



Woking Joint Committee

Together shaping our Borough

Supplementary Agenda

Opportunity to ask questions of your local
Councillors from 6.00pm for up to 30 minutes

6.00pm – 9.30pm

Wednesday, 25 September 2019

Woking Borough Council Civic Offices
Gloucester Square
Woking, Surrey, GU21 6YL

Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Ayesha Azad, Woking South-West (Chairman)
Liz Bowes, Woking South East
Amanda Boote, The Byfleets
Ben Carasco, Woking North
Saj Hussain, Knaphill and Goldsworth West
Will Forster, Woking South
Colin Kemp, Goldsworth East and Horsell Village

Woking Borough Council Appointed Members

Cllr David Bittleston, Mount Hermon (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Simon Ashall, Heathlands
Cllr Gary Elson, West Byfleet
Cllr Tahir Aziz, Canalside
Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, Goldsworth Park
Cllr Graham Chrystie, Pyrford
Cllr Melanie Whitehand, Knaphill

Chief Executive
Ray Morgan
Woking Borough Council

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian
Surrey County Council

The supplementary agenda for the meeting is set out below.

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please call Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Partnership Committee Officer on 01483 404788 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at or nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk

This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEMS

5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To answer any questions from residents or businesses within the Woking Borough area in accordance with Standing Order 14.2. Notice should be given in writing or email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

One public question has been received and the answer given is included.

6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

(Pages 1
- 4)

To receive any written questions from members under Standing Order 13. The deadline for member questions is 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

A written question has been received in advance from Cllr Gary Elson. Two further member questions have been received.

Questions and answers included.

12 COMMUNITY SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT

(Pages 5
- 8)

To provide an update on the activity and impact of the Safer Woking Partnership in the year 2018/19, and to report on community safety budget spend.

Amended report text to reflect the updated crime statistics attached.

Annex 3 – Crime Statistics included.

15 FORWARD PLAN

(Pages 9
- 10)

Members are asked to note the forward plan and to comment / provide suggestions for future agenda items.

Provisional future dates included.



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 25 SEPT 2019
SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS
DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1: Keith Creswell, West Byfleet Village Representative, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Association and WBNF Committee member

I have been asked by the Committee of WBNF to express our strong support for the item "A245 cycle and pedestrian improvements, including cycle route A245 Parvis Road between West Byfleet and Byfleet" in your existing list.

Given the imminent s106 funded construction of a significant element of this scheme outside the Broadoaks Park development, we request the Joint Committee to prioritise the implementation of the remainder of the shared pedestrian and cycle path along the south side of the A245 to the motorway bridge, which should now be at a lesser cost than originally conceived.

We would ask the Joint Committee to recognise this scheme as a very positive contribution to the strategic cycling connection from Byfleet to Old Woking, the recognised educational benefit to Fullbrook Pupils and a contribution to the objectives encompassed by the Climate Emergency Policy recently adopted by WBC.

Answer

Cycle and pedestrian improvements along the A245 are fully captured within the Woking Local Transport Strategy (LTS) and Forward Programme of schemes. This scheme forms part of a broader vision for a high quality cycle corridor between Cobham and Woking.

The LTS Forward Programme has recently been updated and published following a period of public consultation last year. The document can be accessed here – <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/transport-plan/local-transport-strategies-and-forward-programmes>

The Committee notes the interest in this scheme and it's potential value, and will ask officers to include this in the prioritised local schemes list for potential future delivery.

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 25 SEPT 2019

SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1: Cllr Gary Elson, Pyrford Ward

‘Please can Officers explore what opportunities there are to improve the condition of the Green in Beaufort Road and seek to alleviate some of the connected parking issues in this area of the Maybury Estate.’

‘Many trade and private vehicles are regularly parked there and what little green is left ends up being a quagmire whenever there is heavy rain.’

‘The Green fronts a number of private properties and residents have complained for many years’

Answer – Area Highways Team

We are aware that there is a high demand for parking in the Maybury area. We are also aware of the condition of the verge in Beaufort Road and we have had several enquiries about this.

The verge in Beaufort Road could be fenced off in order to allow the grass to re-grow and for the amenity to be re-established but given the demand for parking, it is assumed that the residents would prefer the parking to be formalised, with a hardstanding provided.

We have a generic item on our capital schemes list for “Maybury, various road – convert verges to parking” and Beaufort Road can be considered to be one of these roads.

We also have a two other similar items for the conversion of verges to parking but it must be noted that the provision of parking is not a function or duty of a highway authority, simply because there is no right to park on the highway. Whilst a highway authority can convert a verge or other area to parking, in a residential area such as Maybury, converting any verge would amount to the provision of private parking because there are no other amenities such as shops, community centres, doctors’ surgery etc whereby the parking would be of benefit to a greater number of highway users. Allocating funding for such schemes will undoubtedly be at the expense of other schemes on our work programme that would have wider and, potentially, casualty reduction benefits.

The particular verge in question is sloped and there is a fairly significant level difference between the edge of the road and the footway that runs immediately in front of the properties. This means that if the area was converted, either the parking spaces would be on a slope or the verge would have to be dug out to form a level

ITEM 6

area and this would clearly require a retaining structure at the back (closest to the properties). If the area remained sloped, this could have implications for people getting in and out of the vehicles and walking to and from them, particularly if they are elderly or disabled and especially so in winter conditions; the gradient would be steeper than the one on the existing footway, which is longer and, therefore, less steep. If the area was levelled, not only would a retaining structure be required, as already mentioned, but it would be less convenient for residents to use because they would not be able to take the shortest, most direct route to their properties but would have to walk to the footway that runs in front of the properties and then follow that. Either option would be expensive.

A cheaper option might be to use a product such as "Grass-crete" which is grid-type mat through which grass can still grow but the weight of vehicles is supported by the grid structure, so the grass suffers less and the area tends not to turn into an unsightly expanse of mud. This has been used before in Woking but on level ground and not over such a large area.

Without allocating some funding to undertake more detailed investigation, accurate cost estimates for these options cannot be given.

As mentioned earlier, we have an item on our work programme for the conversion of verges to parking in various roads in Maybury but within our ranking system, it sits over half-way down the list. It is not a high priority scheme and is likely to be prohibitively expensive and because of this, it is recommended that no action is taken at this time.

Question 2: Cllr Graham Chrystie

CIL Procedures - We now have received £385,000 for credit to the West Byfleet Forum 'account' and this adds to smaller sums already accumulated for other Wards.

The Committee has already set out outline arrangements for dealing with the utilisation of Forum monies but there needs to be procedural guidance to ensure that monies can be properly disbursed by WBC. When will officers/ members meet to draft the guidance?

Answer – Ernest Amaoko

The Joint Committee has approved the arrangement for how the CIL contributions earmarked for the various local communities could be used, including how local community infrastructure projects could be identified. The procedure set out in the Joint Committee report of 13 March 2019 is sufficiently comprehensive at this stage to be applied without the need to prepare another procedural guidance.

The Joint Committee has said that the agreed process has to operate and be monitored for about a year and lessons learnt will be taken into account to determine whether any further measures or change in the process might be necessary. It would therefore be premature to prepare another procedural guidance without the benefit of the lessons learnt from the outcome of this monitoring exercise.

Furthermore, Officers have said that they will be willing to facilitate training for Members to help them manage the process. If the Joint Committee is happy for Officers to go ahead, that will be organised. The outcome of the training and how it has helped Members to manage the process will also be taken into account in any

potential future review of the process. Whilst Officers are not against preparing the procedural guidance, such a guidance note would benefit from the outcome of the monitoring, and as such would be premature to do that now.

Question 3: Cllr Will Forster, County Councillor, Woking South

Please can the County Council confirm how many road traffic collisions there have been on Westfield Road in the last 5 years?

Please will the Council state what was the average speed of traffic on Westfield Road the last time a speed survey was carried out? What was the highest speed recorded?

Answer – Area Highways Team

Please can the County Council confirm how many road traffic collisions there have been on Westfield Road in the last 5 years?

Since the beginning of 2014, there have been 19 personal injury collisions along Westfield Road. These resulted in 4 serious injuries and 16 slight injuries.

Please will the Council state what was the average speed of traffic on Westfield Road, the last time a speed survey was carried out? What was the highest speed record?

A series of 5 traffic surveys were undertaken along the road in 2016, with data collected by means of rubber tubes stretched across the road. The site locations and the recorded average mean speeds are set out in the table below.

The speed data is collected and displayed in what are known as speed “bins”, with each increasing in 5mph increments. The highest speed bin contains all those vehicles that were travelling at 56mph or more. This bin is populated in each direction at each survey site but it is not possible to say what the maximum individual speed was in each case.

Survey site details	Direction of traffic	Average mean speed
Site 1 – Telegraph pole outside No 102 Westfield Road	Eastbound	33.6mph
	Westbound	32.9mph
Site 2 – Lamp column 28 outside cricket ground	Eastbound	32.2mph
	Westbound	32.3mph
Site 3 – Lamp column 16 opposite St Mark’s Church	Eastbound	28.8mph
	Westbound	29.5mph
Site 4 – Lamp column 10 near shops	Eastbound	26.6mph
	Westbound	27.2mph
Site 5 – Telegraph pole outside Nos 8/10 Westfield Road	Eastbound	29.5mph
	Westbound	30.1mph

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 25 September 2019
LEAD OFFICER: CAMILLA EDMISTON, COMMUNITY SAFETY MANAGER
 WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL

SUBJECT: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SAFER WOKING PARTNERSHIP
 2018-19

**UPDATED TEXT TO REFLECT LATEST CRIME STATS
 (ANNEX 3)**

Domestic Abuse

- 2.3 Reports of Domestic Abuse (DA) have steadily reduced over this reporting period, totalling 354 offences: 122 DA related violence with injury offences and 232 violence without injury offences. This trend has continued to reduce into the remainder of 2019. Domestic abuse continues to be a significant focus for Surrey Police, with sustained effort to encourage reporting, provide ongoing support to domestic abuse victims and bring offenders to justice. High and Medium risk incidents (accordingly to a risk assessment used nationally) are investigated by specially trained officers.

The use of the PCSO 'DA' Car continues to support victims of domestic abuse when incidents have occurred with the intent to safeguard them and provide them, with professional partners, with the support to prevent reoccurrence. The DA car can also signpost to other professional partners who can assist and encourage reporting in the future.

Sexual Offences

- 2.4 Reports of serious sexual offending have increased by 20% when compared to the same reporting period last year. These statistics include domestic and non-recent sexual offences. The level of public place sexual offending remains low and these offences are dealt with robustly by police.

Such offences are generally stable throughout the year, but traditionally the summer experiences a spike.

Unfortunately positive outcome rates have reduced from 17 down to 7 in this reporting period which may represent complex reasons such as evidential challenges presented by the Crown Prosecution Service; victim support and high volume historical offences.

Hate Crime

- 2.5 Reports of Hate Crime increased by 10.7% when compared to the same reporting period last year, including both racially motivated and homphobically motivated offences. This is an area of crime where victims are often repeatedly targeted, often by different offenders. Positive outcomes have reduced by 12% - this is largely due to lack of evidence and Woking Police continues to work with victims and partner agencies to safeguard, support and prevent reoccurrence.

We continue to deal with all hate crime reports robustly and thoroughly to encourage future reporting and bring offenders to justice.

Domestic Burglary

- 2.6 Positively, reports of domestic burglary have decreased by 5%. 2018-2019 continues the trend of continuing reduction of burglary reports.

Surrey Police continue to focus on both crime prevention and dealing with offenders via intelligence gathering, analysis, proactive detection, disruption and re-assurance patrols. In the coming months Woking Safer Neighbourhood Team will be using SelectaDNA to further deter burglars from offending and offering crime prevention advice where vulnerabilities are identified.

- 2.7 Surrey Police monitor and analyse numerous crime types and trends, identifying potential emerging problems or series and subsequently responding accordingly. Surrey Police continue to work with both partners and the broader community to make Woking Borough as safe as possible. Surrey (and Woking particularly) remains one of the safest counties in the country. We also work with offenders to identify those responsible for burglaries.
- 2.8 Residents can report criminal behaviour or incidents to the Surrey Police Safer Neighbourhood Team on 101, or if it is a genuine emergency call 999.

Borough Changes											
FYtD: Apr-2018 to MAR-2019											
TNO											
Volume											
Borough	Crime				Positive Outcomes				+Outcome Rate		
	Last Year	This Year	#	%	Last Year	This Year	#	%	Last Year	This Year	%Point Change
Epsom & Ewell	5126	5401	275	5.4	788	785	-3	-.4	15.4	14.5	-.8
Mole Valley	4577	4865	288	6.3	831	769	-62	-7.5	18.2	15.8	-2.3
Reigate & Banstead	9186	9850	664	7.2	1676	1669	-7	-.4	18.2	16.9	-1.3
Tandridge	5546	5526	-20	-.4	787	727	-60	-7.6	14.2	13.2	-1
Elmbridge	8098	8165	67	.8	882	1072	190	21.5	10.9	13.1	2.2
Runnymede	6577	6337	-240	-3.6	934	951	17	1.8	14.2	15	.8
Spelthorne	7214	7784	570	7.9	960	991	31	3.2	13.3	12.7	-.6
Guildford	9440	9927	487	5.2	1801	1640	-161	-8.9	19.1	16.5	-2.6
Surrey Heath	4729	5370	641	13.6	821	800	-21	-2.6	17.4	14.9	-2.5
Waverley	5232	5941	709	13.6	660	557	-103	-15.6	12.6	9.4	-3.2
Woking	7128	7321	193	2.7	1126	1181	55	4.9	15.8	16.1	.3
FORCE	72853	76487	3634	5	11266	11142	-124	-1.1	15.5	14.6	-.9

Borough Changes Plus											
FYtD: Apr-2018 to MAR-2019											
TOTAL HATE CRIMES Volume											
Borough	Crime				Positive Outcomes				+Outcome Rate		
	Last Year	This Year	#	%	Last Year	This Year	#	%	Last Year	This Year	%Point Change
Epsom & Ewell	135	136	1	.7	22	19	-3	-13.6	16.3	14	-2.3
Mole Valley	66	97	31	47	12	13	1	8.3	18.2	13.4	-4.8
Reigate & Banstead	233	237	4	1.7	45	38	-7	-15.6	19.3	16	-3.3
Tandridge	85	83	-2	-2.4	16	10	-6	-37.5	18.8	12	-6.8
Elmbridge	212	187	-25	-11.8	27	36	9	33.3	12.7	19.3	6.5
Runnymede	151	169	18	11.9	23	42	19	82.6	15.2	24.9	9.6
Spelthorne	251	247	-4	-1.6	48	46	-2	-4.2	19.1	18.6	-.5
Guildford	244	249	5	2	49	52	3	6.1	20.1	20.9	.8
Surrey Heath	99	126	27	27.3	20	16	-4	-20	20.2	12.7	-7.5
Waverley	73	80	7	9.6	6	10	4	66.7	8.2	12.5	4.3
Woking	206	228	22	10.7	50	44	-6	-12	24.3	19.3	-5
FORCE	1755	1839	84	4.8	318	326	8	2.5	18.1	17.7	-.4

<p align="center">Borough Level FYTD: Apr-2018 to MAR-2019 Woking</p>																							
Crime Category	Crime			Positive Outcomes						+Outcomes breakdown													
	Last Year	This Year	%	Volume			Rate			Volume								Rate					
				Last Year	This Year	%	Last Year	This Year	%	Last Year	This Year	#	%	Charge Summons	Caution	TICs previously recorded	TICs not previously recorded	FPN	Resolved	Last Year	This Year		
	This year +outcome method																						
Criminal damage	884	923	↑	83	97	↑	9.4	10.5	↑	83	97	14	16.9%	↑	43	14	0	0	1	39	9.4	10.5	↑
Domestic burglary	410	387	↓	29	27	↓	7.1	7	↓	29	27	-2	-6.9%	↓	17	0	10	0	0	0	7.1	7	↓
Drug offences	252	350	↑	211	269	↑	83.7	76.9	↓	211	269	58	27.5%	↑	122	23	0	0	81	43	83.7	76.9	↓
Fraud and forgery	39	24	↓	22	15	↓	56.4	62.5	↑	22	15	-7	-31.8%	↓	15	0	0	0	0	0	56.4	62.5	↑
Non-domestic burglary	147	107	↓	13	5	↓	8.8	4.7	↓	13	5	-8	-61.5%	↓	4	0	1	0	0	0	8.8	4.7	↓
Other criminal offences	193	217	↑	71	74	↑	36.8	34.1	↓	71	74	3	4.2%	↑	59	5	0	0	4	6	36.8	34.1	↓
Other sexual offences	47	44	↓	17	5	↓	36.2	11.4	↓	17	5	-12	-70.6%	↓	3	2	0	0	0	0	36.2	11.4	↓
Robbery	31	42	↑	5	4	↓	16.1	9.5	↓	5	4	-1	-20%	↓	4	0	0	0	0	0	16.1	9.5	↓
Serious sexual	190	235	↑	17	7	↓	8.9	3	↓	17	7	-10	-58.8%	↓	4	1	0	0	0	2	8.9	3	↓
Theft (other than vehicle) & handling stolen goods	1436	1472	↑	144	152	↑	10	10.3	↑	144	152	8	5.6%	↑	68	3	2	0	10	69	10	10.3	↑
Vehicle crime (excluding interference)	372	362	↓	20	10	↓	5.4	2.8	↓	20	10	-10	-50%	↓	8	2	0	0	0	0	5.4	2.8	↓
Vehicle interference and tampering	83	78	↓	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0%	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Violence with injury	784	794	↑	159	161	↑	20.3	20.3	↑	159	161	2	1.3%	↑	109	12	0	0	0	40	20.3	20.3	↑
Violence without injury	2260	2286	↑	335	355	↑	14.8	15.5	↑	335	355	20	6%	↑	203	24	0	0	6	122	14.8	15.5	↑
TNO	7128	7321	↑	1126	1181	↑	15.8	16.1	↑	1126	1181	55	4.9%	↑	659	86	13	0	102	321	15.8	16.1	↑

WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

2019/2020

2019 Dates	Meeting	Time	Location
Wed 23 Oct 2019	Informal Meeting	18:00-20:00	Boardroom
Wed 4 Dec 2019	Joint Committee Meeting	18:00-21:30	The Chamber, WBC BOOKED
Provisional 2020 Dates – TO BE CONFIRMED	Meeting	Time	Location
Wed 12 Feb 2020	Informal Meeting	18:00-20:00	Boardroom
Wed 4 Mar 2020	Joint Committee Meeting	18:00-21:30	The Chamber, WBC BOOKED
Wed 24 June 2020	Joint Committee Meeting	18.00-20.00	The Chamber, Woking BC, BOOKED
Wed 2 Sept 2020	Informal Meeting	18:00-20:00	
Wed 23 Sept 2020	Joint Committee Meeting	18:00-21:30	The Chamber, Woking BC
Wed 21 Oct 2020	Informal Meeting	18:00-20:00	
Wed 2 Dec 2020	Joint Committee Meeting	18:00-21:30	The Chamber

This page is intentionally left blank