DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 26 November 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

37/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 1]

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.
It was noted that the Local Transport Review would be open for public feedback until mid-January.

38/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 3]

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Mr Graham Ellwood, Mr George Johnson, Mrs Marsha Moseley and from Borough Councillors Zoe Franklin, Monika Juneja, Nigel Manning and Stephen Mansbridge.

39/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 4]

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2014 were confirmed as a true record.

Annex 1 Written Formal Questions 26 November 2014

40/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

No declarations of interest were received.

41/14 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

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

Two written public questions were received by the committee.

Question One. Mr Allen was not in attendance.
Question Two. Mr Jarvis was in attendance. The meeting heard that there would be coordination between the two councils and the Highways Agency when approaching the existing and future transportation issues arising in the borough.

42/14 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

No member written questions were received.

43/14 PETITION RESPONSE - DARYNGTON DRIVE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]

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

The petition submitted at the last formal meeting in September received a formal committee response. The meeting heard that the proposed tree planting would take place this winter 2014/15.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

44/14 GUILDFORD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

The report was presented by the Principal Planning Officer for Guildford Borough Council.

During 2014 the two councils agreed to work more closely on matters of common concern and joint service delivery via the Guildford Local Committee. This report was the first such Guildford Borough Council officer report to be presented to a Local Committee meeting.

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was a charge on new development that raised funds towards infrastructure that would be needed to support new development.The CIL was an executive function of the borough council. The purpose of the report was to enable councillors from both authorities to jointly note and consider the forthcoming initial draft preliminary draft charging schedule (PDCS) which would be publicly consulted upon in due course.

The meeting heard that a CIL Board would be created with appropriate representation from officers and members to determine where and how future funding would be distributed. This Board could be similar to the Elmbridge CIL Board model where the decision making process was made available for public information and scrutiny. Under the new process the county council would submit bids to the CIL Board for infrastructure funding relating to planned growth.

The '123 list' did not commit to specific future spending, but identified potential sites and areas where it was envisaged additional future infrastructure spending could be required. Any sites included on the list would not attract additional s106 spending.

Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) had been prioritised both within the draft CIL proposals and in the draft Local Plan. This was because central government guidance and European legislation required that the planning authority must deliver back or mitigate any damage to European protected habitats arising through development. It was anticipated that this provision could amount to a considerable portion of the ultimate CIL charge.

It was noted that there was no requirement for the CIL to be spent in the direct area of the development but could be spent anywhere in the borough or even outside of the borough possibly to support environmental mitigation and transport links.

The draft PDCS would be bought before the borough council Executive on 6 January 2015 for agreement to consult.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

45/14 PARKING BUSINESS PLAN 2015-16 (FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

The report was presented by the Parking Service Manager for Guildford Borough Council.

During 2014 the two councils agreed to work more closely on matters of common concern and potentially joint service delivery via the Guildford Local Committee. This was the first occasion the Guildford Borough Council Parking Business Plan had been reported to a Local Committee meeting. For the first time the report considered off-street, on-street and Park and Ride services together in combination.

The meeting heard that it was proposed in future to utilise car parking facilities and charging to encourage modal shift and to tackle town centre congestion.

The committee agreed this was a good example of joint working.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

(i) In principle, that we look at the use of virtual permit technology to provide an improved service for residents whilst reducing costs.

(ii) That all interested parties discuss changes to road direction signage particularly where this will improve motorists' ability to park in the first convenient car park.

(iii) That the provision of guarding services at Artington and Merrow park and ride sites be combined into a single mobile guard between the two sites.

(iv) That Surrey County Council undertake a consultation on the proposal to remove the ENCTS from the Park & Ride network, for people qualifying based on age, and on the introduction of a nominal charge of £1 per return journey for these concessionary pass holders.

(v) To use the uncommitted surplus from on-street parking management in Guildford in 2013-14, of £68,000 on funding the cost of Onslow Park and Ride in 2015-16.

(vi) that a Task Group is established to develop a Parking Strategy which sets a framework for parking operations to support key strategic plans like the Local Plan, Town Centre Master Plan and Local Transport Plan.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To improve customer service, help motorists find the most appropriate parking facility and to provide funding for the park and ride service.

46/14 GUILDFORD BOROUGH DRAFT LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY & FORWARD PROGRAMME PART A (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

The Transport Policy Team Manger presented the report.

Apologies were made for the late delivery of the report and a note was circulated to members which provided a summarised overview.

A Local Transport Strategy (LTS) reflecting local transportation infrastructure issues was to be written for each of the eleven districts and boroughs in the county. The LTS document was used by the county council as Highways Authority to apply for major bid funding to the Local Transport Body (Local Enterprise Partnership) and other potential funding sources. In five boroughs the LTS document had been completed. However, these were the boroughs where a Local Plan had been adopted. For Guildford, as the draft Local Plan process was ongoing, a pragmatic approach had been taken and the LTS split into two parts. Part A as presented reflected the existing and known transportation issues, whereas a Part B would be produced and merged with the overall document once the Guildford Local Plan had been accepted by central government.

Both councils would work closely together on infrastructure needs as the emerging Local Plan was developed. It was noted that feedback from residents from the early Local Plan consultation process would provide important information to both councils future planning. There had been

concerns raised about congestion, road safety and public transport both in terms of current issues and in relation to any future growth.

The outcomes from school expansion planning and the current Local Transport Review consultation which considered passenger and community transport would also feed into the LTS in due course.

Members raised the sustainability of rural routes which were not usually the subject of major funding bids. In addition rural communities had a high reliance on private cars. Congestion 'hotspots' would always be reviewed and where possible there could be opportunities for the Local Committee to provide funding for interventions which might be supplemented by a major funds bid. The members of the Local Committee were asked to continue to keep officers informed of emerging local transportation issues.

Members again raised the matter of signage for the Park & Ride services from the A3 and it was understood that discussions with the Highways Agency are in hand. In addition, there was a request for the Highways Agency to consider a separate exit to the Onslow Park & Ride. Overall members were generally concerned about safety and the frequency of road traffic collisions on the A3.

It was noted that the meetings of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Enterprise M3 were open to the public and further information can be found on its website.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

47/14 GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE PRIORITISATION FRAMEWORK (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager and Project Officer.

The Transportation Task Group had recommended that the Local Committee adopt a framework or matrix by which to assist with the assessment of applications for future transportation schemes. The draft framework included criteria around sustainability, safety and value for money.

A presentation was given providing an update on progress. It was anticipated that the final framework would be ready for the June 2015 committee meeting.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

48/14 ROAD SAFETY OUTSIDE SCHOOLS - BOXGROVE AREA INTERIM UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 13]

The Area Highways Manager presented the report.

The Local Committee had agreed at its previous meeting to support the review of road safety outside of three schools in the Boxgrove area. The review had been ongoing and members received an update report.

It was anticipated that the final recommendations would be received in March 2015. A provisional allocation in the forthcoming budget had been set aside for any possible interventions that might be advised for consideration.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

49/14 HIGHWAYS BUDGET 2015/16 (FOR DECISION) [Item 14]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

There was a consideration of the general allocations of budget for the forthcoming year. Final allocations would be known when the county council published its agreed budget in February 2015. The Transportation Task Group provided recommendations on priority schemes.

The Local Committee agreed to:

(i) the following budget allocations for 2015/16 as detailed in the committee report:-

Proposed maintenance works and operations	£421,000
Proposed improvement (ITS) schemes	£369,500

(ii) delegate authority to the Area Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman and locally affected Members to amend budgets throughout the year if required to ensure the budget is allocated in a timely manner.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee is asked to agree 2015/16 allocations at this stage so that the design of schemes can start at the earliest opportunity, increasing confidence in delivery.

50/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (FOR DECISION) [Item 15]

The report was presented by the Area Highways Manager.

The 2014/15 budget had been spent and there were no funds remaining. It was possible that some schemes could be deferred to the following year and that there would be meetings with local members as appropriate to discuss.

Whilst he overspend on the village scheme at Shere would be reported back to members, it was noted that occasionally it was only possible to report general scheme costs to committee at the early stages. Increases or decreases would be reported back to members if the budget would be significantly affected and schemes were always reviewed for priority.

Members asked if there a model to overview a possible impact between the removal of the right hand turn at Jabobs Well and the new proposed Clay Lank Link Road.

It was noted that Stoughton Road resurfacing had been deferred until March 2015 and Cabell Road resurfacing was not yet completed. The Area Highways Manager agreed to respnd to various other member requests on an individual basis.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

(i) Authorise the prohibition of the right turn from Jacobs Well Road into the A320 Woking Road.

(ii) Note that ten additional resurfacing schemes will be centrally funded.

(iii) Note the Highways Update report

REASONS FOR DECISIONS

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

51/14 REPORT OF THE TRANSPORTATION TASK GROUP (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 16]

The Area Highways Manager presented the report.

The Transportation Task Group (TTG) comprised of six members of the Local Committee which convened to look at local transportation issues in greater detail than it permitted by the agenda of the committee as a whole. Members to the TTG are nominated on an annual basis.

A work programme for the TTG was submitted for the committee to note.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

52/14 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 17]

Members noted that there would be a future item reviewing the impact of HGV's on rural roads in the borough and requested that they be consulted.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

Meeting ended at: 9.28 pm

_____

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

TABLED ITEM

Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 26 November 2014

Public Questions and Statements [Item 6]

1. Question submitted by Jim Allen, Burpham
In reference to Gosden Hill – single sided intersection proposal – why is this proposal still being put forward when it was deemed necessary a four way was required in 1984 as a minimum requirement (the whole project rejected on appeal) - noting the additional increase of Traffic since 1984 – this is short sighted and not future proof.

Answer
Since 1984, there have been significant changes in Government policy relating to the assessment of the impacts of potential developments including how they impact upon the Strategic Road Network. These changes include:

Central Government policy for the Strategic Road Network has changed in terms of requirements to design for future year traffic growth
Highway design standards for the Strategic Road Network have changed
In the plan-making process and in the development control process, there has been a shift in emphasis towards demand management and promoting travel by sustainable modes, alongside critical infrastructure improvements.

In summary, a Government-appointed Planning Inspector would assess any future Local Plan or future planning application in the context of the above changes.

2. Question Submitted by Richard Jarvis on behalf of Guildford Residents Associations
The A3 through Guildford is operating at or close to capacity in peak periods and the growth envisaged in the draft Local Plan will undoubtedly mean more traffic. There is currently no improvement scheme in the Highways Agency's programme to address the issue, as the GRA pointed in our response to Policy 17 in the draft LP consultation.

I understand that the HA is carrying out Stage 2 of the M25 to Solent Route Strategy Study, which includes the A3. The draft results are expected to be circulated to stakeholders in January 2015 for comment. The HA has also commissioned 'an economic and congestion study of the A3 through Guildford to identify possible improvements which could be implemented in both the medium and long term to reduce congestion'. This work is expected to be completed by autumn 2015. The fact that this study is underway is good news.

Given the strategic significance of the A3, the question is whether there are consequences for the timetable for the LTS&FP and perhaps the IDP? And also what steps can be taken to ensure that there is compatibility between the HA studies and the related studies by SCC and GBC?

Answer
The Local Transport Strategy and Forward Programme will reflect the Guildford Local Plan when it has passed the Examination in Public. On the current timetable it is anticipated that the Local Transport Strategy and Forward programme can only be consulted on in Autumn 2015 at

the earliest. As a result any output from the Highways Agency can be reflected in these documents and as the Guildford Local Plan on the current timetable will have been submitted to the SoS the projects here can also be included where appropriate. In addition as living documents significant changes can be made if this is necessary at anytime.