

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 12 March 2014
at Lord Pirbright's Hall, Pirbright GU24 0JE.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton (Chairman)
- * Mr W D Barker OBE (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mr David Goodwin
- * Mr George Johnson
- * Mrs Marsha Moseley
- * Mrs Pauline Searle
- * Mr Keith Taylor
- * Mrs Fiona White
- * Mr Keith Witham

Borough / District Members:

- Cllr Mark Chapman
- * Cllr Monika Juneja
- * Cllr Nigel Manning
- Cllr Bob McShee
- * Cllr James Palmer
- * Cllr Tony Phillips
- * Cllr Caroline Reeves
- Cllr Tony Rooth
- Cllr David Wright
- * Cllr Stephen Mansbridge

* In attendance

46/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 1]

47/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillor Mr Graham Ellwood and Borough Councillors March Chapman, Bob McShee, Tony Rooth and David Wright.

48/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2013 were confirmed as a true record.

49/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

No declarations of interest were received.

50/13 PETITIONS [Item 5]

(i) Graham Mansfield, resident of Wisley Village

This petition requested that Surrey County Council reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph or even 20mph along the entirety of Wisley Lane, Woking, Surrey. Mrs Engells spoke to the petition.

The meeting heard that members had agreed to allocate funding from the 2014/15 Local Committee Highways budget at the last meeting to look at this matter. The Area Highways Manager said a schedule was not in place at the current time, but that residents would be informed once a schedule was in place.

(ii) Shalford Parish Council

The residents of Peasmarsh would like Surrey County Council's Highways department to reduce the speed of vehicles on the A248 in the proximity of Oakdene Road whether by reducing the speed limit or by adding vehicle activated or other working signs and to reinstate access for emergency vehicles from the A3100 to Oakdene Road close to the Astolat roundabout. Parish Councillor Bill Burkett spoke to the petition.

Local members were in support of the petition.

The meeting heard that Shalford Parish Council was in favour of installing a Vehicle Activated Sign on the A248. The Area Highways Manager (AHM) proposed that existing signage could be made more conspicuous if it were yellow-backed. The AHM agreed to visit the site to review and also to look at the stopping up order for the A3100 access to Oakdene Road and would liaise with local members and the Parish Council.

51/13 PETITION RESPONSE: ONSLOW 20MPH ZONE [Item 5a]

The Area Highways Manager (AHM) presented the report.

The petition request had been to implement a 20mph zone on specified roads in Onslow Village. The meeting heard that the Transportation Task Group would consider the matter of 20mph zones at the next scheduled meeting and consequently an officer report would be submitted to the next meeting in June.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Nominate the Transportation Task Group to review this request along with any others that may be received for consideration in future programmes of capital highway works funded by this committee.

Reason

To enable the Local Committee (Guildford) to engage with residents on a matter of local concern.

(a) PETITION RESPONSE: THROUGH-TRAFFIC IN MERROW WOODS [Item 5b]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager (AHM).

The original petition request was to slow down through traffic at Merrow Woods. The members were content that the concerns and requests in the petition had been addressed.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the committee report.

52/13 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Three questions were received from the public. The written responses to these questions can be found at the annexe to these minutes.

With regard to the question about section 106 developer contributions relating to proposed road crossings in Ash Manor Road, it was confirmed the proposals had been discussed with the headteacher of Ash Manor School in terms of feasibility and that there would be consultation with local residents.

53/13 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 7]

No member written questions were received.

54/13 JOINT WORKING THROUGH GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE (LOCAL COMMITTEE PLUS) [Item 8]

The report was presented by the Surrey County Council Community Partnerships Team Manager.

Members of the local committee had considered and proposed a number of new ways to work together in partnership and to increase local engagement which had been outlined in the report.

The members of the committee endorsed the report and agreed that it was the expectation of residents that the two Councils should make every effort to work together more closely and effectively. The contribution of Guildford Borough Council to the Members Local Allocation budget and the improvements to local engagement through webcasting and the local 'cluster' meetings were welcomed.

It was noted that the agreement of the Surrey County Council Cabinet would be sought and a further report detailing the governance of the new proposals would be brought to the June meeting of the committee.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) the proposals contained within the report to enhance the joint working arrangements between the Councils from the next municipal year.
- (ii) Endorse the development of an updated terms of reference for the Committee Plus.

- (iii) the proposed divisions and boundaries for the Cluster Group Meetings across the Borough.
- (iv) Note that following the required approval of Surrey County Council Cabinet and Council, a further report will be brought to committee in June 2014 to agree the terms of reference of the Task Groups and the financial arrangements for the cluster budget.

Reason

Working jointly and in partnership can provide added value in terms of cost and time savings and produce more effective, coordinated responses to service delivery. These recommendations seek to increase and develop joined up working between the two authorities to produce better value and coordinated services for residents

55/13 ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN BOXGROVE ROAD AND EPSOM ROAD, GUILDFORD [Item 9]

The Senior Countryside Access Officer spoke to the report.

An application has been received for a Map Modification Order (MMO) to add a footpath between Boxgrove Road and Epsom Road, Merrow, Guildford.

Mr Phil Bell spoke on behalf of the Greenmeads Residents Association and in opposition to the MMO.

The local member confirmed there was no evidence to support the proposed MMO and historically the route had always been private.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) No public footpath rights are recognised over A – B – C – D on Drg. No. 3/1/75/H48 and that this application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath is not approved.
- (ii) In the event of the County Council being directed to make a MMO by the Secretary of State following an appeal by the claimant, the County Council as surveying authority will adopt a neutral stance at any Public Inquiry, making all evidence available to help the inspector to determine the case.

Reason

The County Council has a duty under Section 53 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA 1981) to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (DMS) if it discovers evidence which on balance supports a modification. In this instance the evidence does not support the making of an MMO.

56/13 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - ONSLOW VILLAGE AND VARIOUS OTHER LOCATIONS ALREADY WITHIN THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE [Item 10]

The Guildford Borough Council Parking Services Manager presented the report.

The report provided the responses received as a result of the formal advertisement of proposals in Onslow Village and also for a number of other locations already within the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ).

Public speaking under Chairman's discretion

Under his discretion the Chairman invited four members of the public in attendance to speak to the item in advance of the member debate. Three members of the public objected to the Onslow Village recommendations of the officer report which they considered did not accurately represent the majority of the resident's views. They were concerned that implementation of restrictions could shunt local parking issues to new areas. They asked for a greater number of spaces to remain unrestricted and queried the motives for making the proposed changes. One resident spoke in favour of the officer recommendations.

Member debate

Local members representing Onslow noted that the current officer recommendations arose from one formal consultation, two informal consultations and one exhibition. It was felt that best efforts had been made to engage residents on the matter and, although it was regrettable that resident response rates to consultations had remained low, it was the right point in time to make a decision. The local members were in support of the officer recommendations. The meeting heard that the agreed restrictions could be reviewed again in the future if necessary. It was noted that this was the first occasion that unrestricted bays had been included in the package of recommendations and this was as a direct result of resident feedback.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) that in respect to the proposals for Onslow Village, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to the parking restrictions set out in Annexe 1 of the committee report, but with minor amendments which lessen the proposed level of control. The minor amendments are detailed in paragraphs 2.20 & 2.21 and shown in Annexe 6 of the committee report;
- (ii) that in respect to the proposals for Guildford Park Road and Pewley Way, and the various other locations for which no representations were received, the traffic regulation order is made to introduce the changes to parking restrictions set out in Annexe 7 of the committee report, so that the controls can be implemented

Reason

To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to and make local improvements.

57/13 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND UPDATE AND 2014/15 PROGRAMME [Item 11]

The Transport Projects Team Manager presented the report.

The report provided an update to the Local Committee on progress made with the programme to date and sought approval for the indicative 2014/15 programme.

There was a verbal update for the Westborough Community Fund and it was noted that a written report would be circulated after the meeting. It was further noted that there would be shortly be a meeting held between Surrey County Council officers and the Highways Agency to discuss the Egerton Road traffic lights and A3 signage for the new Park & Ride service.

Members requested a link between inconsiderate parking at bus stops and the implementation of clearways via the LSTF. It was noted that was a need for a bus clearway at Briarfield Road.

Members requested that overseas models of cycle route management be considered in the proposed local cycle plan. It was noted that cyclists may cycle both ways up a one-way street in Copenhagen.

The real time bus information was working well on Park and Ride services, but not on other mainstream services. This was because the bus companies did not yet have the real time system in place and that the data from the bus company's was currently not accurate enough. Work would continue to achieve a solution.

The Department for Transport had been unable to provide any additional time for the LTSF programme roll-out despite the impact on operations caused by the severe winter weather. The deadline for expenditure of the budget remained March 2015.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (ii) the indicative 2014/15 programme;
- (iii) to delegate amendments to the LSTF Programme to the Chair of the LSTF Delivery Group in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and the appropriate county and borough officers and members.

Reason

The Department for Transport advise that all LSTF grant money should be spent by 31 March 2015 and there is no ability to carry forward LSTF grant beyond this date. The indicative 2014/15 LSTF TravelSMART programme for Guildford has been developed to meet this financial requirement, while meeting all the LSTF objectives.

**58/13 OPERATION HORIZON 5 YEAR CARRIAGEWAY MAINTENANCE PLAN
[Item 12]**

The Area Highways Manager (AHM) presented the report.

An update on the progress of road surfacing under the programme was provided by County Council division.

It was acknowledged that a period of extraordinary weather from December 2013 had compounded and exacerbated the usual level of damage to the road surface that could be expected during springtime. It was further noted that the extreme weather had delayed the progress of the programme resulting in a backlog. As a result the County Council was planning a programme of local resurfacing during April and May along with the regular programme of surface dressing during summer. A Cabinet budget meeting would be held to agree funding for the additional programme.

The members of the committee noted Queen Street (Gomshall), Wood Hill (Send), Stoughton Road, Western Road (Westborough) and Frog Grove Lane (Wood Street) were local priorities for the Horizon programme.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the committee report.

59/13 INTRODUCTION OF BUS STOP CLEARWAYS IN GUILDFORD [Item 13]

The Area Highways Manager presented the report.

The members were content to approve the proposal for the implementation of three new bus clearways.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) Clearways are introduced in Byrefield Road at the existing bus stops adjacent to properties 1 to 3 and adjacent to property 2, the restriction to be 'at any time' (the bus service operates between 06:00 and midnight).
- (ii) A clearway is introduced in Bushy Hill Drive at the bus stop opposite Wykeham Road, the restriction to be 'at any time' (the bus service operates between 06:00 and midnight).
- (iii) A clearway is introduced at the bus stop in Ash Street Ash adjacent to property 65, the restriction to be 'at any time' (the bus service operates between 06:30 and 23:00)

Reason

Buses require parallel alignment with the kerb to deploy ramping and kneeling equipment to allow access for wheelchair users and those with mobility problems.

Parked vehicles within bus stops prevent this access.

Bus stop clearways enable Borough enforcement officers to issue penalty charge notices on offending vehicles thereby discouraging inconsiderate parking.

60/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 14]

The Area Highways Manager (AHM) presented the report.

The Highways Update provided information relating to the progress of Local Committee funded schemes and local highways issues.

The cost to Surrey County Council for the severe winter weather and flooding stood at £20 million and continued to rise. There had been a maximum draw on resources and capacity to cope with the emergency and then the recovery. In Guildford, some scheduled work had needed to be put on hold during the period. It was noted that there could be an impact on the 2014/15 local committee budget as schemes that it had not been possible to complete due to the weather were carried over. The Transportation Task Group would review the impact of the severe weather on the local programme and there would be a report to the June meeting.

On the whole residents had been pleased with the new Woodbridge Road scheme. The local member had received responses on behalf of residents provided by Mr Byrne.

Members were critical of the roll out of the Lengthsman scheme with parish councils. It was said to have been too bureaucratic in nature. However, it was noted that the scheme had been successful in Waverley. Consequently, there would be review engaging with previous applicants to understand and address the issues which had arisen for Guildford parish councils.

The estimate for the cost of re-laying the setts on Guildford High Street would be provided by consultant WPS. It was noted that careful project management would be required to ensure that the work did not clash with any local events involving the High Street. The members observed that utilities companies ought to be notified of the intentions of the County Council to undertake this work and the resulting restrictions clarified should they themselves have any High street maintenance to undertake.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) Due to the effects of the recent extreme weather across Guildford and Surrey agree that £50,000 be allocated from the 2014/15 budget towards flood recovery works organised by the area team.
- (ii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager to introduce clearways at bus stops where there is habitual parking in consultation with the Group Manager for Travel and Transport and locally elected divisional and ward members.

Reason

To contribute to flood recovery in Guildford and introduce enforceable parking restrictions at bus stops blighted by parking

61/13 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 15]

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the committee report.

Meeting ended at: 9.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 12 March 2014

Petitions [Item 5]

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Graham Mansfield, resident Attracting 66 signatures Speaker: Cherry Engel
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Horsleys / Wisley
Summary of concerns and requests	<i>This petition requests that Surrey County Council reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph or even 20mph along the entirety of Wisley Lane, Woking, Surrey. The current speed limit implies that the road is safe to drive at 40mph and as a consequence the road is extremely dangerous for vehicles, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.</i>
Response	The Committee would like to thank Mr Mansfield for presenting the petition regarding reviewing the existing speed limit in Wisley Lane. At the meeting of 11 December 2013 the committee agreed the programme of highway schemes for the 2014/15 financial year which includes £10,000 allocated towards reviewing, and potentially reducing, the speed limit in Wisley Lane.

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Shalford Parish Council Attracting 111 signatures Speaker: Parish Councillor Bill Burkett (Chairman)
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Shalford / Shalford
Summary of concerns and requests	<i>The residents of Peasmarsh would like Surrey County Council's Highways department to reduce the speed of vehicles on the A248 in the proximity of Oakdene Road whether by reducing the speed limit or by adding vehicle activated or other working signs and to reinstate access for emergency vehicles from the A3100 to Oakdene Road close to the Astolat roundabout.</i>
Response	The Committee would like to thank Shalford Parish Council for presenting the petition to investigate the possibility of reducing the speed limit in the vicinity of the A248 Broadford Road and Oakdene Road junction and to reinstate access for emergency vehicles from the A3100

TABLED ITEM

	<p>to Oakdene Road, close to the Astolat roundabout.</p> <p>The current speed limit in Broadford Road between the A3100 Portsmouth Road and the A281 Horsham Road is 40mph which officers consider to be an appropriate limit given the nature of the road, and which accords with SCC's Speed Limit Policy. There is a difficult bend in Broadford Road just to the east of the Oakdene Road junction where the road narrows and rises/falls which requires drivers to exercise caution. In the past five years a single accident has been recorded by the Police in the vicinity of the bend and the junction, which was as a result of the driver losing consciousness while at the wheel approaching the bend from the east.</p> <p>Officers have reviewed existing signs and road markings and consider that they are adequate and clearly warn drivers of the bend from both directions, and of the need to slow down.</p> <p>However, the anti-skid surface in the vicinity of the bend is in poor condition and the road markings are worn. Officers will organise re-marking the road at the bend and investigate local re-surfacing, though no timescale can be given for the latter in view of the need for extensive repairs to the road network following the extremely wet Winter.</p> <p>The planning conditions for the development of the Astolat site in 2002 required the construction of a new roundabout forming a junction with the A3100 Portsmouth Road and the site access road as well as stopping up the junction of Oakdene Road with the A3100 Portsmouth Road.</p>
--	--

Public Questions and Statements [Item 6]

1. Submitted by Roger Hall, resident of Onslow Village.

Regarding ITEM 10 on the agenda

Having regard to representations* on reducing the number of proposed parking bays in Wilderness Road between The Crossways and Litchfield Way to improve sight-lines, the Committee is invited to respond to the following question:

“In developing the parking proposals, has account been taken of the possibility that parking bays when occupied could obscure the view of traffic coming up or down Wilderness Road for drivers attempting to safely exit their driveways and, in

TABLED ITEM

consequence, has the right balance been struck between the provision of bays and the need not to compromise safety in this section of Wilderness Road?"

(*See representations 10275, 10373, 10383, 10384 and 10402 in Annex 3 and the Officer comments thereon.)

Answer

We have considered the ability of residents to exit their driveways. In response to the various consultations the amount of parking in Mr Hall's section of Wilderness Road has been reduced to improve access for residents. Since receiving the question we have re-visited the site.

At the moment vehicles can park as close as they like to a resident's access. The proposed controls provide a marked bay and limit how close vehicles can park to an access. If the proposal is agreed by the Committee the bay will be set back 1.8m from the dropped kerb. We have used the same set back in similar roads in other parts of the controlled parking zone and it provides sufficient sight lines.

We note Mr Hall would like the length of the bay reduced and we do not think this is necessary. To do this would require the readvertising of this proposal. We are happy to meet with Mr Hall, discuss the situation and monitor it. If the situation warranted it we could consider changing the length of the bay during a future review.

2. Submitted by Alan Norris

Proposed pedestrian crossings in Manor Road, Ash

The approval for Guildford BC planning application no: 12/P/00645 for the outline development of 60 houses at land off Ash Green Lane West, Ash provides for S106 payments to include the provision of two pedestrian crossings on Manor Road, Ash - one to be an uncontrolled crossing south of Ash Green Lane West near the bus stop at Elm Lane, and the other to be a controlled crossing to the north of Ash Green Lane West, (i.e. outside Ash Manor School), the actual locations are not specified. (Only one crossing to be provided if the controlled crossing is located south of Ash Green Lane West.)

The provision of two pedestrian crossings on Manor Road near Elm Lane and in the vicinity of Ash Manor School and upgraded bus stops was a recommendation of the County Highways (Transport Development Planning) (ref: letters from Greg Devine to planning officer, 12 June and 26 October 2012). The Transport Statement prepared by Odyssey Consulting Engineers to support the planning application concluded that there would be minimal public transport trips incurred by the development residents in the AM and PM peaks and that there would be no requirement for additional infrastructure or bus services (ref. paras 5.8 and 5.9 of the TS).

TABLED ITEM

The location of a controlled pedestrian crossing near Ash Manor School is presumably intended for the children who need to cross Manor Road to go to and from school. (I cannot find anything within the planning documents as confirmation of this.) This crossing will in effect only be used for a short time each school day (under 200 days per year) when children come to and leave the school, there being only a minimal number of pedestrians who cross Manor Road at other times. A large majority of the children going to and from the school come either from the Ash Street (Greyhound) direction or from Tongham, and they do not need to cross Manor Road. The letter from the head teacher of Ash Manor School to the planning officer (20 Sept. 2012) supports the planning application, but he does not mention anything about requesting a pedestrian crossing on Manor Road.

Does the County Highways have any information on the number of children at Ash Manor School who are likely to cross Manor Road (both near to Kings Avenue and near to Carfax Avenue / Elm Lane) on their way to and from school? (The school should be able to provide this information from the home addresses of the pupils.)

Speeding traffic along Manor Road is a regular occurrence. Will the County Highways / Guildford Local Committee consider applying the S106 payments to provide several road narrowing points in Manor Road with priority in one direction (similar to those in Oxenden Road and in The Street at Tongham) instead of the two pedestrian crossings? Such road restrictions would help to reduce traffic speeds and also provide a reasonably safe place for the Ash Manor School children and others to cross Manor Road in that there would only be a single alternating line of traffic to negotiate. The pedestrian crossings alone will not reduce the speed of traffic travelling in excess of the speed limit.

Does the stipulation of provision of pedestrian crossings within the planning approval documents (under S106 payments) commit the County Highways to provide these crossings?

Answer

The Committee would like to thank Mr Norris for presenting the background information on the pedestrian crossings in Manor Road.

The condition wording, under permission 12/P/00645, states that there should be a) an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing, dropped kerb with tactile paving, on Manor Road to the south of Ash Green Lane West and b) a controlled pedestrian crossing on Manor Road in the vicinity of Ash Manor School.

Last April a meeting was held, at Ash Manor School, between SCC highway officers and the school Head teacher, to identify and agree the exact location of a controlled crossing in the vicinity of the school. The proposed location, outside the school entrance, was concluded to be the most appropriate location for the controlled crossing.

The SCC Highways Authority has to adhere to what is stipulated on the S106 agreement.

3. Submitted by Joanna Cadman, Albury Parish Council

Albury Parish Council would like to apply to the Local Committee for funding for work to New Road in Albury, which will involve installing kerb stones in order to prevent lorries from continually eroding the side of the road. This scheme was evolved during discussions with Bahram Assadi and Gavin Smith, and seems to be the best solution to an increasing problem.

However, I am not clear how to do this: do we draw up a scheme first and then submit it for consideration for funding, or do we advise you of the requirement and ask Local Committee to consider its merits before proceeding further?

Answer

The Committee would like to thank Albury Parish Council for presenting the question about the installation of kerb stones in New Road.

There are rural roads throughout the county similar to New Road with the side verge being eroded. SCC Highways Authority does not consider installing kerb stones in such roads as these are relatively expensive schemes to implement. If a short section of a road verge has been damaged and causes debris on the carriageway, which becomes a safety hazard, kerbing could possibly be considered. The section of New Road described that requires kerbing is approximately 560m in length, which would be a relatively expensive scheme. Therefore, kerbing in New Road will not be considered.

SCC officers could possibly consider installing rib edge road markings, which is a raised profile thermoplastic road marking material, subject to funding.

Member Questions [Item 7]

None received.

This page is intentionally left blank