



# **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, 22 January 2020

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](mailto: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**

### **5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

(Pages 1  
- 4)

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 question has been received to date, but more may come in over the next few days and will be answered on the night or published in a supplementary agenda.

### **6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS**

(Pages 5  
- 6)

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.



**WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE**  
**DATE: 22 JAN 2020**  
**SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**  
**DIVISION: WOKING**

**Question 1: Mr Ross Daniell, local resident**

When will we have a Traffic Regulatory Order Forbidding Pavement Parking along the length of Redding Way, Knaphill?

Driving on the pavement is illegal, yet parking is now the accepted practice. Lack of Off Street parking in Tudor Way has resulted in overspill onto Redding Way's pavements even though there are no carriageway parking restrictions. Cyclists regularly have near misses with pedestrians walking in the cycle lane as the vehicles park with all 4 wheels on the pavement.

Photographic evidence taken by a SCC Highways representative at 13:40 hrs on 15.11.2019. The gentleman even asked if I was cycling on a designated cycle lane!

I have raised over 80 reports to Surrey Police over the last 3.5 years as obstruction is the only way of bringing any action against the drivers. Not a single report has been followed up because it's a SCC Highways issue!

I have also made both Cllr Melanie Whitehand and Cllr Saj Hussain aware of my request.

**Answer**

Thank you for your question.

The conflict of interest in this location stems from the lack of parking for residents in Tudor Way when the majority are at home. Most of the properties in Tudor Way probably have more than one vehicle, and there is insufficient parking capacity within the development to cater for them all. Therefore the extra vehicles end up parked, straddling the advisory cycle lane along Redding Way. Drivers are probably parking in this manner as they think it is less obstructive than parking fully on the carriageway which is a busy through route. This style of parking has now become a habit.

It is however inadvertently obstructing passing cyclists, who cannot use the full extent of the cycle lane for the use it is intended. This then creates some conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, when cyclists are forced to use the footpath.

## ITEM 5

A length of double yellow line was introduced in 2018 covering the junction of Tudor Way, and extending north westwards along Redding Way towards the roundabout with the delivery entrance to Sainsbury's. This was where the majority of parked vehicles were straddling the cycle lane, and should now be clear of parked vehicles at all times.

The rest of Redding Way down to Cavell Way and beyond, has been assessed during more than one Woking parking review to consider if parking controls are necessary. Initial proposals have been sketched out in the past, but observations are that there is a low number of both cyclists and pedestrians using the paths regularly, and although on occasion there is some inconvenience they are able to negotiate any parked vehicles safely, Therefore the resources required to advertise and install parking controls over this length of road have not been prioritised.

If regular usage of the paths by cyclists and pedestrians increased then I'm sure there would be more clamour to keep the paths clear of parked vehicles and local decision makers would respond accordingly.

### **Additional Information since the response was drafted...**

Mr Ross Daniel has also provided a photograph (Please find attached photograph taken 06:59 hrs 7th January 2020. The vehicles are parked on the designated footway on the right and the available area to the left is the designated cycle lane. The photograph covers the section of Redding Way from Sainsbury's Garage looking to Cavell Way roundabouts)



**Question 2: Mr James Pembroke**

Please could the Council explore what options are available in order to help reduce the high volume of speeding vehicles that regularly travel along Littlewick Road.

A large proportion of the road is residential and home to a number of young families, it contains concealed driveways and also has to be crossed on a daily basis by parents and children travelling to the Peter Pan pre-school on Littlewick Common.

Added to this, in parts, the pavements are very narrow - meaning you have to get very close to the road and it can feel like a dangerous task just to leave the house at times.

As a resident, the issue with speeding appears to be getting worst and this is from an already unacceptable position - which was highlighted in the traffic survey undertaken by the council between 3rd and 9th November 2015 and obtained under the freedom of information act. This survey shows that on the Eastbound direction alone 43,181 vehicles passed through during this timeframe, of these 5% (or 1,978 vehicles) were travelling at 51 mph and above, more than 25% above the speed limit of 40 mph for this road and in total during the period of the survey a total of 46% of all journeys made were done so above the speed limit.

The numbers from this survey only add weight to the argument that there is indeed an issue with speeding along Littlewick Road and I would ask that the council acts now to help tackle this problem before there's a serious accident.

**Answer**

Thank you for your question.

The speed survey that was carried out in November 2015, which Mr Pembroke refers to, indicates mean speeds of 41mph eastbound and 38mph westbound. The corresponding 85<sup>th</sup> percentile figures were 46mph and 42mph. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile figure is the speed at which or below, 85% of drivers are travelling. Conversely, it means that 15% of drivers are exceeding this figure.

The Department for Transport document, "Circular 01/2013 Setting Local Speed limits" states, "Mean speed and 85th percentile speed (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are the most commonly used measures of actual traffic speed. Traffic authorities should continue to routinely collect and assess both, but mean speeds should be used as the basis for determining local speed limits."

Surrey County Council and Surrey Police follow this guidance and consider the mean speeds when assessing speed limits but also look at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds when considering compliance with the existing limit. The DfT guidance goes on to say, "For the majority of roads there is a consistent

## ITEM 5

relationship between mean speed and 85th percentile speed. Where this is not the case, it will usually indicate that drivers have difficulty in deciding the appropriate speed for the road, suggesting that a better match between road design and speed limit is required. It may be necessary to consider additional measures to reduce the larger than normal difference between mean and 85th percentile speeds or to bring the speed distribution more in line with typical distributions. The aim for local speed limits should be to align the speed limit to the conditions of the road and road environment.”

The recorded mean and 85th percentile figures for Littlewick Road are quite close together and indicate relatively good compliance with the 40mph speed limit, although it should be noted that they are too high to permit the speed limit to be reduced. As is the case in many roads, there will be a number of vehicles travelling in excess of the 85th percentile speed. However, the 51mph figure that Mr Pembroke quotes equates to the 95th percentile figure which, as explained previously, would not be considered when assessing the speed limit or reviewing compliance with it.

Having checked the personal injury collision database, there are 3 such collisions recorded along the road, not including the roundabouts at either end, in the last 5 year period. Two of these occurred on 20 January 2015 and both appear to have been caused by a water leak which subsequently froze to create hazardous driving conditions. The members of the Joint Committee will be aware that the problematic water main along the road has recently been replaced. The third incident, which took place in 2018 is likely to have been caused by driver fatigue.

Given the relatively good compliance with the speed limit that the November 2015 survey indicated and the personal injury collision history, there are no plans for any work to be undertaken or measures to be introduced along the road.

However, we can make arrangements for a further speed survey to be carried out and, for comparison purposes, we will endeavour to have this conducted at the same location as before.



**WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE**

**DATE: 22 JAN 2020**  
**SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS**  
**DIVISION: WOKING**

**2 x Written Member Questions have been received from Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, Liberal Democrat Group Leader and Councillor for Goldsworth Park**

**Question 1:**

Lakers Youth Centre sadly suffered a fire 2 years ago this month. Since the fire the building has been left to deteriorate with little to no protection from the weather. What asset value did the Lakers Youth Centre building have:-

- i) Prior to the 2018 fire? and
- ii) What is the current asset value?

**Answer**

Surrey County Council (SCC) carries out valuations of its operational assets every 5 years.

Lakers Youth Centre was valued in 2013 at £371,000 (Existing Use Value).

The site was then re-valued in 2018, following the fire which partly destroyed the building, at £600,000 (if fully rebuilt) and estimated value of £420,000 for the impaired property. SCC has not carried out any further valuations since 2018.

**Question 2:**

Surrey has recently received the dubious accolade of being the pothole capital of the UK with more than three and a half thousand claims for pothole damage made in the first 10 months of 2019. What is being done to avoid Surrey being the pothole capital of the UK in future years?

**Answer**

Surrey County Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand on its highway network, and we repair approximately 50,000 potholes every year, from revenue funding, through our Reactive Service.

## ITEM 6

In addition to this, we repair and prevent a further 25,000 to 30,000 potholes through one of our capital funding streams on the residential road network.

Our planned maintenance programme funds the resurfacing of all, or sections of, approx 20 roads a year, these roads are selected via a prioritisation process as outlined in our Asset Strategy (on the website). To clarify, this covers around 20 roads under the Major Maintenance Programme - but that will increase to 50 in 2020/21 due to the increased budget.

For the last 2 years we have received additional capital funding for Severe Weather Recovery, which has seen delivery of further resurfacing and patching work across the network and for the next 4 years we have been allocated some additional monies as part of the Medium Term Financial Plan to fund more road repairs.

In total, we do minor and major patching, major maintenance, and locally funded LSR across approx 200 roads.