

Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.00pm on 26 March 2012
at
Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square,
Woking GU21 6YL

Members present:

Surrey County Council
Mrs Liz Bowes (Pyrford) - Chairman
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 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]

05/12 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Mohammed Amin.

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

06/12 Minutes of the last meeting held on 8 February 2012 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the local committee (Woking) held on 8 February 2012 were agreed and signed.

07/12 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

Under Standing Order 61, Mr Will Forster declared a personal interest in items 5, 6, 7 and 8 on the agenda. Cllr Bryan Cross declared a prejudicial interest in item 12.

08/12 Petitions [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mr Jeremy Smith presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. This petition received 70 signatures:

“We the attached 70 signatories of the enclosed petition require Surrey County Council to fully repair and re-surface Old Avenue within the next twelve months.

This half a mile long Avenue serving almost 70 residences now has over 42 potholes, and many more areas of a deteriorated road surface, that will soon develop in to potholes. These are a hazard to drivers and vehicles particularly in the dark, an issue that is accentuated by virtue of the lack of street lighting in Old Avenue. The Avenue is no longer in a fit state for cars to run on it and not suffer damage directly caused by the poor surface.

Whilst we realise Surrey County Council has a limited budget of some £21 million in 2011-2012, to our knowledge Old Avenue has not been properly re-surfaced in over 40 years. The system of filling in potholes, which has been employed from time to time and the one occasion when the Avenue was given a coat of tar and chips spread, has not solved its worsening condition. We urge you therefore to priorities the work to fully resurface Old Avenue within the next twelve months.”

Mr Smith introduced the petition and explained that in the last 40 years there had only been superficial resurfacing done, which had lasted less than 3 years. The Avenue has had increased traffic over the years and has received a complete lack of maintenance. In addition to the general deterioration, the road was not reinstated properly after works were undertaken by a cable company and the petitioners asked Surrey County Council to take action. The petitioners would like the committee's support for action to be taken to improve the condition of the road.

The local members supported the request of the petitoioner.

A tabled response was given. Andrew Milne explained the criteria for getting works carried out. It was agreed that Old Avenue would be reassessed and rescored. If it did not rank highly enough to be part of the

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

programme, the Team would look to see if any more remedial work could be done.

Members were reminded that they could log potholes onto the Surrey County Council website.

09/12 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

Five 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: Cllr Barker asked where the website and signs give contradictory dates, which are correct. She also raised the safety aspect of equipment left on the road.

Andrew Milne responded that the intention is that the information is consistent and Cllr Barker's concerns will be fed back. Specific examples of vehicles parked in the road were requested so that these could be fed back to the contractor.

Question 2: Cllr Morales asked:

- There is a difference in the answer and the wording of the Act. There is no increase in the width of the pavement - is the committee going to allow work without a traffic order?
- Does the committee agree to the developer putting in decorative features on land owned by Surrey County Council rather than widening which is what it was purchased for?
- The street design was presented to appeal. The land parked on should be adopted as parking, not given away for trees.

In response Greg Devine explained:

- Section 75 of the Highways Act says it is possible to vary the width. The footway on the development side of the road is being varied. If Cllr Morales summarises her points in writing, then we could ask for a lawyer to have a look at it.
- Surrey County Council does not see the trees as an obstruction and the design has passed a number of safety procedures.
- Cllr Morales is meeting Council colleagues on site later in the week and this could be discussed at that meeting.

Question 4: Mr Thomas (on behalf of Mr Sechiari) explained that a lot of the holes are as a result of service companies and they would like Surrey County Council to take this up with these bodies.

In response Liz Bowes explained that the County Council now has a Streetworks Manager who deals with this.

Question 5: A representative of Cllr Coulson asked why the work was carried out during the day.

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

In response Andrew Milne explained that decisions are made on a case by case basis considering both residents and congestion. The starting point is to carry works out during the day as it is more cost effective and gives better results due to the lighting conditions.

10/12 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

Seven member questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 3 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

Question 6: Will Forster requested that all divisional members get included in the notice given five days in advance of works taking place. He further requested an item on a future agenda on the SCC policy on working hours and surfaces used. Cllr Lyons requested that letters about such works be sent to everyone they may affect. In response Andrew Milne explained that they do make every effort to take into account everybody that might be affected.

Question 7: In response to Will Forster it was agreed to find out when the markings would be implemented on the ground and respond outside the meeting.

Executive Items

11/12 Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) [Item 7]

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

Paul Fishwick introduced the report which set out the proposals for both the Key Component and the Big Bid for 2012/13. If approved, it is intended to go out for public consultation from 2 April 2012 until 16 May 2012.

In response to comments/questions, the following points were noted:

- The developments listed in paragraph 2.161 of the bid are those that would take place during the life of the LSTF. Additional large developments are noted in the strategic case.
- There are no current plans for the redevelopment of Woking train station.
- The Sheerwater Access Road is included in the second bid – additional funding is required.
- The schemes listed are quick wins for the first year that meet the Government criteria and can be delivered in time.
- The funding originally allocated to Brewery Road will be used for St Johns Road.
- Local Councillors will be contacted outside the meeting to discuss the community panel in Sheerwater and Maybury.

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

- Details of the bike parking at key bus stops in Knaphill and Woking will be given outside the meeting to Diana Smith.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed:

- (i) The schemes listed under the Key Component within Annex A are approved for 2012/13 financial year, with consultation undertaken (where required) during the spring of 2012. Schemes that have local support following the public consultation will be progressed and schemes which require further work following the consultation process will be presented to the Local Committee, via the Task Group, at the planned meeting on 27 June 2012.
- (ii) That the schemes within the Large Bid listed in Annex B are approved for consultation during the spring of 2012, and developed further with the Task Group with an analysis of the consultation presented to the Local Committee, via the Task group, at the planned meeting in June 2012.

12/12 Youth Small Grants [Item 8]

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

Deborah Honey introduced the report which set out the process for decision making on small grants.

In response to comments/questions, the following points were noted:

- The criteria for the grants is intentionally broad, and can be seen on the Surrey County Council website (link to be sent to all members of the committee).
- Members of the Task Group could see the bids before they go to committee if they wished.
- Would be good to be able to secure consistent input of young people, and perhaps the young people or their organisations could be rewarded in some way. Need to re-approach the Youth Council and school councils.

Diana Smith abstained from the vote as she felt the information was not sufficiently developed.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to (by a vote of 4 for and 1 abstention):

the process for approving Youth Small Grants as set out within paragraphs 2.3 – 2.6 of this report.

13/12 Response to petition regarding road safety on Albert Drive [Item 9]

Andrew Milne introduced the response to the petition received in October 2011.

RESOLVED:

The local committee noted the report.

14/12 Response to petition regarding cycle facilities along the A245 Parvis Road, West Byfleet [Item 10]

Andrew Milne introduced the report.

Members welcomed the report. In response to a question regarding what would happen if the LSTF Large Bid fails, it was noted that the ITS programme is a working document, and new schemes could be added during the year if that's what members wanted, but funds are limited.

RESOLVED:

The local committee noted the report.

15/12 Highways Update [Item 11]

Andrew Milne introduced an amended tabled item 11. Members noted that the Community Pride monies were nearly all committed.

In response to comments/questions, the following points were made:

- A response will be given outside the meeting regarding when the Guildford Local Committee will make a decision regarding Bagshot Road.
- Email confirmation regarding the maintenance of Rive ditch for another 12 months will be given outside the meeting.
- Surrey County Council will work in partnership with Woking Borough Council on traffic modelling work on Victoria Way. Members will be consulted on it at an appropriate time.
- If the LSTF Big Bid is unsuccessful, then the Committee could consider adding Parvis Road scheme to the programme in June.
- It was noted that committee could consider adding Hermitage Road speed limit reduction to the programme at a later date.
- The Brewery Road VAS was cancelled as the developer contributions could not be used for this purpose.
- An update on parking in Vale Farm Road would be given outside the meeting.

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (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.
- (iv) Approve the list of ITS schemes shown in Table 4 of this report for progression in the 2012-13 financial year, and authorise the NW Area Team Manager to promote and progress any necessary Traffic Regulation Orders or other items associated with the progression of these schemes, and authorise the NW Area Team Manager to resolve any objections that may be received together with the Divisional Member and the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee.
- (v) Approve the provisional split of 2012/13 Revenue funding shown in Table 5 and authorise the NW Area Team manager to adjust the split of this funding in response to operational need throughout the course of the financial year, subject to consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of this Committee.

16/12 Local Committee Funding: Members' Allocations [Item 12]

Under Standing Order 61 Cllr Cross declared a prejudicial interest in Item 12 and left the room.

Michelle Collins introduced the report.

Diana Smith asked whether some of the capital monies from 2012/13 could be used equally across the borough towards streetlighting.

Will Forster agreed to defer the decision on the bid from the Maybury Neighbourhood Advice Centre until the meeting in June, and suggested that the £5000 should go to the Looked After Children's Bursary Fund.

Will Forster noted that he, Diana Smith and Mohammed Amin would like any surplus funds from 2011/12 to go to the Looked After Children's Bursary Fund. The committee agreed this.

Diana Smith noted she did not support the full amount of the bid from the Horsell Residents Association.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed (by a vote of 5 for and 1 against):

Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

- i. Approved the proposed expenditure from the members' allocation budget 2011/12 as set out in para 3.1 (as amended) and tabled additional allocations 8 – 11
 1. Mayford Hall Bowling Club - £2,826
 2. Sythwood Children's Centre - £3,455
 3. Woking Football Club - £1,934
 4. Woking Hockey Club - £3,000
 5. Maybury Neighbourhood Advice Centre – DEFERRED
 6. West Byfleet Business Association - £1,500
 7. Horsell Residents Association - £2,700
 8. SCC Operations, Highways and Countryside Service - £6,050
 9. Woking Hospice - £10,000
 10. Grit Bin - £1,000
 11. Surrey Arts - £800
 12. Looked After Children Fund - £5,082

- ii. Noted the allocations approved under delegated powers between the last local committee on 7 December 2011 and 26 March 2012 including the tabled additional allocation.

17/12 Forward Programme [Item 12]

Members noted the programme outlined in the report and requested future reports on road surfacing, speed limits, Adult Social Care and school admissions.

[The meeting ended at 10.15pm]

Chairman

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

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

Question 1: Mr Stubbs

The formal question I submitted on flooding in the Broadway in December 2011 was referred for further investigation. I have still not received a response to this.

Andrew Milne apologised for the lack of response and agreed to ensure that a response would be forthcoming.

Question 2: Christine Saunders, Rydens Way

The approved plans for Rydens Way include road widening and parking. The new road is narrower than the existing one. Are the committee prepared to intervene and put in place a proper road widening scheme?

Greg Devine explained that the scheme had been through the planning and appeal process and will therefore go ahead. The road is being widened, and the narrowing being referred to is in relation to the small sections with trees.

Question 3: Mr Butler, Rydens Way

Would like the current work halted until an independent safety audit under the 278 agreement has taken place.

Greg Devine explained that for the work to go ahead there needed to be a three stage safety audit. The first stage is done at the planning application stage, the second on the detail design prior to the work starting, and the third when the work has been completed. The first two stages have been done in accordance with DfT standards. The stage 3 safety audit will be carried out when the scheme is built and the road is open to traffic.

Question 4: Norman Johns

Regarding Victoria Way toucan crossing – has the work been completed, what were the full costs of the works and why was it funded out of s106 Cycle Woking monies?

Andrew Milne explained that the works undertaken was a Cycle Woking improvement, which is why it was funded from this source. The remaining answers would be provided outside the meeting.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Question 5: Cllr Ian Johnson

There is flooding by the surgery on Guildford Road due to problems with a drain. When will work be undertaken to get this fixed?

Andrew Milne agreed to take this issue away and provide a response outside the meeting.

Question 6: Cllr Ian Johnson

What is the timescale for the traffic signals work near the pub on Guildford Road?

Greg Devine explained that it is likely to be carried out later this year, but we don't have a definite timetable from the developers.

Question 7: Cllr Louise Morales

Is the committee aware they have incorrect information regarding Rydens Way:

- Stage 2 safety audit said some issues identified at stage 1 were not addressed.
- The top of Rydens Way is a cycle lane, which will now be too narrow at 46 points. The signage has also been removed.
- The bus cannot get around the corner as it is too narrow.

Greg Devine made the following comments in response:

- Matters of detail can be safely carried forward to stage 2 and addressed then.
- No cycle routes will be deleted as part of this process – the signs will go back up. A width of 3.5m passing a cyclist is not safe on a main road, but is ok on minor roads. Dominic Forbes is meeting with Cllr Morales on site later in the week to look at this further.
- The road is wide enough for a bus to use. This is checked through vehicles being virtually driven, but if there are problems then tweaks in the design can be looked at.

Question 8: Mr Duffield, Rydens Way

95% of the residents in Rydens Way do not want trees planted along the road due to the issue of dog fouling.

Greg Devine explained that the trees were included as part of the planning application and the County Council has to enable the developer to build the scheme as part of the planning process. If dog fouling is an issue, then the borough council has dog wardens.

Question 9: Richard Thomas

Could I have a deadline as to when the landowners on Lock Lane will be written to about the ditches.

Andrew Milne is aware that the site meeting has taken place and has given his undertaking to contact the landowners and will do that. He will try to get the letters out in the next six weeks, but can't guarantee it.

Question 10: Mr Chapples

When will Andy Lobban's replacement be in post.

Andrew Milne explained that the appointment had been made and the post holder would start the day after Andy leaves. There will be a handover process before Andy retires.

Question 11: Jeremy Smith

How do we identify funds for additional street lighting. Old Avenue has two street lights. Following recent anti social behaviour, it would be useful to have an additional three.

Mr Smith would receive a written response outside the meeting.

2. Surrey Fire and Rescue Annual Report [Public Engagement Item 2]

Charles Fairfull introduced this report which showed an overall reduction in incidents as a result of interventions undertaken.

Members and the members of the public welcomed the report. The following comments/responses were noted:

- A response regarding the funding shortfall for Woking's schools education programme would be given outside the meeting.
- The current potential for wildfire is high at the moment.
- The team attend more road traffic accidents than serious fires.
- The fire service have standards regarding call out times, and the nearest available vehicle/s will be sent to an incident.

The Chairman thanked Charles for his presentation.

3. Drive Smart and Speed Management Plan [Public Engagement Item 3]

Duncan Knox introduced the report and invited comments. He noted that new sites could be added to the plan throughout the year.

Members welcomed the report. Comments were invited from members of the public and members of the committee. Key comments/responses included:

- A speed survey has yet to be undertaken for Sythwood. When it has been, the results will be shared with local members.

Annex 1 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

- The Casualty Reduction Officer has two RPCSOs. They have two speed detection radar devices which are deployed a week at a time at each site.
- Community Speed Watch need police enforcement from time to time.
- Speed limit change requests should go to Andrew Milne's team to be investigated. Speeds are unlikely to go down without supporting measures.
- The plan highlights action to be taken so the police are aware of what the County Council are proposing and vice versa.
- Speed repeater signs need to follow DfT guidance.
- The use of Queens Road, Knaphill as a rat run was discussed.

The Chairman thanked Duncan for his presentation.

4. Update on Preparations for the Olympic Cycling Event [Public Engagement Item 4]

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. Comments were invited from members of the committee and members of the public. Key comments/responses made are set out below:

- A lot of work is being done to ensure that vulnerable people are being catered for during the road closures. There will be a phone number available from 4am on the race days to provide residents with information etc – 0300 200 1018.
- It was agreed to let Cllr Branagan know outside the meeting the amount of funding coming to Woking for dressing the county.

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

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**26 March 2012****1. Question from Cllr Anne-Marie Barker**

Whilst welcoming the flurry of work to resurface roads around Woking I am concerned about three aspects of the way these works have been carried out. Details of my concerns are below. Can the officer respond to my concerns and tell me if Surrey sets down any basic operational procedures for carrying out roadworks.

- i) Information on works was unclear, contradictory and misleading.
 - a. Works in Horsell were advertised as lasting for days, then 1 day, then 4 days
 - b. Dates of work were different on signage on the road and on the Surrey website
 - c. Signage said roads would be closed but the reality was intermittent closures so nobody had any idea when the road would be open and when it would be closed
- ii) Closures of whole road and lanes was badly organised
 - a. Advance notice of a road being closed was not given so traffic, including a bus drove up to works and had to turn around in the road
 - b. Road reduced to one lane and stop / go boards used on busy roundabout on Saturday morning with lots of confusion
 - c. Long traffic jams and cars trapped in Morrison's car park during works on Goldsworth Road
- iii) Safety concerns
 - a. Equipment was left on the road at night with no lighting – I am aware of one accident caused by this
 - b. Loose stones and lumps of tarmac were thrown on to resident's drives

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

A response from Surrey Highways has been presented as follows:

Information about highways works

It is not clear from the question about duration of works, when and where the different work duration information was observed. However, when works are first planned, a period of time will be advised to give advance warning of when works are intended to take place. This generally allows more time than is actually needed, to accommodate any unforeseen changes to the works programme, so that members of the public are aware in advance.

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Due to the high volume of works carried out by Surrey Highways, there are occasionally inconsistencies between our website information and the information provided on site, but it must be emphasised that the information provided on the website is generally accurate. It should be noted that advance warning signs on site give dates as week commencing.

Whilst a road closure may be required for works on the public highway, the road is not necessarily closed for the whole duration of the works. Where and when possible, to assist the travelling public, closures are removed. This action is generally well received, and in fact failing to take this action can attract complaints.

Organisation of road works and closures

The concerns raised relate to works carried out as part of the localised structural repair programme. These were much-needed works at difficult locations which would cause some disruption whenever and however they were carried out.

Advance noticing of road works is standard practice. If a site is identified which did not have advance warning signs in place then please can details of this site be made clear so that this matter can be taken up with our contractor.

It is recognised that the traffic management associated with the works in Goldsworth Road was not handled satisfactorily, and that this resulted in considerable delays and complaints from members of the public. This matter has been taken up with the County Council's contractor.

The works carried out in Brewery Road, and at the junction with Chobham Road were commenced on a Friday and took longer on site than was anticipated. In consequence it was necessary to complete these works on Saturday during off-peak hours.

Safety concerns

I am not aware of any safety concerns raised directly with Surrey Highways. However, if details of the site can be provided, I would be happy to take this matter up on your behalf.

2. Question from Cllr Louise Morales

1. What law does the highways department think gives it the right to reduce the width of a two way bus route in south Woking to make it too narrow for two vehicles to pass in 46 places along its route.

2. As the highways act 1980 prevents highway trees from being planted in such a way as to cause an obstruction to road users, how does the council propose to prevent the 46 trees and associated build outs in Rydens Way from obstructing the free flow of traffic in both directions that currently exists on the current tree free road?

3. Why has the highways department not followed government guidelines for home zones and held public consultation with local road users prior to changing priorities within the road?

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

1. Section 75(1) of the Highways Act 1980 enables the highway authority to vary the widths of the carriageway on public highways like Rydens Way.

However in fact the highway works in Rydens Way generally widen the carriageway. The pre-existing carriageway width was about 4.2m, leaving a running lane width of about 2.2m past parked vehicles. The carriageway is being generally widened to about 5.5m, widening running lane width past parked vehicles.

It is understood that there is local concern about the proposed 3.5m running lane width past the new roadside planters containing the street trees. Officers consider this lane width to be both acceptable and safe. However to address the local concerns, officers are investigating narrowing the street tree planters to slightly increase the running lane width past them.

2. Section 96 of the Highways Act 1980 allows the highway authority to plant trees and other vegetation within the public highway provided it does not hinder the reasonable use of the highway and does not cause a nuisance or injury to the owner or occupier of adjacent premises.

The proposed street trees were considered as part of the Rydens Way development appeal. Subsequently the county council considered them as part of its normal processes when reviewing developer's proposed highway design. Consequently officers do not consider that the proposed street trees hinder the reasonable use of the public highway, nor will cause problems to adjacent premises.

3. Many of the existing Rydens Way streets are to be altered and will receive a number of environmental improvements, which can be deployed within home zones. These alterations are faithful to the street design concepts presented by the developer at his public consultation events and illustrated on the development planning documents. However the Rydens Way highway works do not create any designated home zones. Consequently there is no need for the county council to undertake the public consultation exercises that accompany their creation.

Lastly, the general public were able to express their views about all aspects of the development, including the street design during the public consultation exercises done by the developer and the local planning authority. The planning inspector will have considered all of the issues and arguments which were presented to him during the planning appeal. At this post-planning stage, the county council is obliged to enable the highway works that form part of the development planning permission.

3. Question from Richard Thomas

Lock lane , when are SCC going to produce a list of landowners and bodies that are responsible for the maintenance of the waterways appertaining to lock lane flooding problem? Will SCC remind those responsible that they are required to carry out this work [basically clearing of ditches] i.e. put in writing, and then follow up?

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

I understand that this request follows the meeting you had on 7 February 2012 with the Surrey County Council Maintenance Engineer, Andy Lobban, Woking Borough Councillor Richard Wilson, and Mr Ernie Elliot.

At that meeting, the area around and including Lock Lane, the golf courses and the marina were walked and inspected, to confirm and identify the general condition and critical points of the road and field drainage systems, and information was exchanged regarding known landowners and boundaries (Mr Elliot's contribution as a long term local resident being very helpful).

Andy Lobban agreed to compile an information pack, with a marked-up map of the area, and known contacts, to help to understand the network, and to assist future contact and if necessary enforcement of riparian responsibilities. He is retiring at the end of April, and is therefore very busy with closing off tasks, but has confirmed that this particular task is one that he is very keen to complete for the benefit of those involved and his (and their) successors before he leaves.

It was made clear during the site meeting that Surrey County Council will be in contact with the relevant responsible parties. This remains the case.

4. Question from Jeff Sechiari

There are many concerns about the state of the road surface of Old Avenue. It is believed that the cause of some of the problems has been the service companies and builders not reinstating properly after undertaking works. Is this something that SCC can take up with the companies and have rectified at their (the companies) cost?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The Local Committee are in receipt of a petition concerning the condition of the road surface in Old Avenue. This is discussed in detail in the response presented by Officers to this petition.

With regard to utility company works, Surrey County Council have Streetworks Inspectors dedicated to monitoring these works and ensuring that these are carried out to an acceptable standard. Where it can be demonstrated that works have not been carried out to an acceptable standard, Surrey County Council are able to take this up with the responsible party and seek repairs carried out at their expense.

6. Question from Cllr Amanda Coulson

First I would like to personally thank Mr Mark Borland, Group Manager SCC, for apologising to Woking residents and Morrisons for the disruption caused by roadworks on Goldsworth Road at Morrisons Supermarket entrance on the 8th March.

Based on Mr Borland's answers at the Overview & Scrutiny Meeting on the 20th March, he said that the following preventative measures will be implemented to

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

avoid this happening in the future:

- a) Proactive and enhanced communication with large retail units affected by future roadworks will receive dedicated telephone numbers and contact names to be given to store managers and not just general help-line numbers
- b) Revised instructions will be issued to all Supervisors advising where discretion can be applied in regards to Health & Safety
- c) On-site Supervisors will be advised of the need for improved customer service
- d) Improved communication links with Local Ward Councillors and the public when problems arise
- e) Investigation into May Gurney and their subcontractors in upholding standards set by SCC with regards to Highway works

I would like to ask for an update on the above measures and the progress of their implementation.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

- a) The Customer & Stakeholder Engagement Plan (CSEP) policy governs how all Surrey Highways road works are planned and delivered has been amended to confirm that all schemes which directly impact businesses with 50 employees or more, will have personal site visit 4 weeks before scheme delivery. As a minimum the business representative will also be provided with direct telephone number for area supervisor.
- b) All supervisors are experienced in Health & Safety policies and practice and are appropriately qualified. To further develop their skills an additional "Tool Box" training session has been arranged for mid April to provide refresher training on the various scenarios they may encounter.
- c) All Supervisors will be required to attend the "Working in the Public Eye" training course. This is an all day industry standard customer service training course, advising of the need for respect and courtesy to members of the public, while on-site or on the telephone. Following mandatory training, supervisors will be continually monitored in their delivery of customer service.
- d) We will continue to communicate with all Councillors as appropriate and ensure Divisional Members are aware of works in their areas. The "Highways Bulletin" is issued twice per month has details of all upcoming work on a district by district basis. This is available on our website. We strive to continually improve information to residents and Members and any new substantive proposals will be reported to the Local Committee.
- e) Quality Audits and inspections of schemes to date confirms that the quality of schemes continue to meet the contract standards, and indeed in majority of cases workmanship has exceeded minimum requirements. However, key areas of improvement have been identified in delivery of customer service

Annex 2 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

and road works management. These areas will continue to be reviewed, and will be supported by the specified actions above.

MEMBER QUESTIONS
26 March 2012

1. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

To prevent large vehicles, in excess of 7.5 tonnes, using Carthouse Lane:

What is the feasibility of physical measures, such as chicanes, at both ends of Carthouse Lane to overcome the above?

Or

Two way traffic at either end, Guildford Road to entrance to Knaphill Manor and Littlewick Road to entrance to Greenbays Park with one way traffic for the remainder of Carthouse Lane?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Whilst it would be possible to prevent access through the introduction of physical measures, this would not necessarily be desirable. A width limit (which would have to be physically enforced to be of any value) would prevent any legitimate access from Chobham Road. This would impact on deliveries to residents along the road, refuse collection, emergency service vehicles, removals lorries and other activities.

The introduction of a physical width limit would require the lane to be taken down to a single lane for vehicles to pass through the physical restrictor, usually with one flow having priority over another, examples of which can be seen in Chertsey Road and Oyster Lane, Byfleet. It should be noted that in Byfleet, alternative routes for vehicles requiring legitimate access are much shorter than they would be for Carthouse Lane.

Moreover, a typical 6' 6" in width restriction would prevent the junction from functioning, as free flow in and out of the junction would not be possible.

There are other practical considerations if a restriction was set back, away from the junction, so that the latter could function properly. For example, if an over-sized vehicle enters the road and is confronted by a width restriction that it cannot pass through, then how this vehicle can turn around or exit safely must be considered and catered for. There is no room to provide a turning area, which would be extremely expensive to construct even if enough highway land was available. This applies to vehicles coming from the Littlewick Road direction, too, whether they are seeking legitimate access or whether they have chosen to ignore (or haven't even seen) the 7.5T weight limit, which commences just to the north of Greenbays Park.

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

The same considerations and impacts would have to be considered for chicanes, as unless they are severe enough to prevent vehicles over 7.5 tonnes from gaining access, these would be ineffective.

Placing restrictions at both ends of Carthouse Lane would be highly undesirable, as this would prevent all necessary legitimate access for larger vehicles. For the reasons described, this proposal would not be supported.

With regard to the alternative suggestion, this would require further investigation, and potentially feasibility work which would have to be funded from the Local Committee capital allocation, subject to Committee supporting the inclusion of this scheme on the provisional ITS list.

2. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

A sign restricting traffic to under 7,5 tonnes has been knocked into the hedge adjacent to the entrance to Greenbays Park. May remedial action be taken to ensure the sign stands correctly thus advising the weight restriction?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The damaged weight limit sign adjacent to the entrance to Greenbays Park has been raised with our contractor for repair.

3. Question from Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

For what proportion of time during the last three years has the bus gate between Redding Way and the Broadway in Knaphill been fully operational?

What are the main causes for the bus gate having failed, what measures can be taken to improve the situation, and if these measures are not currently in hand, what would be necessary to allow them to be taken?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Unfortunately we were unable to obtain a full response in time for the meeting. A full written response will be provided to Mrs Smith as soon as possible.

4. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

Would the Local Transport Manager please let me know how the re-surfacing of roads in the Borough has been prioritised? It appears that some roads that have been resurfaced appear to have deteriorated far less and than other roads that are still waiting resurfacing. (For example York Road and Lockfield Drive).

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Prioritisation of road resurfacing is based on a scoring system that takes into account a number of factors including visual inspection by highways inspectors, and structural assessment of roads using specialist equipment (scanner surveys). The methods used are in accordance with National best practice.

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Confusion often arises when a road that appears to be in a relatively good condition receives a surface treatment, and another road nearby is not attended to that appears to be in a far worse condition. There is a simple reason for this, which is that there are different forms of surface treatment used for different purposes.

As an example, surface dressing (commonly known as chip and tar) is a cost-effective treatment used to prolong the life of a road surface and prevent it from reaching a point where more expensive treatment is required. This is applied to surfaces that members of the public would generally view as being in a satisfactory condition, and accounts for many of the enquiries of this nature that we receive.

However, as surface dressing can only be applied where the road surface is still in relatively good condition, other treatments are required for roads that have deteriorated beyond this point. Resurfacing is one such alternative, where the existing surface is planed off and a new surface is laid. This treatment is far more expensive than surface dressing, and so fewer sites each year can be done. Sites requiring full resurfacing or other major maintenance work are prioritised separately from the surface dressing programme and in consequence situations do arise where one road appears to be prioritised ahead of another that is seen to be in a worse condition. It should also be noted that not all defects are visible, and sometimes structural repairs are carried out to address defects that have been identified beneath the road surface.

5. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

Can the Local Transport Manager please let me know why the road narrowing works around the Amstel Way/Lockfield Drive roundabout have been carried out? Can he also please advise the cost of these works and the accident record at the roundabout?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

This item was first raised by Councillor Diana Smith in 2004, formed the subject of a report to Local Committee on 31 October 2007 and was included in the ITS works programme for 2010/2011 following approval from the Local Committee to carry out this work. The aim of the scheme is to alter the kerb line around the Denton Way / Lockfield Drive part of the roundabout to help reduce vehicle speeds and to reduce the distance that pedestrians have to cross the road. This will help pedestrians, a high number of whom are school children making their way to and from the Winston Churchill School.

The estimated cost is £40,360.

6. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

The Station Approach section of the A320 was resurfaced on 19th and 20th March as part of the Council's Major Maintenance programme.

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

Please could the County Council confirm if, and if not why were they not, nearby properties including Centrium, Consort Court, Eastgate, Exchange, Somerset House, St Andrews Gate were notified about the A320 works?

Please could the Council also explain why the Goldsworth Road 'Morrisons roundabout' resurfacing was done during the day because of concerns about nearby residents in the Metro apartments, yet the A320 works with many more residents living nearby was done during the night? Why were these works not planned during non-peak hours (10 am to 4 pm) during the day or at a weekend?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Over 200 letters were hand-delivered locally in the vicinity of Station Approach. This included delivery of letters to Lynton House, the Centrium Building, 1-21 Mountside Place, 1-24 The Birches, Sandringham, The Retreat, the Police Station, and also notification to Woking Borough Council's Environmental Health team.

In addition to these letters, which were delivered five days in advance of the works, advance warning signs were placed on the public highway advising of the dates and times of the works, and notification of these works was also advertised through the County Council website.

It is often not practical to distribute letters as widely as some would like, and a judgement has to be made by the project manager as to which properties are most likely to be affected by the works, and therefore need to be included in the letter delivery.

The work to Station Approach was a major maintenance scheme. Due to the logistics of resurfacing a carriageway at such a busy intersection, it was decided to carry out these works at night to minimise disruption to the large volume of traffic that uses this route. Nightwork also gives a larger window of 10 working hours as opposed to the six hours that can be achieved working off-peak during the day.

In comparison, the works carried out in Goldsworth Road formed part of the localised structural repair programme. This is short duration work that can normally reasonably be accommodated in off-peak daytime hours.

Daytime working is always the first choice unless there are reasons why this is impractical. In urban situations an often difficult decision must be taken between balancing the impact of works on residents and also the travelling public.

7. Question from Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Please could the Council confirm when the requested road markings around the Hoebrook Close traffic splitter will be implemented on the ground?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 27 June 2012

A work order will be given to May Gurney early in the new financial year to undertake works at this island.