

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 23 March 2016
at Council Chamber, Guildford, Borough Council, Millmead, Guildford GU2
4BB.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Matt Furniss
- * Cllr Nigel Manning
- * Cllr David Bilbe
- * Cllr Julia McShane
- * Cllr Tony Phillips
- * Cllr Tony Rooth
- * Cllr David Wright
- * Cllr Illman
- * Cllr Reeve
- * Cllr Sarti

* In attendance

126/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were no apologies received.

127/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

128/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Councillor Pauline Searle under Item 9 St Joseph's School Zebra Crossing,
declared that she was a governor at St Joseph's school.

129/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman explained at the start of the meeting that Item 8 - A31 Hog's Back Gap at East Flexford Lane would be deferred to a future meeting based on the advice of the Surrey County Council legal team.

The Chairman welcomed Councillor David Bilbe as a new member on the Local Committee.

The Chairman informed Members that this was likely to be the last time that the Committee was web cast due to a reduction in funding but other alternatives were being looked at.

130/16 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Two petitions were received.

The Committee received a petition on stopping HGVs travelling through West Clandon village signed by 125 residents, agreeing with the statement:

We the undersigned request that you stop HGV 's travelling through West Clandon village and mounting the pavement to pass each other. That a restriction of 20mphs is put in place through The Street & Clandon Road and by the Primary School.

The Committee **NOTED** that a full response would be provided at the Local Committee meeting on 22 June.

The Committee received a petition on Hogs Back A31 - Gap closure proposal at East Flexford Lane signed by 71 residents, agreeing with the statement:

We the undersigned oppose the proposed gap closure and request that SCC Highways undertake a strategic review of the A31, with input from local residents. Closure of this crossing is against the interests of residents of the Hogs Back and is a step closer to creating a motorway by stealth and imposing an 11 mile physical barrier across Surrey, affecting an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, against the interests of all residents, walkers and cyclists.

The Committee **NOTED** the response of the Highways Manager Surrey County Council attached to the minutes as **Appendix A** and the report at Item 8. The item itself was deferred until a future meeting based on advice from the Surrey County Council legal team.

131/16 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Two formal public questions were received from Amanda Renshaw regarding the On-Street Parking Review at Fairlands and from Robert Drummond regarding the Flexford Gap accident statistics. Responses were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**.

Amanda Renshaw asked an additional question as to 'what documentary evidence has been provide to Members to support a 24/7 yellow line restriction and does this evidence show that there are parking issues at Fairlands? Will the restrictions be policed by parking officers?'

The Parking Manager responded that this is the standard way to deal with 24/7 restrictions and that there have been issues reported. The restrictions will be enforced and if there are any issues officers will come round more often.

132/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

A Member question was submitted by Councillor Bob McShee Guildford Borough Council regarding the crossing at St Josephs School.

A second Member question was submitted by Councillors Bob McShee, Iseult Roche and David Elms Guildford Borough Council regarding On- Street parking at Fairlands.

Responses from Highways and Parking were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix C**.

133/16 A31 HOG'S BACK GAP AT EAST FLEXFORD LANE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

The purpose of the report was to ask the committee to consider making a traffic regulation order for the closure of East Flexford Lane central reservation gap.

Based on the advice of the Surrey County Council legal team this decision was deferred to a later meeting.

134/16 ST JOSEPH'S SCHOOL ZEBRA CROSSING (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

The purpose of the report was to provide an update following the December meeting when the committee considered a petition for a pelican crossing to replace the zebra crossing on the Aldershot Road at St Joseph's School.

Members thanked the Headteacher of St Josephs School for putting in place a crossing patrol while a permanent solution is found. Members clarified that the cost of the patrol is solely falling on St Josephs School.

A wish was expressed by some Members that the crossing should be upgraded to a Pelican crossing in the future. The Chairman referred the Committee to the response to the Member question around funding for the crossing patrol at appendix C of the Minutes. He confirmed that the scheme had been reclassified as 'high' within the Prioritisation Framework and that the Transportation Task group would be looking at it in the future.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report.

135/16 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - PROPOSALS FOR GEOGRAPHIC AREAS AND 'AD-HOC' LOCATIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

The purpose of the report was to present the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals in a number of other geographic areas and 'ad-hoc' locations and recommends that traffic regulation orders are made.

Members commented that controlled parking zones in Guildford town centre seem to have brought in uniformity around parking however there is need to bring in more flexibility as things have changed. For example some resident's need for Sunday controls and changes to operation. Councillor Furniss said he would take this on board.

The query was raised as to when the Onslow area would be looked at, the Parking Manager responded that once this On-Street Parking review is complete a scoping report will be brought to Committee to look at other further items. Members discussed recommendation three concerning new controls in Fairlands and whether to adopt the option of Annex 7a or Annex 7b. It was felt that the option of Annex A would bring in unnecessary restrictions, the Parking Manager however informed Members that these would be the clearest set of restrictions. It was commented that the option to adopt Annex 7b would cost the borough more and take extra enforcement however Councillor Witham had volunteered funding to cover costs from his Members Allocation. Members therefore agreed on Annex 7b.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Avondale area around the Ash Vale and North Camp railway stations, shown in ANNEXE 3,
- (ii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Effingham Junction, shown in ANNEXE 5,

Councillor Witham proposed that option 2 Annexe 7b of recommendation 3 is agreed this was seconded by Councillor Bilbe; on a vote it was resolved by 14 votes For and 6 votes against.

- (iii) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls, covering Fairlands, shown in ANNEXE 7b,

Councillor Witham proposed that option 2 Annexe 7b of recommendation 3 is agreed this was seconded by Councillor Bilbe; on a vote it was resolved by 14 votes For and 6 votes against.

- (iv) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the Merrow shopping parade area, shown in ANNEXE 9. **In Merrow Street retain 10 metres of 'no waiting at anytime' restrictions around the junction with Epsom Road but do not implement the remaining 'no waiting at anytime' restrictions proposed for the rest of Merrow Street.**
- (v) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TROs) is made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering Shalford, shown in ANNEXE 11,

- (vi) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the 'ad-hoc' locations, shown in ANNEXE 13.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

136/16 ADOPTION OF ADDITIONAL HACKNEY CARRIAGE STANDS (TAXI RANK SPACE) IN GUILDFORD (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 11]

The purpose of the report was to outline Guildford Borough Council's proposals for taxi rank locations in Guildford and to seek the consent of the Highways Authority to adopt the proposed locations as taxi ranks, subject to public consultation.

Members queried whether the taxi rank situation outside the Guildford Train Station and the Friary shopping centre could be alleviated. The Licensing Team Leader informed members that the rank is provided by the Train Station although Guildford Borough Council does have input into planning applications for the station, other suitable locations for taxi ranks haven't been found. The Licensing Team Leader commented that the large number of people coming into the town centre using the Friary taxi rank causes problems particularly at night and ranks in other areas will help to disperse people.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to adopt the following locations as taxi ranks, subject to public consultation as required by law.

1. Bedford Road – 7 spaces (18.00 to 08.30 daily)

Parking bays adjacent to Bedford Road Surface Car Park for a distance of 36 meters

2. North Street – 11 spaces (24 hour operation)

Length of single yellow line outside Vinyl Night Club and TGI Friday for a distance of 50 meters

3. North Street – 6 spaces (24 hour operation)

Outside Marks and Spencer and Paperchase for a distance of 30 meters

4. High Street (Lower end) – 4 spaces (18.00 to 08.30 daily)

Parking Bays, outside Vision Express Opticians for a distance of 19 meters

5. Upper High Street – 5 spaces (18.00 to 08.30 daily)

Parking bays outside Pizza Express and Oxfam for a distance of 26 meters

6. Millbrook (A281) – 4 spaces (22:30 to 04:30 daily)

Bus Stop on north-bound carriageway outside the Legion nightclub for a distance of 19 meters

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Improving Taxi Rank provision in Guildford will improve public safety through

allowing residents and visitors to easily obtain a licensed taxi service.

Having well defined rank locations in key areas, particularly late at night, will reduce the burden on partner agencies such as the Police.

137/16 GUILDFORD LOCAL CYCLING PLAN - MINOR IMPROVEMENTS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]

As a result of the public consultation held on the Guildford Local Cycling Plan in October and November 2015, a number of minor improvements to improve Guildford's cycle network were identified.

These were split into improvements that don't attract any cost, and those that do have some cost associated with them for the Committee to consider implementing.

A query was raised as to whether signage should be put up at Clay Lane, Burpham; the Sustainable Transport Manager said he would certainly look at this. Members raised issues with potholes at the side of the road causing problems for cyclists. The Sustainable Transport Manager informed the committee that they are currently looking at standards for infrastructure with Highways and shared use by pedestrians and cyclists. Members were encouraged to report potholes and where drains drop at the side of the road to Highways via the Surrey County Council website.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that:

- (i) The minor improvements identified in annex A are approved
- (ii) The existing footway on the eastern side of The Chase between the entrance to Guildford Cathedral to the alleyway link to Arlesford Road be converted to a shared use cycle/footway.
- (iii) The closed road between Cumberland Avenue and Johnston Walk be converted to a shared use cycle/footway
- (iv) The footway and traffic island linking Woodbridge Road road and Leapale Lane be converted to a shared use cycle/footway
- (v) The minor improvements that require funding in annex B are considered for inclusion in the Local Committee Highways forward programme.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

As part of the Surrey Cycling Strategy, the Count Council and Guildford Local Committee want to encourage more people in Surrey to cycle, more safely. Guildford Local Cycling Plan include a map of proposed infrastructure improvements to support this, however there are a number of minor improvements, many of which do not cost money, or are inexpensive that can be implemented quickly and improve the cycle network in the Borough.

The recommendations in the report ask the committee to consider implementing some of these minor improvements, making an immediate positive contribution to the cycle network in Guildford.

138/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]

The purpose of the report was to provide an update on the 2015/16 programmes of highway improvement and maintenance works funded by this committee and makes recommendations on the allocation of the budget for 2016/17, which has been announced since the committee last met in December.

Members commented that some residents have stopped reporting potholes because for example they will be told that they aren't deep enough to be looked at. The Highways Manager confirmed that Ash Parish Council had submitted a bid for funding for the Lengsthman Scheme of £8,000.

Action: Highways Manager to inform Customer Care about people not reporting potholes.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note progress and forecast outturn costs for the 2015/16 programme of highway works funded by this committee and described at Annex 1 of the report.
- (ii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager (AHM) to progress the schemes included in the programme in consultation with local elected members and associated task groups.
- (iii) Subject to approval of recommendations (i) and (ii) authorise the Area Highway Manager to consider and determine any objections submitted following the statutory advertisement of the traffic orders and notices associated with the programme of schemes, in consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and relevant local councillors.
- (iv) Delegate authority to the Area Highway 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.
- (v) Agree that Community Enhancement Fund is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equal allocation of £5,000 per division

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The committee is asked to agree allocations for 2016/17 so that the agreed programme of highway works and operations can be delivered in a timely manner.

139/16 TRANSPORTATION TASK GROUP UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]

The purpose of the Transportation Task Group (TTG) is to consider local transportation business on a more frequent and flexible basis than the schedule of the formal full committee may allow and thereafter to act in an informed and advisory capacity to the full committee. The report is for the information of the full committee. The intention is to provide an update of the TTG work and a work programme.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note and comment on the work and programme for the Transportation Task Group.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The purpose of the Transportation Task Group (TTG) 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 bought forward for the attention of the full committee.

140/16 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 15]

Members noted the update on the progress of the Local Committee decisions.

141/16 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 16]

The purpose of the report was to inform the committee of the Forward Programme of reports for the Local Committee for 2016/17.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

Agreed the Forward Programme 2016/17, as outlined in Annexe 1 of the report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Members are asked to comment on the Forward Plan so that officers can publicise the meetings and prepare the necessary reports.

142/16 INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS - ANNEX D

Meeting ended at: 8.55 pm

Chairman



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 23 March 2016

Petitions [Item 5]

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Kate Mackay 125 confirmed signatures, e-petition
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Shere/West Clandon
Summary of concerns and requests	We the undersigned request that you stop HGV 's travelling through West Clandon village and mounting the pavement to pass each other. That a restriction of 20mphs is put in place through The Street & Clandon Road and by the Primary School. (Please see background information below)
Response	The Committee would like to thank Ms Mackay for presenting the petition regarding various traffic issues in West Clandon. The Surrey County Council officers will investigate the possibility of implementing these requests and a full response will be provided at the Local Committee meeting on 22 June.

Background to e-petition:

For many years West Clandon has had problems with HGV's speeding through the village both in the 40mph and 30 mph zone. Whist this is classed as an A road 247, which provides access to the A3, A25 and A246. In fact it is a B road in a small village that does not have the capacity to take the traffic. There are several bends and areas where the visibility is limited, there are very narrow pavements and pavements only one side of the road. And when they cannot pass another vehicle coming in the opposite direction they mount the pavement to pass each other. I enclose 2 photographs as evidence. This is a frequent occurrence.

Six years ago, My daughter and I together with my 2 grandchildren age 6 weeks and 2 years (who were in a double buggy) were walking from Felix Drive to the Railway Station. An HGV that was coming from Clandon Road/The Street, which was speeding mounted the pavement inches from my 6 week old grand-daughter. The vehicle drove along the pavement, the driver did not even slow down, he/she was going so fast we could not even obtain a number plate or the name of the Company who owned the HGV's. I reported this matter to the police to the Parish Council and to Guildford Borough Council.

Six years on we still have the same problem which results in people not being confident about walking about the village in their daily lives. Reports of vehicles mounting near the bus stop, of cars driving so close to people are put in serious danger.

Introduction:

I was promised that we would have speed checks and in six years they have been very few usually outside of any period when the traffic is heavy. The Parish Council looked at putting in VAZ signs and when we were about to put them in last year 5 years later this was dropped. This is now being reviewed but will not solve the problem of HGV's or speeding vehicles entering the 30mph zone from the 40mph zone or stopping large vehicles from mounting pavements.

Findings:

A speed test survey was carried out a couple of years ago, which showed traffic speeding through the village at 50/60 and up to 70 mps. And still no effective measures were put in place to reduce the risk to pedestrians. There are several areas of risk, The Clandon Road, A 3 Slip Road, the 30mph section at Lime Grove bend, the Railway Station area, the area by Summers and the area from the Clandon Cross Roads by Clandon Park and the Village School.

We are in a situation where families with their children cannot walk safely around this village to the Railway Station, Playground or Village School. There is only one crossing point by the Playground and Village Hall. The lighting in Winter is bad with many accidents being at the Clandon Road section slip road and it is becoming every increasing difficult for people to enter and exit their drives in vehicles safely on Clandon Road and The Street. Lines of sight and visibility are poor due to the bends and the Bridge at the Railway Station.

When it rains flooding of the road is serious with the narrow pavements it is almost impossible for Pedestrians to walk down Clandon Road and The Street without being drenched in drain water from Vehicles. In the last year or so we have many cyclists using the village and it is extremely dangerous for them. Another problem last year or so has been over the weekends with constant traffic and speeding motor bikes seen speeding at 60/70 mph and on the wrong side of the road by Lime Grove bend, where the speed drops to 30mps.

Conclusion:

In view of the fact that many Counties in the Country including London, have now put in speed restrictions and measures to stop HGV's and speeding vehicles using areas as "rat runs" when the traffic becomes heavy on the motorways they should be using, it is now time that the situation in West Clandon is reviewed. It is not acceptable to continue to allow HGV's and other vehicles to speed through this village and put people at risk by trying to pass vehicles when there is insufficient room. It is not acceptable for this problem to be ignored and putting vehicles travelling through the village before the residents.

This year the village school will be accepting up to age 11 and there needs to be a speed reduction to 20mph as in other areas which complies with the Surrey County Council 2014 Safety Outside School Policy. This would allow those parents who wish to walk their children to and from school to do so.

Therefore as a Health and Safety Consultant I advise SCC/GBC to put in place the measures that would greatly reduce the risk.

1. Lighting and Signage by the Clandon Road hotspot.
2. Reduce the Speed in the 40 mph zone to 30mph.
3. Put VAZ sign by Lime Grove as planned.
4. Reduce the Speed in the 30mph zone to 20 mph.
5. Put measures in at the Bridge so that vehicles can pull out of the Railway Station and

- Oak Grange Road with safety. A width/weight restriction on the Bridge is an option.
6. Put in measures along the hotspot by Summers to stop vehicles mounting the pavement.
 7. A 20 mph zone along by the School with road signage
 8. Measures in place by the Church so that residents can cross safely to the Church.
 9. A VAZ sign as you come into the village from the Clandon Cross Roads.
 10. The air pollution emissions needs to be considered as many of the Properties on Clandon Road and The Street are at risk.

The previous response from Guildford Borough Council over road safety has given priority to vehicles over people who live in the village. I hope now that Surrey Country Council, who are responsible for the Highway will not take the appropriate steps to change this and give the same consideration to residents that is given in other Counties as part of the UK initiative to reduce accidents and deaths.

The accidents statistics for the village do not include 1915, 1916, and since there have been a lot of near misses not reported, I am not going to present the accident statistics but I will highlight some of those reported which have happened recently.

Examples: Incidents & Comments from Residents.

1. Felix Drive: Crossing the Road by Felix Drive, half way across with grand-daughter and women comes from the Railway Station in vehicle speeding had to grab my grand-daughter and pull her back. No where in sight when we started to cross the road.

2. Felix Drive: 2 residents have written to GBC/SCC regarding the speed of the traffic and trying to exit the drive safely.

3. From Resident:

I met a very wide load yesterday morning being escorted by a police car over the railway bridge at more than a slow speed . I dread to think what would have happened if another HGV was in the vicinity.

As an aside, I have noticed an increasing number of trainee HGV's going through the village lately and wonder if it is used for training purposes because of the obstacles created by the road conditions.

4. From Resident:

I do not know if you are aware but there was a nasty accident that an ambulance was called to this evening at about 8pm. It was at the Junction where you get on the A3 going Southbound.

Also if we reduce the speed through the village, at the point where it is 40 mph and is still a built up area, it also needs to be reduced as proved by the accident this evening.

5 From Resident;

There was another nasty accident with ambulance / police about 8 weeks ago during the day at the same spot (sorry do not have date). At the actual junction as you turn right to enter the slip road down to the A3 south.

Two cars crashed (one certainly write off)...elderly drivers in both.

6 From Resident:

I do not know if you are aware but there was a nasty accident that an ambulance was called to this evening at about 8pm. It was at the Junction where you get on the A3 going Southbound.

Also if we reduce the speed through the village, at the point where it is 40 mph and is still a built up area, it also needs to be reduced as proved by the accident this evening.

7 From Resident:

Just seen what I would deem to be a "serious" vehicular accident at the unlit (not that I want the village awash with lights) badly signed, poorly laid out junction of A247 with the A3 southbound to Guildford. Serious enough to warrant a police car and ambulance - looked like at least 2 cars. Seen quite a lot of bother here. I avoided by coming home through Clandon the other way ie via the Clandon Crossroads and a driver in the opposite direction said there was an accident and the road was "closed".

8. From Resident:

Can I please mention the road by our village church. It is very dangerous trying to cross the road to and from the church - cars speed around the corner from the village towards Clandon crossroads - we have to have people guide us across from a viewpoint from the path on the church side. Church-goers park in the Rectory drive and it is too dangerous to turn right on exiting - it is necessary to turn left and go back on yourself at Clandon crossroads.

9 From Resident:

I am not sure that I have missed this point but the other thing that also adds to the issues in the village are cyclists. It is not necessarily the cyclists that are a problem (although there is increased volume since the Olympics and annual races through here) but the way that cars and trucks overtake. I have seen several near misses as impatient drivers go to overtake as soon as they enter the village (particularly from the Church side) on a road that is both narrow and has blind bends. Often, to be faced with a truck or car coming the other way (and often not taking into consideration the pedestrians safety should their overtaking antic go horribly wrong).

10 From Resident:

About 15 years ago a man nearly lost his foot in an accident outside Jaynes (half way between the Onslow and the Station) as he crossed the road, the driver must have been speeding.

Later, about 10 or so years ago there was a major incident where a White van going northbound way too fast tried to break in wet weather (probably didn't realise there was the station and cars turning) and went off the road to the west side (ie nearside) and narrowly missed the bus stop just south of the railway station.

11 From Resident:

You might be interested in these photos taken last year when traffic came to a grinding halt when two HGVs came face to face in the narrow stretch outside Summers. I think the picture says it all.

(Photos attached to document)

12 From Resident:

I hope we are not thinking that a 20 mph speed limit in our village is an unobtainable dream. The excellentincludes a long list of the many towns and cities which have already made 20 mph as their norm for residential streets like ours. Let 20 be the new 30 for our village as well.

13 From Resident:

I lost my wing mirror recently at the pinch point near Summers as the car coming in the opposite direction in the dark was over the white line.

14 From Resident:

I had a minor accident trying to turn right out of Oak Grange road a month ago. No-one hurt, though damage to both cars, but coming out of that road is a nightmare at certain times of

day. Visibility, particularly looking left, over the hump and bend by the railway bridge, is very poor, given the speed at which traffic moves. A 20mph limit would go a long way to preventing such accidents. I know of at least one other who has had an accident coming out of Oak Grange Road, and I'm pretty sure she mentioned another accident as well as hers.

15 From Resident:

I agree that the danger to the largest number of people are the cars heading north from the Summers pinch point. Once they get onto the straight downhill section past the village hall most are doing 40, many much faster, especially in the morning rush. I will never forget the time a van lost it and careered into the side narrowly missing the bus stop just shy of the station. This is the main gathering area for children in Clendon to get their school bus and it makes them sitting ducks. Hence whilst I also support slowing south bound traffic into the 30mph section the main risk on numbers of potential casualties is fast traffic coming downhill towards the rail road crossing and of course near the school further south. I would be very happy if we can achieve 20mph but 30 would be a good start.

16 From Resident;

I have had to stop many times at the narrow part of the A247 or just before it to avoid being hit by lorries, buses and speeding cars. Lots of the lorries and buses mount the pavement to get through and likewise I have had to mount the pavement because of on-coming lorries and buses. The HGV learner lorries are the worst! Especially the double hinged ones. I have had my wing mirror hit once whilst stationary just before the narrow point. I walk along the main road fairly often and I am scared to. The speeding vehicles whizz by. I am sure that I have escaped being hit by lorry/bus wing mirrors several times.

17 From Resident:

I don't know how possible it is to get the speed limit reduced to 20mph but I am fully supportive.

18 From Resident:

Further to your point as to quite where any sign should go I would endorse your view that the bend near Lime Grove needs motorists to slow down. We live atThe Street. Our entrance is on the right soon after you come around that bend from the Send direction. A few years ago my daughter was sitting stationary signalling right to turn in, waiting for oncoming traffic, when two motor cyclists came around the bend too fast. One did manage to stop OK, but the other (less experienced one) came off her bike and injured her arm in avoiding her companion and also my daughter's car. I don't believe the incident was ever reported to any authority/insurance company as no damage was done to anyone or anything other than the motorcyclist herself and her bike. But definitely a dangerous bend.

Turning right out of our drive - up which there are three houses - I quite often get the feeling that I have annoyed people by making them slow down sharply after the bend, but they were not in sight when I made the decision to pull out. I would suggest they are travelling too fast for the road.

19 From Resident:

I would suggest the most dangerous part of the of the A247 coming through the village is the narrowing of the road by "Summers", and the main entrance to the station. In the past 3 years there has been numerous accidents at this spot, and I have seen motorcyclist's doing "wheelies" over the bridge. To try and get motorist to adhere to the speed limit, I have put 30mph and speed kills notices in a prominent position on the entrance to the station which can clearly be seen from the A247, with little success.

20. From Resident:

I live between the station and the Onslow and currently walk my son to Clandon school most days. I have 2 younger boys as well so quite often have a double buggy. I am determined to walk, but do often wonder whether I'm being irresponsible in terms of our safety. Particularly on the narrow pavement by Summers. Last week I was walking and a van almost brushed her leg and the buggy as it drove past. We have often discussed that a priority lane is needed at that point so that only one car can pass at a time at that narrow point and perhaps further traffic slowing/calming measures.

I would also like to draw your attention to the Department for Transport Circular 01/2013, which has been drawn to my attention by Sir Paul Beresford, our local MP. I would outline some of the advice for Local Authorities from the Ministers which I think is appropriate to our request.

“Traffic authorities are asked to keep their speed limits under review with changing circumstances and to consider the introduction of more 20mph limits and zones, over time, in urban areas and built up village streets that are primarily residential to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists using the criteria in Section 6.”

“Roads should be designed so that mistakes made by road users do not result in death or serious injury. Effective speed management is part of creating a safe road environment which is fit for purpose.” “Achieving local speed limits that better reflect the needs of all road users not just motorised vehicles”. “Ensuring improved quality of life for local communities and a better balance between road safety, accessibility and environmental objectives, especially in rural communities”.

Considerations in setting local speed limits

23. A study of types of crashes, their severity, causes and frequency together with a survey of traffic speeds, should indicate whether an existing speed limit is appropriate for the type of road and mix of use by different groups of road users, (including people walking, cycling or on motorbikes) or whether it needs to be changed. Local residents may also express their concerns or desire for a lower speed limit and these comments should be considered.

24. Is about air quality.

26. Where there is poor compliance with an existing speed limit on a road or stretch of road the reasons for non-compliance should be examined before a solution is sought.

K Mackay 23 March 2016



Principal petitioner/ organisation	Susan Lowther, 71 confirmed signatures, paper petition
SCC Division/ GBC Ward	Shalford
Summary of concerns and requests	<p>Hogs Back A31 - Gap closure proposal at Flexford Lane. The Petition states:</p> <p>We the undersigned oppose the proposed gap closure and request that SCC Highways undertake a strategic review of the A31, with input from local residents. Closure of this crossing is against the interests of residents of the Hogs Back and is a step closer to creating a motorway by stealth and imposing an 11 mile physical barrier across Surrey, affecting an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, against the interests of all residents, walkers and cyclists.</p>
Response	<p>The subject of the petition is addressed under Item 8 of the agenda and the below response.</p> <p>ITEM 8: A31 HOG'S BACK GAP AT EAST FLEXFORD LANE ADDITIONAL PAPER</p> <p>Accidents at the Puttenham Interchange & Farnham Road gap SCC's Road Safety Team Manager has provided the following analysis of accidents at the Puttenham Interchange and the A31 Farnham Road gap to the east of Flexford Lane 'The collision data for the Puttenham junction shows that all the collisions in the last three years do not involve any vehicles making movements that would be the same as vehicles that would be using the junction to u-turn instead of using the gap. All the collisions involve vehicles making other manoeuvres irrelevant to the gap traffic (ie turning into the slip road to access the Hogs Back westbound) or involve vehicles travelling eastbound on the Hog's Back (not traffic emerging onto the Hog's Back from the B3000)'</p> <p>'There are two collisions involving vehicles using the u-turn to the east of the gap, though that is a small number compared to the number undertaking that manoeuvre.'</p> <p>The Road Safety Team manager also provided a plot showing all collisions recorded at Puttenham Interchange for the period 1 January 2012 and 30 November 2015, a period of just under 4 years, which shows a total of 10 accidents, none associated with westbound carriageway to eastbound carriageway movements.</p> <p>Missing objections At the meeting with residents the Area Highway Manager was</p>

	<p>handed a letter of objection dated 2 June from Mr M J Harrison of Flexford Cottage, East Flexford Lane who objected on the grounds that regular congestion from early morning on the Hog's Back eastbound (towards Guildford) makes the A31 in that direction almost impassable and using the Flexford gap at these times is the only way his family can go about their daily life. He felt that there were good sight lines exiting the gap and so considered it safe to pull out from, and the main issue with using it is it's state of disrepair and lack of signs and road markings. He felt that few accidents were related to the gap, rather most were due to lane changing and queuing traffic, and that the Puttenham interchange was more dangerous to negotiate than the gap.</p> <p>Fiona Curtis, Vice Chairman of Compton Parish Council submitted an objection by e-mail on 4 June 2015 on behalf of the parish council which was not taken to be an objection expressing concern about the significant inconvenience to cyclists, residents and possibly local businesses and asking that other measures be considered to improve safety such as better signage or locally reducing the speed limit.</p> <p>Mr V I A Underhill and Mrs B J Burgess of Flexford Farmhouse, East Flexford Lane submitted a letter of objection dated 14 March 2015, though this was not in response to the formal consultation which ran from 7 May 2015 to 5 June 2013, see para 1.8 of report, and so was not included in the report annex which summarises objections in response to the formal consultation only. In this letter they raised objections on the grounds that closure would seriously hinder access to East Flexford Lane by the emergency services, where there is an existing care home with another in the planning process, that the Puttenham Interchange is a difficult bottleneck, and that people in East Flexford Lane would no longer be able to access the bus stop on the opposite westbound carriageway.</p> <p>Further checks with the emergency services</p> <p>As at para 1.40 of the report the emergency services did not submit any objection during the statutory consultation in the Spring of 2015. The Area Highway Manager asked that they were contacted again for any comment, and the following has been received by the Road Safety Team Manager in the last two days.</p> <p>Fire & Rescue.</p> <p>Duncan</p> <p>I have spoken with Anne Gasson below and explained your concerns which on the face of it I agreed with. However with the appliance response time data supplied by our mobilising team, we would have to object to the closing of the gap. This is based upon our being required to attend a property fire in East Flexford Lane with appliances being mobilised from both Guildford and Farnham. Closing the gap would increase out</p>
--	--

	<p>attendance time by 3.5 minutes and would increase our current response standard (10 minutes) by 1 minute and 51 seconds.</p> <p>While I agree that the cut through's could be the cause of an accident, could consideration be made to restricting the use to emergency vehicles and improving visibility or generally improving visibility?</p> <p>Would it assist if we all met to try and find a safe and suitable solution?</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Andy</p> <p>Andrew Treasure GIFireE Assistant Group Commander</p> <p>Ambulance Service Hi Duncan</p> <p>In response to our conversation I would like to detail my views on the proposal. I'm happy for this to be read out at your meeting to discuss the proposal.</p> <p>'I have on occasions used all the gaps in the A31 Hogs Back in the 16 years I have worked for the Ambulance service and I can understand the local resident views and objections to this proposal and the impact it will have on their journey times. Secamb have Ambulances based at stations in Tongham, Godalming and Guildford serving the local community so if we are sent to incidences where we have to use the A31 Hogs back we would not routinely use a gap except if we were stood down from one incident and sent to another in the opposite direction. Recently this happened when I was travelling Westbound from Guildford and I had to use a gap but felt uncomfortable using the East Flexford gap and continued on to the Puttenham turnoff. I feel the Flexford gap in its current state is dangerous and I would not feel comfortable using it in my own car or while at work driving an Ambulance. There is not enough signage before the junction, it is secluded by trees and there is a high risk of rear-end collisions when braking to negotiate the junction. I think there are alternatives and so I don't object to the proposal.'</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Mark.</p>
--	---

	<p>Mark Newton Clinical Team Leader – Guildford South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust</p> <p>Covenant for Right of Passage</p> <p>In the last few days the Hog's Back Residents Association advised committee members by e-mail of a covenant included in property deeds relating to the right for certain vehicles to cross the gap at East Flexford Lane. The landowner has sent details to the County Council but this has not reached the Area Highway Manager as yet. The RA provided the deed references which enabled them to be traced and the covenant dates to 1968 when the A31 was upgraded to a dual carriageway. SCC Legal team have been consulted who strongly advise that this covenant needs to be properly assessed and the committee appraised of any possible implications prior to making a final decision on closure.</p> <p>There simply has not been the time since this covenant came to light for it to be assessed and based on the advice of the Surrey legal team the Area Highway Manager recommends that a decision by the committee is deferred to a later meeting.</p>
--	---

This page is intentionally left blank



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 23 March 2016

Public Questions and Statements

Submitted by Amanda Renshaw

Could the officers please explain why they consider it necessary to introduce 24x7 parking controls on a residential estate with no through traffic to combat a parking issue that only occurs twice a day for a short period of time during term time only.

In order for any parking controls to be effective they need to be policed so what guarantees can be offered that this will happen on Fairlands.

Response

Where there are parking problems at junctions it is standard practice to have double yellow lines, which restrict parking 24 hours a day. At junctions parking has the potential to cause a problem at any time. To only restrict the parking at the junctions for part of the day suggests we are happy for residents and others to park outside the restricted times.

The purpose of parking enforcement is to encourage compliance with the restrictions. Anyone parking in a restricted area risks getting a penalty charge. Where we are aware of regular infringements we will increase the patrols to address the problem.

Submitted by Robert Drummond

Please explain why the accident statistics connected to the gap used by the officers were withheld from the residents until the last minute despite repeated requests so that the accuracy and relevance could not be studied and shown to the committee as thoroughly misleading.

Response

Please refer to the tabled paper on the A31 Hogs Back Gap at East Flexford Lane (can be found at Annex A - Petitions of the Minutes).

This page is intentionally left blank



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 23 March 2016

Member Questions and Statements

Submitted by Councillors Bob McShee, David Elms and Iseult Roche, Guildford Borough Council

Would the Committee please acknowledge the concerns of residents on the Fairlands Estate regarding the proposed parking restrictions, noting that the problem which residents complained about, that led to Fairlands being included in the review of parking controls, is the regular anti-social and inconsiderate parking by parents dropping off and collecting children at Worplesdon Primary School AM and PM (despite being asked by the school not to do so), and rather than impose double yellow lines, meaning 24 hour, 7 days a week controls on residents as well, please consider the junctions single yellow line option for 8.30am to 10.30am and 2.30pm to 4.30pm restrictions, Monday to Friday, being the time at which there are the parking problems.

Response

Where there are parking problems at junctions it is standard practice to have double yellow lines, which restrict parking 24 hours a day. At junctions parking has the potential to cause a problem at any time. To only restrict the parking at the junctions for part of the day suggests we are happy for residents and others to park outside the restricted times.

The introduction of single yellow line controls would also require each length to be signed, to highlight the hours the restrictions apply. To implement single yellow lines would require an extra 30 signs and posts. All double yellow lines apply 24 hours a day and do not require any signs.

Submitted by Councillor Bob McShee, Guildford Borough Council

In response to the accidents that have occurred on this crossing, I am very pleased to see that 'Lolly-pop' ladies are on duty in the mornings and afternoons when the children need to cross the road. However, I have now been informed that it is the school who are paying for this essential safety provision, and I question why SCC is not paying for this service.

Response

Surrey County Council's Road Safety Outside Schools Policy outlines our approach not to fund School Crossing Patrols at locations where there is an infrastructure improvement such as a pelican crossing or a zebra crossing. The policy seeks to avoid duplication of resources and to ensure that funds are diverted to sites where there is greatest need, i.e. where there is no infrastructure provision. Our policy states;

National guidance advises that school crossing patrols should not operate where there is a light controlled crossing already in situ as this is a duplication of resources and could cause confusion. Therefore any request for a new school crossing patrol at a site that has a light controlled, or zebra crossing, will not be approved.

If a new light controlled or zebra pedestrian crossing is installed (or installed nearby to) where a school crossing patrol is currently operating, then the service will be reviewed and may be relocated or withdrawn after a provisional period of 3 months.

In response to recent collisions involving the school community at this crossing location, the school have identified funds for an SCP and Surrey County Council's Schools Sustainable Travel Team have agreed to facilitate the recruitment, training and risk assessment associated with the post. SCC has recently trained four parents and school staff to operate as Patrols at this location, and have agreed to provide the necessary training, monitoring and support. We have also offered additional pedestrian awareness training to the school.

Annex DGuildford Local Committee
23 March 2016
Open Public Question Time**1. Question from Sandra Morgan, from Worplesdon Parish Council****Q1 Sandra expressed her concern about the Clay Lane Link Road.****Q2 Why has Councillor Bob McShee been taken off the Local Committee.**

Reply from Chairman

The question on the Clay Lane Link Road maybe better directed at Guildford Borough Council. As a Surrey County Council Committee we have no power over who represents the borough on the Committee.

2. Question from Charles Hope, West Horsley Parish Council**Q1. Please come back to us on our outstanding request for the speed limit on a stretch of Ockham Road North to be reduced to 30 mph.****Q2. Why will it have taken over a year to get a Village Gateway sign erected by Highways when the parish council are paying for it? Please can Highways formally reply to the query about the progress of the gate?****Reply from John Hilder, SCC**

We will come back to you on request for the 30pmh speed limit.

We have many highway schemes being designed across the borough and it can take some time for them to be completed, I apologise for the delay.

3. Question from Marushka Broughton, Parent, Aldershot Road Crossing**Please can you confirm that the crossing patrol at St Josephs School is a temporary measure and the scheme to upgrade the pedestrian crossing will be considered in the future? Why isn't Highways paying for the patrol?****Reply from the Chairman**

Rebecca Harrison, SCC came along and gave training to parents on running a crossing patrol. The scheme is very much on the Highway Scheme list and will be considered in the future.

4. Question from Doug Clare Guildford Bike User group (GBUG)**Doug thanked Marc Woohall and his team for consulting with GBUG.**

Q1. Will Annex B in the Cycling report be included in the Highways Forward Programme for 2016/17 Budget?

Q2. Can the connection of the Shalford cycle path to the High Street Bridge be prioritised and please can Marc Woohall continue to consult with G BUG?

Reply from the Chairman

The Highways report will include the cycling quick wins and I was anxious that Annex B be open to the Committee and public and I hope we are to be able to bring these forward in the future.

5. Question from Julie Brown, Newlands Corner Campaign Group

Following a public meeting on 9 March it seems that Cllr Goodman is going ahead with the play trail etc at Newlands Corner despite the public giving feedback being against this. I want to know whether Surrey County Council is really listening to the residents of Surrey?

Reply from the Chairman

The Local Committee is really not the right place for your question and you would be better referring it to Cabinet.

6. Question from Jo Caplan, Merrow

Please can you ensure that a 2 or 3 hour parking limitation is put in place in Merrow Road near the shops?

Reply from Kevin McKee

In Item 10 there is a recommendation to put in a 3 hour limitation.

7. Question from Kate Dumbleton, Merrow Residents Association

Kate thanked Kevin McKee and Andy Harkin for their assistance around the yellow lines in Merrow Road. Kevin said he'd meet with residents please can he confirm this?

Reply from Kevin McKee

Kevin confirmed that he had written to say that he would meet with residents.

8. Question from John Oliver

Does the Committee agree that the Newlands Corner scheme should be stopped given the real road safety issues involved, until traffic data is properly analysed?

Reply from the Chairman

The Chairman reiterated his answer to question 5 from Julie Brown.

This page is intentionally left blank