwick confirmed that the Task Group would be able to put forward proposals and ideas to local committee, and the committee would be responsible for making decisions, but that there were clear rules about what the funding can be used for.

Mrs Smith said it was important not to prejudice the work suggested for this year and that councillors had their own opportunity to do some informal consultation on local requirements.

Mr Forster asked if there would be an opportunity to improve connections with the South of Woking.

Cllr Carasco said that it was important to ensure that future projects fitted with the scheme's overall aim to promote economic recovery and growth, as well as reduce carbon emissions. He proposed an amendment to (ii).

Proposed by Cllr Carasco:

(ii) That officers will update members of the local committee in relation to the progress of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (Key Component) Project, at each local committee after the next financial year to support economic recovery and growth and reduce carbon emissions. This was seconded by Cllr Cross and agreed to become the substantive recommendation (ii).

It was agreed to appoint the following members to the Task Group, Mr Forster and Mrs Kemeny on behalf of Surrey County Council and Cllr Wilson and Cllr Cross on behalf of Woking Borough Council. It was also agreed that the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the committee and borough lead member for the Environment and Sustainability would also be appointed. The Vice Chairman will only attend in the absence of the Chairman.

Members agreed to the proposed revised recommendations which ensure officers update members on the progress of the programme and that the role, governance structure and terms of reference are reviewed at the start of the next financial year.

### **RESOLVED:**

The local committee agreed:

- (i) The draft plan and programme for 2011/12 attached as Annex A (Woking section only) is approved.
- (ii) That officers will update members of the local committee in relation to the progress of the Local Sustainable Transport

## Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

Fund (Key Component) Project, at each local committee after the next financial year to support economic recovery and growth and reduce carbon emissions

- (iii) The local committee will establish an LSTF Task Group with the role and governance structure indicated in Annexes C and D and the Terms of Reference set out in Annex F, to be reviewed at the start of the next financial year
- (iv) To appoint four members from the local committee to the Task Group as well as the Chairman or Vice Chairman of this committee and borough lead member for the Environment and Sustainability
- (v) A report on the 2012/13 programme will be submitted to this committee in February/March 2012 for approval including both LSTF Grant Funding and Section 106 monies that are proposed to be used. This will be repeated annually until the end of the programme in 2014/15.

### **56/11 Highways Update [Item 9]**

Under Standing Order 61 Mr Forster declared a personal interest in Item 9.

Andrew Milne presented this report on the progress of the delivery of highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Pride expenditure for this financial year.

He said that there was some question over the Vale Farm Road traffic management and the Brewery Road VAS schemes and the use of developer funding.

Cllr Kingsbury asked for an update on the build-out outside the Marjorie Richardson Centre, Mr Milne will confirm the transfer of funds and timescales with the Borough Council.

Mr Milne agreed to review the status, provision and priorities of pedestrian crossings in Byfleet and West Byfleet in response to concerns raised by Cllr Wilson and Mr Marlow, in particular the provision of a crossing on High Rd and whether the Marist crossing was a priority.

Mr Carasco asked for clarification on the next steps for bringing a report on Section 106 expenditure to the formal local committee meeting. Officers confirmed that a revised version of the spreadsheet would go to a private meeting in January/February 2012. Then if members were happy, it would go to the formal local committee meeting in March 2012.

Members agreed to note the contents of the report.

**57/11 Members Allocation 2010/11 Overview [Item 10]**

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

**RESOLVED:**

The local committee agreed:

(i) The following allocations from the members allocation budget for 2011/12 as set out in paragraph 3.1 of the report as amended, and the tabled addition for Attitude Youth Club:

1. Pyrford Village Event 2010 Olympics - £5000
2. Attitude Youth Club - £5039
3. Surrey Archaeological Society - £2000
4. Woking Explorer Scouts - £2900
5. Surrey County Council Libraries - £5000
6. Brookwood Primary School: Brookwood Buddies Playground Project - £5000
7. Friends of Byfleet Parish Day: The Queens Diamond Jubilee Celebrations - £3000
8. Grit Bins – Finch Close - £1000

(ii) Note the allocation approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 29 June 2011 and 12 October 2011 set out in paragraph 4.

**58/11 Forward Programme [Item 12]**

Members noted the programme outlined in the report.

—

---

**Chairman**

[The meeting ended at 9.58pm]

## Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

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

#### Question 1: Ian Wright

With regard to considering the objections to restricted cycling in the town centre, please can you confirm who the group manager is, who the divisional member is and if they were present at the meeting on 26 September?

Andrew Milne confirmed that he is the Area Highways Manager with responsibility for considering objections to Traffic Regulation Orders locally, the local member is Mr Mohammed Amin. They were both present at the meeting.

#### Question 2: Robert Shatwell

Asked a supplementary question to his formal written question, asked if Surrey County Council could look at the reopening of Footpath 52 as a matter of urgency and give assurance that it will do so?

Mr Milne confirmed that the county is seeking further legal opinion and that he would follow the matter up with SCC countryside/legal services. He noted that it would be difficult to give any assurances until the legal situation has been resolved.

#### Question 3: Carol Frost

Asked a supplementary question regarding what parameters were used to include the hour to 4pm?

Mr Fishwick confirmed that according to national guidelines, the starting position should be that cyclists are allowed to continue to use the streets 24 hours a day. If there are concerns about conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, the preferred approach is to allow cycling from the outset on the basis of an experimental traffic regulation order while evidence can be collated.

Following the 18 week consultation exercise held between October 2010 and February 2011, the analysis of the data concluded that the main area of concern was within the town square, which is the focal point of the town centre. The original proposal was submitted to the local committee on 28 March 2011. It recommended that the existing permanent order allowing cycling (dual use with pedestrians) within the town centre on designated streets was amended to allow cycling all of the time, except in the town square. At the meeting the committee decided that it wanted to restrict cycling in the Town Square, Gloucester Walk and Commercial Way between 10:00am to 4pm, Monday – Sunday.

#### Question 4: Cllr Louise Morales

Are there any plans to put signage up to inform residents that there is shared use on the pavement between the Happy Fish Bar and Kingfield School?

Mr Fishwick confirmed that the local committee had agreed to shared use in this area and that signage could be funded under the Local Sustainable Transport Scheme in the future.

**Question 5: Cllr Melanie Whitehand**

Can the signs be tidied up following the completion of works on the corner of Wych Hill Way and Hook Heath Avenue over eight days ago?

Mr Milne agreed to raise this with the contractor.

**Question 6: Cllr Lyons**

Residents on York Road and Mount Hermon Road are concerned about the amount of time the gravel has taken to settle down following resurfacing works and with the quality of line painting. Could the worst affected areas of the road be redone? This has already been raised with SCC Highways.

Mr Milne confirmed that the engineer will inspect the area, if the work is considered to be substandard this will be raised with the contractor and they will have to put it right at their expense.

**Question 7: Linda Kemeny**

When will the work on St John's railway bridge be done?

Mr Milne said the original intention was to coordinate the drainage cleansing work with the structures group. He will follow this up with the head of structures and arrange for a separate closure to carry out maintenance work if necessary. He will keep Mrs Kemeny informed of progress.

**Question 8: Cllr Mohammed Iqbal**

When the new Asda opens on White Lion Retail Park, will the county council consider doing some work to the public walk bridge off Maybury Road to Oriental Road?

Mr Milne said that this needs to be raised directly with the highways service to see if it could be considered.

**Question 9: Cllr Cross**

## Annex 1          Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

Why is the library service closing the Saturday before half term week, could this be put back a week?

Ruth Brown agreed to raise this with the library service.

### **Question 10: Cllr Preshaw**

I raised a concern on 14 September regarding some drains on Connaught Road in Brookwood which have foliage growing out of them, leading to flooding on Sheets Heath Lane, when will I get a response?

Mr Milne agreed to follow this up and provide a response.

### **Question 9: Mohammed Amin**

Please can you give me an update on the scheduled works to Chertsey Road taxi rank which was approved some time ago?

Mr Milne agreed to follow this up and provide a response.

### **Question 9: Cllr Morales**

Two weeks ago there was a road closure on Maybury Hill/Old Woking Road and there were no diversion signs in place, can we have reassurance that the next time a major road is shut diversion signs are put in place?

Mr Milne agreed to look into why diversions were not put in place.

## **2.      A Life Without Fear [Public Engagement Item 2]**

Camilla Edmiston from Woking Borough Council and Fiamma Pather from Your Sanctuary, an outreach service to people experiencing domestic abuse, gave a presentation as part of Domestic Abuse Awareness Week.

They thanked the Chairman and said they were grateful for the opportunity to present this information to members and the public.

Mrs Edmiston agreed to provide details of the register to vote which enables people to remain anonymous keeping town and location details hidden to Cllr Morales in response to her question.

### 3. **Trading Standards Annual Report** [Public Engagement Item 3]

Steve Ruddy introduced a report providing an update on trading standards issues in the Woking area.

Members welcomed the contents of the report and a number of comments and queries were raised. Mr Ruddy confirmed the following:-

- a) The new approach to prevent doorstep cold calling enabling residents to say no to cold callers using new "doorstickers" is enforceable in certain circumstances, but has yet to be tested in law.
- b) Fake alcohol can be seized and Trading Standards will look to find the source and encourage retailers use legitimate suppliers.
- c) Trading Standards can inform and educate residents about unsolicited phone calls from unlisted numbers, but limited action can be taken as many of the calls are from international numbers.
- d) Residents should contact Consumer Direct for advice over the mis-selling of goods over the internet. Trading Standards can follow up with businesses who have been selling unsafe or counterfeit goods.
- e) The Eat Out, Eat Well initiative is new to Woking and there will be a push to get other establishments involved in the scheme.
- f) There has been some success in stopping the doorstep sales tactics used by energy companies. As a result they are increasingly using telesales. Residents can contact the telephone preference service which can help to stop cold callers.

The Chairman thanked the officer for his comprehensive report.

### 4. **Cycle Woking – End of Programme Review** [Public Engagement Item 4]

Paul Fishwick introduced this report.

Members welcomed the contents of the report and a number of comments and queries were raised. Mr Fishwick confirmed the following:-

- a) The Basingstoke Canal Authority has responsibility for the maintenance of the cycle footpath. Sustrans are also helping out.
- b) There is a need to increase cycle parking on the Southern side of West Byfleet station.
- c) Cycle Woking is working with secondary schools to increase pupil's confidence in cycling to school.
- d) Woking Borough Council Executive has recently established a new Cycle Woking Working Group.

## Annex 1

### Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2012

- e) He agreed to provide Mrs Kemeny with details of the total amount spent on the restoration of the Basingstoke Canal towpath and what else needs to be done to complete restoration.
- f) He agreed to review the status of the signage around Kiln Bridge/ St John's Heritage preservation site and feedback to Melanie Whitehand.

Members congratulated the Cycle Working on the achievements made and thanked Mr Fishwick for the report.

## WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

12 October 2011

1. **Question from Carole Frost**

Will the council please tell me why the proposed ban to restrict cycling in the town centre has to include the hour from 3.00 to 4.00pm? This is a time when many school children will be crossing town to get from their secondary school to home. This provides a much safer route for them than going along Victoria Way?

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

Following the 18 week consultation exercise held between October 2010 and February 2011, the analysis of the data concluded that the main area of concern was within the town square, which is the focal point of the town centre, with frequently held markets and other events and one of the busiest pedestrian movement areas.

The original proposal was submitted to the local committee on 28 March 2011. It recommended that the existing permanent order allowing cycling (dual use with pedestrians) within the town centre on designated streets was amended to allow cycling all of the time, except in the town square. At the meeting the committee decided that it wanted to restrict cycling in the Town Square, Gloucester Walk and Commercial Way between 10:00am to 4pm, Monday – Sunday. In the event that improvements are made to Commercial Way, the committee said that it would reconsider this decision.

The timing and hours came from the peak time for pedestrian use within the town square area and was complimentary with the existing Traffic Order prohibiting motor vehicles from using Commercial Way within the town centre.

The local committee discussed the affect of any restrictions on school children at their meeting on 28 March 2011 before concluding their decision to include restrictions within Town Square, Gloucester Walk and Commercial Way (Chapel Street to Church Path) Monday to Sunday 10am until 4pm.

2. **Question from Cllr Louise Morales**

Following all four available routes from south woking into the town centre all being subjected to road closure or traffic lights last week, and a number of roads that have been dug up in exactly the same place by two or three different utilities within a short space of time, could the committee please explain the system currently used to give a holistic view of the entire town. How does it ensure that roadworks do not halt the entire road network on the same day, or reduce the digging up of the same section of pavement or road, only weeks after new tarmac has been freshly laid by the previous utility. Could the committee suggest what improvements should be

## Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2011

implemented to prevent such disruption to the Woking road network happening again?

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

We have a noticing system whereby all works carried out on the public highway, whether by utility companies or Surrey Highways, have to give advance warning of works and 'book' roadspace to carry out these works. This enables us to coordinate works on an area-wide basis to avoid conflicts with works, unnecessary disruption to the traveling public, and ensure that congestion is minimised.

Woking has had a considerable volume of utility works, and it must be recognised that some of these works do take place at short notice if they are emergency related eg gas leak repairs or water leaks. Unexpected emergencies do of course make coordination more difficult, but legally we cannot prevent utility works from taking place or prevent emergency works from being carried out.

If a utility company wishes to carry out works at a location where another utility company has just resurfaced the road, there is nothing that can be done to prevent this. Under the Highways Act, Surrey Highways can only prevent digging up of the road surface if major resurfacing has taken place and the authority has given utility companies advance notice of this. However, whilst such actions prevent planned utility works, they cannot prevent emergency works from being undertaken.

### **3. Question from Ian Wright**

Will the council please describe all the serious incidents of conflict between cyclists and other users that have occurred in the shared use areas in the period from the beginning of the shared use temporary order on 3 April 2009, a period of 2½ years?

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

There have not been any serious incidents reported between pedestrians and cyclists within the shared space area during the time the order has been in operation. However, there have been a number of incidents of near misses. Quoting from the report entitled Shared Space within Woking Town Centre which was presented to the local committee (Woking) on 28 March 2011, the following is noted:

The local committee at their meeting on the 2 September 2010 requested that a reporting form be developed to allow people to report any incidents. Following that request Cycle Woking developed an 'Incident Reporting Form' for use from the 25 October 2010 during the consultation period and the response within the town centre is as follows:

There were 19 incident report forms submitted.  
10 of these report forms relate to the town centre (none of the 9 'non-town centre' incidents resulted in an injury).

The town centre reports were as follows:

## Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2011

4 report forms related to an area where there already was No Cycling (1 of these included a slight injury in Church Path (Commercial Way to High Street).

3 report forms related to cycling on a footway adjacent to a road.

1 report related to a wheelchair user and a pedestrian.

1 report related to a cyclist hitting a pedestrian on the hand at a toucan crossing (slight injury).

1 report related to a cyclist just missing a pedestrian.

There are around 1,500 cycle journeys into the town centre every working day, therefore approximately, 3,000 cycle trips are made. The incidents (1 near miss) are very low and in this case the person did state that they may have veered towards the cyclist.

In March 2011 the committee asked for a further report indicating any incidents within the town centre be considered in a year's time, and it remains the case that this will be considered as indicated.

### **4. Question from Mr Robert Shatwell**

As the local area highways authority Surrey County Council are responsible for the maintenance of all highways, including definitive footpaths. For some four or five years definitive footpath No 52, which runs from the Wey Navigation at Send to the bridge crossing the River Wey, where it bifurcates and becomes footpath 52a to Old Woking or footpath 45b towards Moor Lane at Woking, has been closed. Signage placed by Surrey County Council, states that the bridge crossing the River Wey is unsafe. There are no diversions in place other than to take footpath 44 from Fishers farm to Runtleys Wood then footpath 43 to Triggs Lock before returning via the canal towpath to Send. This is a diversion of some one mile. I believe the diversion length is inappropriate when compared to the length of the bridge closed.

The bridge does not have any physical barrier to prevent pedestrians using it. I believe that as Surrey County Council has declared the bridge unsafe they have a duty of care to repair the bridge and render it safe. Failure to do so would render the council liable for any injury caused to any pedestrian due to the unsafe state of the bridge (for example should it collapse).

Can you please give an indication as to when the bridge will be repaired and footpath 52 made safe for all users?

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

This matter has been raised with our Countryside service who manage the Rights of Way, and with our Structures team who have reported the following:

This is a complex issue that has been going on for many years. The County Council believes that the bridge is owned by a private individual and that they are responsible for the repair of the structure.

Legal Services have been in discussion with the owner and are now seeking further legal opinion from a QC. The bridge has been closed by

## Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 7 December 2011

Rights of Way, and it is accepted that further consideration needs to be given to the robustness of the physical closure method.

Design of a replacement structure has been included in the Structures 2011/12 reserve programme, and works should go ahead in 2012/13 but will be subject to an appropriate legal agreement. However, until the legal issues surrounding this have been resolved, the timescale for these works must be considered as provisional.

## MEMBER QUESTIONS

12 October 2011

1. **Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council**

a) What changes are planned to salting routes in Woking, including changes to priorities? (eg will Chobham Road in Knaphill be added to the Priority 1 network?)

b) Will Woking have any grit bins removed as the result of such changes, and when will new grit bins paid for from Councillor allocations be installed?

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

a) The Priority 1 salting network has been formally extended by 107 miles across the whole of the County. In consequence, there are a number of changes that have been agreed to salting routes in the Woking area, and these changes are summarised in the attached annex (Annex 1). I can confirm that part of Chobham Road in Knaphill has been upgraded from the Priority 2 to the Priority 1 network.

b) Some grit bins have been identified for removal as they do not meet the new criteria for being placed on the network. However, there are no plans to actively remove these, and they will only be removed if they are damaged, and in consultation with the local member. With regard to new bins requests, these are in the process of being placed, with the anticipation of all new bins being sited by the end of November at the latest.

These bins will be in the following locations: Corner of Boltons Lane/Pyrford Road, Aviary Road (bottom of the hill), Norfolk Farm Road (entrance to Fox Close), Sparvell Road (junction with Coresbrook Road), Queens Road Knaphill, Lane End Drive and Peatmore Avenue, Pyrford.

2. **Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council**

My hopes were raised by the Traffic Order placed on Knaphill High Street from 11 July that this busy road would undergo repairs before the end of the school summer holidays this year. This has not happened. Please can you confirm that there is still a full intention to carry out major maintenance on Knaphill High Street during the current financial year, and indicate when the work will be done?

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

Knaphill High Street is due for resurfacing this year and works are presently scheduled to commence on 15 November 2011.

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

a) When will the remainder of Lockfield Drive and Horsell Birch be re-surfaced as the winter will arrive shortly and these roads will then deteriorate further?

b) How long after new chippings have been laid on a road should it be before the same road is swept by either the Contractor or the County's Agent?

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

Surrey County Council has committed to an ambitious programme of resurfacing and surface treatments, and has carried out a significant number of schemes in the Woking area.

With regard to Lockfield Drive, further resurfacing is planned between Anstell Way and Littlewick Road, and this is presently programmed to commence on 1 November 2011. A further smaller section of surfacing work is also planned for delivery through our localised structural repair programme.

The stretch of Horsell Birch between Bullbeggars Lane and Littlewick Road is also due to be resurfaced this financial year, and is also scheduled to commence on 1 November 2011.

When a road is surface dressed, the agreed process for sweeping is that the road should be swept twenty-four hours after the surface has been laid, and then again after one week. There is also provision for further sweeps to be carried out if these are necessary.