

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.00pm on 7 December 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)

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]

59/11 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Ben Carasco and Mr Geoff Marlow.

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

60/11 Minutes of the last meeting held on 12 October 2011 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the local committee (Woking) held on 12 October 2011 were agreed and signed.

61/11 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

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

62/11 Petitions [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mrs Elizabeth Evans presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. This petition received 64 signatures:

“We the undersigned urgently request Surrey County Council to reduce the charges for pay and display bays in the Walton Road area to those charged in a similar area in Guildford: free for the first two hours and no return within one hour.

This area is penalised unfairly by the present parking charges because of low wages, high social deprivation, little off-street parking as in the better off parts of Woking, and has a lot of resident trade vans and taxis which puts more pressure on the available space. Residents are entitled to reasonable and flexible access for visitors while ensuring commuter parking is prevented.”

Mrs Evans introduced the petition and explained that the current situation inhibits free flow of people visiting the area for short periods of time and does not enable residents to have reasonable access for their visitors or for services coming to their houses. It was felt that the introduction of parking meters would be a backward step and cumbersome to administer. The needs of the residents need to be considered.

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager explained that the removal of parking charges for visitors to the Maybury area was not supported by officers, as it would mean residents would have greater difficulty finding a parking space near their homes in this area where road space is already at a premium. There are no plans to increase the charge for visitors or to change the existing free 20 minutes parking near local shops.

The Chairman used her discretion to respond to the petition at the meeting.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

- (i) That the parking charges are retained at the current level for visitors (80p per hour for up to 3 hours) in the Walton and Maybury Road area in order to prioritise road space for residents in this area.

63/11 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

Three 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 1: Mrs Marshall asked what Surrey County Council is doing to enable people to know what is going on on the highway. It was agreed that a response would be given outside the meeting.

Question 2: Mr Stubbs clarified that water pools in the area even when rainfall is not intense. It was agreed that Mrs Smith would be copied in on the response to Mr Stubbs.

Question 3: It was agreed that Mrs Bowes would be copied in on the response to Mr Thomas.

64/11 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

Eight 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 2: In response to Mrs Smith it was confirmed that the Street Lighting Team would be invited to the private meeting of members in February 2012, where members could raise issues directly with officers.

Question 5: It was requested that officers look at slightly extending the shared use in Kingfield Road, and that markings could be put on the ground for cyclists to encourage them to use the crossing.

Question 7: Mr Milne clarified with members the reasons for the delay on the Victoria Way crossing by Brewery Road car park.

Question 8: In response to a supplementary, Mr Milne explained that he does keep an active involvement with colleagues on cross border issues.

Executive Items

65/11 Local Prevention Framework [Item 7]

Anthony Durno introduced this report which summarised the priorities for the use of the commissioning budget under the devolved Local Prevention Framework. Members noted that there had been an addition to recommendation d (set out below) which would help ensure clarity of the group:

To note that nominations for the chairman of the Centre Based Youth Work Steering Board is to be discussed further and recommendations will be brought back at a later date **with Terms of Reference**.

Members were very positive about the report. The following points of clarification/comments were made:

- The 50:50 split of funding was agreed to see how effective the targeted work is, and then alterations to the split could be made in the following year.
- Would like to see the amount of grants that voluntary organisations can apply for uncapped so each bid could be assessed on its own merits
- Would like to see the terms of reference for the youth steering group come back to committee.
- Providers would be asked to come forward with solutions that take into account current provision.
- Proposals for Skills Centre/s in Woking will come back to a future meeting. There are currently four centres in Surrey, which will increase to 20.
- Transport has been an issue for young people for years and providers will be expected to address how young people can get to the services that will be offered.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed:

- a) That 50% of the funding (£57k) is used to target individual young people at risk of becoming NEET or entering the youth justice system for the first time, with a weighting to include an appropriate number of looked after children.
- b) That the remaining 50% of funding is used to target the following geographic areas with a focus on parenting/a whole family approach and raising aspirations, with the funding split weighted towards the number of young people in each area:
 - Goldsworth Park and Lakeview
 - Sheerwater and Maybury
 - Byfleet

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

- South Woking (specifically Old Woking, Kingfield and Westfield and Barnsbury)
- Knaphill

- To delegate the provision of Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development (SOLD) resource to officers to manage on a referred basis, coordinated through the Youth Support Service. The Task Group will be able to comment on the suitability of interventions put forward by officers to address the prevention agenda.
- To note that nominations for the chairman of the Centre Based Youth Work Steering Board is to be discussed further and recommendations will be brought back at a later date **with Terms of Reference**.
- To note that the local committee (Woking) has a Small Grants allocation of £17,000 for the year commencing 1 April 2012. This will be available to support small voluntary youth organisations with grants of £500 to £1,000 and exceptionally up to £5,000.

66/11 Highways Update [Item 8]

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

Andrew Milne introduced the report which updated members on the latest position with regard to highways schemes and budget.

The following comments/responses were noted:

- Regarding Community Pride, Mrs Bowes requested that there are firm proposals for all members by end December 2011, and that these are circulated to her by this date. Mrs Bowes noted she would like her funding spent on road safety around schools.
- Mr Milne agreed to let Mr Forster know outside the meeting what the s106 monies for Vale Farm Road and Brewery Road could be spent on.
- Mrs Kemeny asked for an update on the roads she supported for resurfacing and raised the issue that Sutton Avenue in Hermitage requires resurfacing.
- The works set out in the report are scheduled for construction between January and March 2012.
- Cllr Wilson requested an update for himself and Mr Marlow on the Marist School Crossing, which would be provided outside the meeting.
- Mr Milne agreed to meet Cllr Lyons on site in York Road to look at residents concerns regarding the chippings.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;
- (ii) Note the Community Pride spend position,
- (iii) Note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.

67/11 Annual Review of On-Street Parking in Woking Borough [Item 9]

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

David Curl presented this report which set out the amendments and changes to on-street parking arrangements in parts of Woking borough. It was envisaged that changes on the ground would be made during summer 2012.

The following comments were noted:

- It was agreed to clarify to Cllr Cross outside the meeting who is able to park on Poole Road.
- Cllr Cross wanted to discuss removing a single parking bay in Bridge Barn Lane with the Parking Team prior to the order being made.
- It was confirmed that the operational times for CPZ zones 4 and 5 is 0930-11.30 Mon - Fri. This is when the single yellow parking restriction is in force.
- Footway parking in York Road would be more complicated to investigate (as consultation with utility companies is required) and should be considered as part of next years review.
- Need to look to re-instate double yellow lines along Kingfield Road outside Fox Cottage.
- When changes are made on the ground in Zone 1, these need to be clearly communicated to residents.
- A request was made to review parking overheads and enforcement.

It was noted that parking permits can be issued to residents in flats in Zone 1 if they have been living there since before 2006.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed:

- (i) The proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Woking Borough as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in Annex A (A4 plans numbers 20010, 20012, 20013, 20030, 20031, 20033, 20036, 20050, 20053, 20068, 20073, 20102 and 20107) and B (large Plan) **with the exception of Bridge Barn Lane where some minor amendments may be agreed by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman and local member prior to the order in recommendation (iii) being made.**

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

- (ii) The Local Committee allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Woking as shown on the drawings in annex A (A4 plans numbers 20010, 20012, 20013, 20030, 20031, 20033, 20036, 20050, 20053, 20068, 20073, 20102 and 20107) and B are advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.
- (iv) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and that a decision on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the relevant County Councillor.

68/11 Allocating Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocations [Item 10]

Michelle Collins introduced the report and highlighted that an additional two bids had been tabled for members' consideration. The condition set out in bid 6 was noted.

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 as amended, and the tabled addition.
 - 1. One in Four Surrey - £1,570
 - 2. Friends of Byfleet Library - £2,980
 - 3. British Red Cross - £500
 - 4. The Lightbox - £2,975
 - 5. Grit bins in South Woking - £6,000
 - 6. Trinity Methodist Church - £3,000
- ii) Note that no allocations were approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 12 October 2011 and 7 December 2011

69/11 Forward Programme [Item 12]

Members requested an update on the shared use order including when it will be implemented on the ground.

Members noted the programme outlined in the report and requested and additional follow up report on the Olympics in Autumn 2012.

Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

[The meeting ended at 8.53pm]

Chairman

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

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

Question 1: Mrs Evans

The rise in the cost of residents parking permits is causing an issue for local people in Maybury. What are the restrictions for residents living in flats?

David Curl agreed to give further information to Mrs Evans on eligibility criteria outside the meeting.

Question 2: Mrs Marshall

A number of road signs have been taken from Ranmore. Has Woking suffered any of this?

Mr Milne confirmed that he has no knowledge of any recent incidents in Woking.

Question 3: Mr David Robinson

- a) What pot of money did the remedial work for the traffic island on the A322 come from?
- b) What pot of money did the work to the crossing of Victoria Way outside the Council offices come from?
- c) Regarding Elm Bridge, it was thought that the County offered £1.6m for highways works, which was reduced to £0.6m, which was then reduced to £0. What has happened to this funding?

Andrew Milne responded that works referred to in a) and b) were joint funded from s106 monies and Cycle England. An answer will be given in writing to Mr Robinson regarding question c).

2. Update on the Preparations for the Olympic Cycling Event [Public Engagement Item 2]

Surriya Subramaniam introduced this report which updated the committee on the progress made by the Surrey 2012 team in preparation for the London Olympic Cycling events.

Members welcomed the report and noted how well the practice event went. Key comments made included:

- Local knowledge of stewards is important.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

- The Time Trial event may have an knock on effect into Byfleet as it goes down the Seven Hills Road.

Members were looking forward to the celebrations and events next summer.

The Chairman thanked Surriya for his presentation and teams work to help make 2012 a success.

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**7 DECEMBER 2011****1. Question from Pauline Marshall**

The general public do not have an opportunity to know what is going on on the highway (road and pavement) on a planning application, particularly if a condition is put on that a highways license is required etc. The highways issues are very important to particularly pedestrians and these are the people who see what goes on all day everyday and what is the norm in the village eg dropped kerbs. Obviously the SCC officers can't have this information. The two need to work together.

In the Cliftons application the improved entrance would have come out on the much used crossing, bus bay, Fosters Lane entrance/exit etc.

The planning officers say they can't do anything if the SCC Highways say 'No Highways Issues' or something similar. This is not a one off.

What are SCC doing to overcome this problem? Developers must not rile the people who use the pavements etc and make it more dangerous for them.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The Woking Borough Council web site reproduces all consultee's responses, including those of Surrey County Council, as consultee on the highway and transport issues relating to any application. This information is then reproduced in the planning application report for the further information of all those interested parties. If a condition or informative are recommended by the County Council, this will be reflected in the response. A highways licence is merely a means of facilitating a development, and cannot be used as a means of controlling a permission granted by Woking Borough Council as Planning Authority.

In assessing an application, consideration is given to all highway users, especially pedestrians and those not in private vehicles. A final solution might involve a balance of considerations, and by definition, as soon as a vehicular crossover is either created, or intensified, there will be a marginal impact on those pedestrians who might previously have enjoyed an uninhibited or less-inhibited passage on the footway. What is always ensured, is that pedestrian safety and convenience is not materially prejudiced.

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

During the actual implementation of any access works, the licence process ensures that safety practices are followed and that all highway users are allowed for.

2. **Question from Phil Stubbs**

The Broadway in the vicinity of the pedestrian crossing close to the village floods when we have moderate to heavy rain. The Broadway slopes down hill from this point so the geography is not the problem.

Looking down the Broadway from the village the road floods from the Vyne junction to Sussex Road on the left whilst on the other side of the road it floods from just before the pedestrian crossing to Sussex Road.

This crossing is heavily used by children and parents going to and from the school. In the event of flooding the crossing becomes unusable as does walking from the Vyne to Sussex Road.

This is a long term problem and goes back to the construction of the crossing.

What action does SCC Highways plan to take to remedy this problem and make the crossing safe in all weathers.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

When the pedestrian crossing was installed at this location, additional gulleys were put in to address an existing issue with ponding on the public highway. Since these gulleys were installed, limited ponding is only known to occur after very intensive rainfall. However, in view of the concerns expressed, this matter has been referred to the NW Area Highways Team for investigation, and a response will be provided directly to Mr Stubbs.

3. **Question from Richard Thomas**

What progress has Surrey County Council made in ensuring that water does not run off golf courses onto Lock Lane, ie stop flooding of Lock Lane?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

It is recognised that there has been problems in Lock Lane due to surface water being discharged onto the public highway from the adjacent golf course. However, since the golf course was refurbished approximately two years ago, monitoring of this location suggests that this issue has improved significantly. The Maintenance Engineer for the Woking area has been made aware of the concerns expressed about this site, following this question to the Local Committee, and will be in contact with Mr Thomas directly to discuss these further.

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
7 DECEMBER 2011**

1. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

What is the current position with regarding to installing and/or filling the grit bins for which payments have been allocated from the Woking Committee's Members Allocation?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

There has been a strong demand for additional grit bins. The initial stock of 150 new bins has been utilised across the County, and further bins have been ordered. It is expected that any bins not yet delivered will be placed on the network and filled in advance of Christmas.

2. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

There are a number of 'black holes' for street lighting which Councillors once hoped could be improved when the new PFI contract reached the stage of replacing street lights in Woking. I understand now that there is no budget allowed within the contract for new, rather than replacement, streetlights. Is there any administrative mechanism by which lights can be funded and provided for underlit areas identified by Councillors and residents?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

There is a mechanism by which additional streetlights can be provided. Requests can be forwarded directly to our streetlighting contractor, Skanska, for an estimate of cost, using the surreylightingservices@skanska.co.uk email address, or by raising requests through the Surrey County Council website, following the 'Report it' link. Once costs have been established, for works to progress a funding source would have to be identified.

Whilst there is no general budgetary provision for additional streetlights in the ongoing replacement programme, some locations are identified for redesign. Where this is the case, there will be improvements to the provision of lighting funded through this programme, which may resolve the locations of concern. Funding options for sites not covered by redesign work are limited, and for this reason Members wishing to promote such sites may choose to consider utilising their Community Pride funding for this purpose. Larger scale works that are unaffordable through this

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

mechanism would have to be considered on a strategic basis, and could potentially form the basis of an ITS project.

3. **Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council**

Many bollards, which are supposed to be lit because they are positioned in the middle of the carriage way, are either missing, damaged, unlit or so dirty that they are not visible. **Who is responsible for their maintenance and when will the dirty ones be cleaned?**

This question has been asked before and the answer was that the company responsible for the lighting standards was responsible for their cleaning on an annual basis. It has been also requested that members of the public need to report dirty bollards. It is clear that only missing or damaged bollards, reported by members of the public, are replaced. Those are the only clean, properly lit, bollards in Woking and account for about 5% of the total.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Surrey Highways is responsible for the maintenance of lit and unlit bollards located on the public highway. A programme of cleaning has been commenced, and all locations that have had road markings refreshed across Surrey are scheduled to be followed up by a resource to clean bollards and road signs. Where lit street furniture is damaged or missing, this can be reported via the Surrey Highways website, following the 'Report it' link.

4. **Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council**

Articulated vehicles approaching the Elm Bridge from Wych Hill Lane have an almost impossible task. I have seen bollards knocked over and the pavement mounted in an attempt to access the bridge. **When will Highways Engineers address the problem which has been reported?** There is ample opportunity to adapt the raised pavement on both sides to avoid the destruction of bollards.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Surrey Highways is not aware of any previous reports about this matter, and the street furniture at this location has been assessed and appears to be in good order. However, in view of the concerns expressed, this has now been raised with Surrey Highways and Councillor McCrum will receive a direct response to this issue.

5. **Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council**

Cyclists trying to turn right on to Kingfield Road from Westfield Avenue have to stop in the middle of the road while waiting for a gap in the traffic.

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

This puts them in extreme danger from vehicles turning right onto Westfield Avenue, having crossed the Bridge. This is most dangerous at night, but even during the day drivers are watching for traffic approaching the Pedestrian Crossing and do not see cyclists in the middle of the junction. **When will a risk assessment be made now that the junction has been changed?**

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Works at this location are ongoing, and a formal safety audit will be carried out by our Safety Engineering team when the developer has completed remaining works. It is noted that there is a new toucan crossing provided in close proximity to this junction, and so any cyclist who feels unsafe using the turning lane as described does have a safe alternative crossing mechanism.

6. Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council

The new Elm Bridge on Kingfield Road remains unlit. There are unlit bollards, signs and even cones in the middle of the road. Even the lamp standards are still unlit. **When will the Bridge be fully lit?**

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The Elm Bridge works are being carried out by developers working in association with Woking Borough Council. Whilst Elm Bridge has been re-opened to the public, there are a number of outstanding items to complete, and this includes the lighting elements. It is understood that there has been some minor delay associated with this, but it is anticipated all lighting will be operational before Christmas.

7a. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

When will the crossing on Victoria Way opposite the Civic Offices be completed? For several months, work has been intermittent and still remains unfinished and looks unsightly on the main road through the town. When can residents expect to see work completed and the crossing operating?

7b. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Crossing on Victoria Way from Brewery Road Car Park to the Civic Offices. The work on the crossing has been ongoing for some 12 months. The original work came to a halt because of concerns raised by Surrey Police due to lack of consultation. Why has this project remained as work in progress for so long? Why have SCC Highways allowed this matter to stagnate for 12 months? When will the project be completed?

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 8 February 2012

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

There have been significant delays in the completion of this crossing due to ongoing issues with Surrey Highways' signals supplier. In view of this, the matter has been raised at a senior level both within Surrey County Council, and also within the suppliers organisation.

It is not the case that works on this crossing were ceased as a result of concerns raised by the Police, nor is it the case that Surrey Highways have allowed this matter to stagnate. Completion of works is now scheduled for mid January 2012.

8. Question from Linda Kemeny, Surrey County Council

Concern has been expressed by local residents and Woking Cycle Forum about the danger faced by cyclists and pedestrians when crossing at the junction of Connaught Road and Pirbright Barracks Road by the railway bridge at Brookwood adjacent to the Basingstoke Canal. Pedestrians and cyclists using the Canal towpath have to leave the towpath at that point and cross the road to continue their journey along the Canal bank. The towpath is well used, including by many school children. The overgrown hedges and vegetation along the road make it very difficult to see traffic coming from Pirbright through the railway arch. Could urgent action be taken to substantially cut back the vegetation as soon as possible to increase visibility in the area?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

This location falls within the boundary of Guildford Borough Council, and in view of this the matter has been referred to the Area Team Manager for the SW Highways Team.