

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 24 September 2014
at Guildford Borough Council.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr W D Barker OBE
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton (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 Zoe Franklin
- * Cllr Matt Furniss
- * Cllr Monika Juneja
- * Cllr Nigel Manning (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr Stephen Mansbridge
- * Cllr Julia McShane
- * Cllr James Palmer
- * Cllr Tony Phillips
- * Cllr Tony Rooth
- * Cllr David Wright

* In attendance

17/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 1]

The Chairman welcomed everyone and announced that the meeting would be recorded and webcast on the Surrey County Council website.
The Community Partnerships Team received thanks from the Chairman on behalf of the committee for ensuring Members Allocation funding was in place to support the recent Stoughton Great War commemorative event.

18/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from Borough Councillor Matt Furniss.

19/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 4]

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2014 were confirmed as a true record.

There was a query raised by Borough Councillor James Palmer regarding the opening of Oakdene Road, Peasmarsh to emergency vehicles. The Area Highways Manager would take forward a discussion with local members.

20/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

County Councillor Mrs Fiona White and Borough Councillor Julia McShane declared a personal interest against item 10 of the agenda as they were both trustees of The Barn Youth Project.

21/14 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6]

The formal written questions paper (along with a separate revised answer to public question 2 at Annex 2) was tabled at the meeting and can be found at Annex 1 of these minutes.

Public Question 1: Mr Bowden was not present at the meeting

Public Question 2: This was taken along with Petition 1 as they were both bought by Mr Burder and both related to Daryngton Drive. It was noted that the survey programme, which would include Daryngton Drive, would be published in early 2015. The local member thanked residents for raising the issue.

Public Question 3: Mr Sellers was not present at the meeting.

Public Question 4: Mr Frankland was not present at the meeting.

Public Question 5: It was noted that there had been no decision about a one-way system for Mount Pleasant, but that residents consultation would commence during the fourth quarter of 2014. Mr Chesterton, as Chairman of the Guildford Cycling Forum, would be included in the consultation.

22/14 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 7]

The formal written questions paper was tabled at the meeting and can be found at Annex 1 of these minutes.

Borough Councillor James Palmer requested that Surrey County Council officers use all powers at their disposal to press Network Rail for a response to the closure of the footbridge.

23/14 NEW PETITIONS [Item 8]

The petition requested proper maintenance of the highway and verge in Daryngton Drive. The committee response was taken under agenda item 6 (question 2). A survey would be undertaken and published in early 2015.

24/14 TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

The report was presented by the Trading Standards Vulnerable Persons Officer and Community Supervisor.

The sectors of the Trading Standards service were outlined and in more detail the work of the Community Protection Unit which included tackling scams and supporting victims. Examples were provided of vulnerable people in Guildford who had fallen victim to scams.

The members were highly supportive and praised the work of Trading Standards officers in Guildford and countywide. The possibility of raising the profile of the service online to promote the dangers of scams and perhaps a new campaign and drive to engage a greater range of partners such as those in the health service was discussed.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

25/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE - EARLY HELP (FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

The report was presented by the Lead Youth Officer (West Surrey).

The report put forward the local priorities for supporting young people in Guildford as identified by the committee's Youth Task Group and in addition the new provision for more local commissioning of services. It was noted that Surrey County Council's Cabinet had approved the proposals.

The members discussed the provision of local services including the running of the Surrey Outdoor Learning Centres, health and physical activities for young people, lifeskills learning and sites for local youth centres. All of these areas were high priorities for the service. Members were also interested to understand how the current Local Prevention funded contract agency was engaging with existing local partnerships.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Approve the local priorities (Annex 1), to be considered by providers, focusing on the identified needs of Guildford and the geographical neighbourhoods prioritised by the Youth Task Group.
- (ii) Note the changes to the council scheme of delegation which provides increased decision making to local commissioning in relation to youth work and Surrey Outdoor Learning (SOLD) (Annex 1a).

26/14 SEALE LANE 7 FOOTPATH 338 (NON-EXECUTIVE ITEM) [Item 12]

There was a short briefing for members on the legal responsibilities of the committee in terms of rights of way matters.

The report was presented by the Countryside Access Officer.

There was a proposal to support the application to modify the Definitive Map so as to create the footpath 338 between Seale Lane and Sandy Cross. The members agreed that there was sufficient evidence to make the modification.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) Public footpath rights are recognised over the route 'A' – 'B' on Drawing No. 3/1/64/H8 (Annex B) and that the application for a MMO under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify

the DMS by the addition of the footpath is approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath No. 580 (Seale and Sands).

- (ii) A MMO should be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation.

27/14 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - CONSIDERATION OF AD-HOC REQUESTS FOR CONTROLS IN THE AREA OUTSIDE THE GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (FOR DECISION) [Item 13]

The report was presented by the Parking Services Manager and On-Street Parking Coordinator, Guildford Borough Council.

The intention of the report was two-fold. Firstly, to agree with members which of the reviewed sites ought to take priority for further consideration and recommendations. Secondly, to make suitable provision for on-street parking around the redeveloped Farnham Road Hospital.

Parking issues on the Ashenden Estate and also in residential areas around the Slyfield Industrial Estate were raised and officers agreed to discuss the issues in these areas with the local councillors and determine a course of action.

It was noted that the committee's Transportation Task Group would be reviewing the parking evaluation matrix to ensure that it remain robust and fit for purpose.

It was further noted that officers from Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council were working closely together to ensure that the restrictions for Woodbridge Hill were appropriate.

Restrictions proposed for Shere Middle Street would be discussed with local members.

The next report on the ad-hoc reviewed sites would be delivered in March 2015.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (iii) that parking controls be proposed for the ad-hoc locations highlighted in ANNEX 1 and paragraph 2.9, that these are discussed with the affected ward and divisional councillors, and reported to a future meeting of the Committee to acquire authority for them to be formally advertised.
- (iv) to formally advertise the revised proposals shown in ANNEX 2 to accommodate the changes to the access arrangements associated with the Farnham Road Hospital development, and should any representations be received they be reported to a future meeting of the

Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.

28/14 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND AND 2014/15 PROGRAMME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]

The report was presented by the Local Sustainable Transport Fund Programme Manager.

The report provided a general update on progress for all work strands.

It was noted that planning permission for the Onlow Park and Ride car park was granted specifically for those accessing the town centre and that the current level of use was in line with business projections.

The criteria for TravelSmart community funded local projects was being strictly applied.

Discussions were continuing positively with the Highways Agency to deliver signage for all of Guildford's Park and Ride car parks from the A3.

It was estimated that the benefits of the review of the town centre traffic management system would begin to be felt in the fourth quarter of 2014 onward.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

29/14 GUILDFORD PRIORITISATION FRAMEWORK (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 15]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

The purpose of the report had been to obtain feedback from the committee to develop a framework approach and matrix with which to evaluate and prioritise local transport schemes and proposals. With the agreement of the committee the matrix would be applied to transportation schemes to support robust and fair consideration of all relevant aspects but that the final decisions would always lie with the committee itself.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

30/14 ROAD SAFETY OUTSIDE SCHOOLS (FOR DECISION) [Item 16]

The report was presented by the Road Safety Team Manager.

Surrey County Council had recently approved a new policy with which to evaluate, better understand and approach matters of safety for all road users outside of schools. The proposal for the committee was to consider and approve the application of this policy in evaluating the Boxgove area where there were three schools and reports of severe congestion and vehicle and parking issues.

The members were in full support of the proposal as a test bed for the new policy and also as Boxgrove was a newly expanded school.

There would be a further report back to committee in due course.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

(v) the proposal to investigate the three schools featured in the committee report in accordance to the councils newly approved policy.

(vi) to note that highway improvements addressing congestion, accessibility, safety, economy and future maintenance liabilities in the Boxgrove area may be recommended in a future report.

**31/14 GUILDFORD SPEED MANAGEMENT PLAN (FOR INFORMATION)
[Item 17]**

The Road Safety Team Manager presented the report.

The Guildford Speed Management Plan is produced By Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. It is reviewed by Guildford Local Committee.

The members welcomed the report and the new geographical maps depicting locations for casualties.

It was noted that in rural areas parish councils meetings with the Casualty Reduction Officer are held but such meetings in the non-parished areas were not so well advertised. The members in non-parished areas would wish to be contacted in future.

30mph speed limit signage on the A320 at Stoke would be reviewed with local members and officers.

The Chairman urged members of the committee to contact the Road Safety Team Manager with any roads of particular concern.

Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

32/14 PETITION RESPONSE: PEASLAKE 20MPH [Item 18]

The Area Highways Manager presented the report.

The petition to adjust the speed limit in Peaslake Lane to 20mph had been presented to the committee at the meeting held on 25 June 2014.

Local members asked the TTG to review the request in a holistic way and to consider a reduction of road signage. Also, to acquire some data before a decision was proposed.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (vii) To 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.

33/14 PETITION RESPONSE: SHERE HGV [Item 19]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

The petition had been submitted to the committee on 25 June 2014.

The local members requested that the task group review the matter in a holistic way considering also boundaries and parallel routes.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (viii) To 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.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To enable the Local Committee (Guildford) and residents to engage on matters of local concern.

34/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (FOR DECISION) [Item 20]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

The purpose of the report was to provide a general update on committee approved schemes.

The members for Guildford (North) and Worplesdon requested a progress report on the proposed crossing on Salt Box Road.

Pending committee approval for the 2015/16 budget letters would soon be prepared for Parish Councils regarding lengthsman's schemes for next year.

Following local members concerns the decision to authorise the prohibition of the right turn from Jacob's Well Road into the A320 Woking Road was deferred to the next meeting. It was suggested that members on bordering wards and divisions should be consulted to discuss likely impacts and outcomes.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Agreed to reduce speed limits as recommended at Annex 2.
- (ii) Agreed the Lengthsman bids by Shere PC (£7,000) and Worplesdon PC (£4,500) subject to SCC officer scrutiny.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The committee is asked to formally agree the recommendations above in order to progress the programme of work for 2014/15.

(noting that the recommendation relating to the proposed right turn from Jacobs Well Road into the A320 was deferred to be discussed at the next formal meeting).

**35/14 REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION TASK GROUP (FOR DECISION)
[Item 21]**

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

The report was noted by the Local Committee.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (ix) the revision to the TTG terms of reference as highlighted in Annex 1;
- (x) **Agreed that Borough Councillor Matt Furniss would join the task group and that Councillor James Palmer would replace Councillor Nigel Manning as the Guildford Borough Council nominated substitute member of the task group.**
- (xi) Agreed the delivery timescale for the Guildford Local Transport Strategy as proposed in the briefing note at Annex 3.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The purpose of the Transportation Task Group is to provide the Guildford Local Committee with considered and informed advice. The purpose of this report is to keep the full committee informed of matters under consideration by the TTG and when those items are likely be brought forward for the attention of the full committee.

36/14 FORWARD PROGRAMME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 22]

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

Meeting ended at: 9.43 pm

Chairman



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 24 September 2014

Public Questions and Statements [Item 6]

1. Question submitted by Andrew Bowden, Footpath Secretary, Guildford East Ramblers Association

Local ramblers have raised the issue of pedestrian safety at Newlands Corner with the Council, specifically the crossing of the A25 to and from the car park to either The Barn cafe or the North Downs way, without success. They have written to Guildford Ramblers for support.

Guildford Ramblers make many crossings of the A25 at this point every year and consider that it is the most dangerous road crossing we know in our area. The crossing is on a bend and brow of a hill making for very sort sight lines in each direction. The problem is compounded by the entrance to the car part at this crossing point. The traffic is relatively fast and this is a very busy pedestrian crossing and someone will get hurt here soon.

Please can the Local Committee use their influence to get signs put up warning of crossing pedestrians (similar to those on the South Downs Way road crossings in Sussex) and/or get a speed limit put on to the road at this point?

Answer

The Committee would like to thank Mr Bowden for presenting the background information on the pedestrian crossings in Shere Road in the vicinity of Newlands Corner..

The SCC officers visited the location in question and reviewed the situation. It has been agreed that two new pedestrian warning signs be erected in Shere Road on either side of the North Downs Way crossing.

2. Question submitted by Stephen Burder, Brian Miller and Andrew Matsis on behalf of the residents of Daryngton Drive.

Through attendance at the last Local Committee meeting on 25 June we became aware of the list of Footway repair works currently scheduled within the Highways Update, Item 15 of the agenda and page 115 of the agenda papers. These were all programmed for work between July and November this year. We have carried out our own inspection of all the listed footways. While in common with nearly all the local footways within the Guildford area there is some need for repair, our conclusion is that all the listed items are in considerably better condition than Daryngton Drive. Example photographs of some of the sites visited by us can be provided. Given the result of our research, our questions are:

1. What is the criteria for including a footpath in the capital works programme and when was Daryngton Drive last considered for inclusion?
2. Why are the footways included in the July/November program considered a higher priority than Daryngton Drive?

TABLED ITEM

3. Is Daryngton Drive included on any list of future work and if so where does it stand in priority and expected timing?

Answer

This question has been referred to SCC Highways Asset Management Team and a response is awaited.

3. Neil Sellers, Resident of Horseshoe Lane West, Guildford, GU1 2SX

Under Agenda Item 16 of the Local Committee Meeting on 24 Sept it is proposed that a report be provided utilising the CC Road Safety Outside Schools Policy with regard to Boxgrove Primary School, St Peters Secondary School and St Thomas Primary School. I raise the following points regarding consultation:

The consultation for the recent road table at the top of HLW was only directed at St Thomas of Canterbury School and their parents without involving the residents of HLW. I observe from reviewing the policy proposals for Road Safety Outside Schools that schools are embedded within the process but residents who are specifically affected by the school traffic and inconsiderate parking are not included.

Would you please reassure me that for any future road safety, parking or infrastructure works which the councils are considering that the residents of Horseshoe Lane West will be included in the consultation process and provided with sufficient time to make an informed response?

Answer

The Committee would like to thank Mr Sellers for contacting SCC and expressing his views regarding the Epsom Road/ Horseshoe Lane West scheme consultation process.

The improvement scheme was mainly focused on and carried out in Epsom Road, with a view to improving the two existing pedestrian islands situated on either side of the Horseshoe Lane West junction for pedestrians crossing the road. New anti skid surfacing was installed on both approaches to the HLW and Epsom Road junction. Similarly, the road table at the junction of HLW and Epsom Road was installed to improve the crossing, particularly during peak times in the morning and afternoon.

Although the scheme was to improve the crossing, a short section of HLW, from its junction with Epsom Road, was resurfaced to improve the road surface.

This scheme was developed by SCC, Guildford Borough Council, the police and the Road Safety Team. St Thomas of Canterbury School was informed of the scheme. Consultation was not carried out with the school or parents.

Regarding parking issues, GBC will be responsible for introducing any new parking restrictions in Guildford.

The SCC officers noted Mr Sellers' comment regarding involving the residents in any future traffic improvement scheme consultation in the vicinity of HLW and they will make sure that this would be done.

4. Question & Statement submitted by Bill Frankland, resident of Horseshoe Lane West.

I raise the following question in my capacity as a resident of Horseshoe Lane West and as a chartered civil engineer (FREng, FICE, CEng, FHKIE):

TABLED ITEM

I understand that there is a proposal to consider using the Road Safety Outside Schools policy document as a basis to evaluate the various issues raised which further requires a report back to committee with outcomes and recommendations. I am concerned that whilst the three schools (Boxgrove Primary, St Peter's Catholic Secondary and St Thomas of Canterbury Primary) will be included the inter-relationship of traffic flows between these three schools does not appear to have been expressly covered with the proposed process. I am also aware that parking restrictions are being considered for implementation within Horseshoe Lane West (HLW) and would seek reassurance that these two formal processes can be considered in parallel particularly as inconsiderate parking immediately around St Thomas of Canterbury School is considered to be a major safety hazard as well as major issue with HSL residents. I am conscious that a process of analysis has been drawn up which does not appear to capture the following safety related issues so would request that these additional components are included:

1. Resurfacing and re-kerbing HLW:
 - a. to prevent traffic mounting the pavements as the road is restricted to one lane whilst cars are parked during school times
 - b. avoid cars swerving to miss dangerously deep potholes.
2. Undertake a coordinated Traffic Management Study involving the roads in vicinity of the three schools by professionally qualified traffic engineers to advise on controlling traffic flows by possible consideration of restricting lane access at peak tidal flows (school start and finish), road layout and signage and the like.
3. 20 mph speed limit.

In your response please take in consideration that I believe as schools form part of the process St Thomas of Canterbury School should:

- a. Be required to work with the process to coordinate traffic to ameliorate congestion in the way they marshal traffic at school start and finish times.
- b. Be required to find parking space for their school bus on campus as this is exacerbating traffic problems increasing pedestrian danger and causing a nuisance to residents by blocking access/egress to their driveways. If this cannot satisfactorily be achieved then a parking bay should be established which is not opposite residents driveways allowing unrestricted access/egress at all times.
- c. as pupil and staff numbers have significantly increased they should be required to ensure that all staff park on campus. This should be used as a specific Planning requirement for any future expansion.
- d. If restricted duration parking bays are to be considered they should be laid-out in such a manner as not to cause difficulties in accessing/egressing from resident's driveways on this narrow lane.
- e. Residents of HLW would not be in favour of a one-way system as this would generally increase traffic volume and speed as the lane is currently used as a short cut.

Answer

The Road Safety Outside Schools policy process is intended to capture all the issues associated with traffic problems and road safety outside schools, including parking. In this case the Road Safety Outside Schools process is being applied to all three schools in parallel, in recognition that the schools are close by to each other. The process will involve qualified colleagues from the county council's area highway engineering team, the road safety team, the sustainability team and police, and will include site visits to complete on site observations as well as analysis of survey data. The policy has been designed to ensure that schools should part of the process because part of the solution can involve action by the school community as well as consideration of highway measures.

TABLED ITEM

5. Keith Chesterton, Chair of Guildford Cycling Forum

Item 20 under 2014/15 schemes it states

"Consultation Q3, Install Q4". The year is not stated but is presumably 2014.

Item 21 Appendix 2 states "Local resident survey to be undertaken & report back to TTG & committee"

At an earlier Local Committee meeting I spoke on this item & pointed out on behalf of local cyclists & the Guildford Cycle Forum that it would create severe disadvantages to cyclists wishing to use this route & the dangers to cyclists of using the gyratory as an alternative. I pointed out that the suggestion was directly contrary to Surrey's own cycling Strategy. Additionally 2 local residents complained about this suggestion. I was assured that no decision had been taken & that consultation would take place on this before any recommendations were made.

Please can you further reassure me that the following will take place before any decision is made that others who use this road, especially cyclists (& pedestrians), as well as residents and the Surrey Cycling Officer will be consulted.

Answer

This question is understood to refer to the proposal to make Mount Pleasant one-way. Installation is expected in the fourth quarter of the current financial year, so January, February and March of 2015. Cycling representatives and the SCC cycle officer will be consulted.

Member Questions [Item 7]

1. Borough Councillor James Palmer (Shalford)

The footbridge over the railway line connecting Florida Road with Station Road in Shalford had to be demolished after it was hit by a Network Rail "Maintenance Train" on 3 September 2014. What action is Surrey County Council taking to ensure that this important pedestrian link is restored as soon as possible.

Answer

Disappointingly Network Rail did not contact Surrey County Council following the incident on 3 September. SCC highways officers have been pressing Network Rail for a timetable for replacing the footbridge which should be available in the near future and which will be shared with local members.

Petitions [Item 8]

| | |
|---|--|
| Principal petitioner/ organisation | Stephen Burder (attracting 50 signatures) |
| SCC Division / GBC Ward | Guildford East / Merrow |
| Summary of concerns and requests | <p>Petition to Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council from the residents of Daryngton Drive and Elles Avenue.</p> <p>We the residents of Daryngton Drive, Carrol Avenue and Elles Avenue request that proper maintenance of the highway and kerb stones takes place and that the grass verges be protected from vehicular traffic by the installation of trees or other suitable means.</p> |
| Response | A response to the petition will be provided at the next formal meeting. |

TABLED ITEM

This page is intentionally left blank

Local Committee (Guildford) 24 September 2014

Public Questions

2. Question submitted by Stephen Burder, Brian Miller and Andrew Matsis on behalf of the residents of Daryngton Drive.

Through attendance at the last Local Committee meeting on 25 June we became aware of the list of Footway repair works currently scheduled within the Highways Update, Item 15 of the agenda and page 115 of the agenda papers. These were all programmed for work between July and November this year. We have carried out our own inspection of all the listed footways. While in common with nearly all the local footways within the Guildford area there is some need for repair, our conclusion is that all the listed items are in considerably better condition than Daryngton Drive. Example photographs of some of the sites visited by us can be provided.

Given the result of our research, our questions are:

1. What is the criteria for including a footpath in the capital works programme and when was Daryngton Drive last considered for inclusion?
2. Why are the footways included in the July/November program considered a higher priority than Daryngton Drive?
3. Is Daryngton Drive included on any list of future work and if so where does it stand in priority and expected timing?

Officer response

The schemes on the 2014 footway programme originate from SCC maintenance engineer (one for each district and borough, so 11) nominations. Daryngton Drive was not nominated as a potential scheme by the maintenance engineer for Guildford and therefore was not assessed under prioritisation criteria.

The 2015 programme will use footway condition survey data to select and nominate potential schemes. This will be the first time such data is available and will provide 100% network coverage. Potential schemes will be prioritised using criteria that includes assessment of defects; engineering solutions; risk and social community impact. The prioritised list will be published in the new year following confirmation of budgets.

Note that the county wide 2014 programme of footway schemes is a mixture of preventative maintenance and needs based structural improvement. This reflects good practice in an asset management strategy and as a result the preventative maintenance schemes selected will have less structural defects.

This page is intentionally left blank