

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 2 December 2015
at Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking GU21
6YL.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Liz Bowes (Chairman)
- Mr Ben Carasco
- * Mr Will Forster
- * Mrs Linda Kemeny
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mr Richard Wilson

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Ken Howard
- * Cllr Beryl Hunwicks
- * Cllr John Kingsbury (Vice-Chairman)
- Cllr Kevin Davis
- * Cllr Anne Roberts
- Cllr Carl Thomson
- * Cllr Graham Chrystie

* In attendance

Notes from Open Public Question

49/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Mr Ben Carasco, Cllr Kevin Davis and Cllr Carl Thomson gave apologies for absence.

50/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting held on 23 September 2015 were agreed and signed.

51/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

52/15 PETITIONS [Item 4]

No petitions were received.

53/15 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Two public questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers are annexed to these minutes. The supplementary questions and responses are set out below:

Question 1:

Mr Blackburn did not think that the answer addressed his question – he asked how the message could be got out that people should not cycle on the pavement unless it was dedicated as shared use.

In response it was noted that the signage for the town centre was due to go up in the New Year. Once this is in place, officers will look to see what education is required. On the wider issue of cycling on pavements, Highways Officers will speak to road safety colleagues who run campaigns to see if they can do any more around this issue.

Cllr Kingsbury suggested the local MP could be lobbied to try and make it a requirement that all bikes have working bells on them.

Question 2:

Mr Bennett was disappointed with the response as he sees the issue caused by people parking in this area at school drop off time before the parking restrictions are enforceable.

As set out in the response, it was agreed that the area would be monitored. Officers would work with the school, councillors and residents to review the location and report back by the March Joint Committee meeting.

54/15 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Five member questions were received and tabled and are annexed to these minutes. The supplementary questions and responses are set out below:

Question 1:

Mr Forster asked for a future update on ETHOS following the pilot to see if it would be suitable for Woking.

Question 2:

It was agreed that a report on HGVs in Woking would be added to the forward plan for December 2016.

Question 3:

Further to a request as to whether bus priority measures could be installed in Woking, it was agreed that a response would be provided outside the meeting.

Question 4:

It was agreed that Cllr Smith would meet with Andrew Milne for a further discussion outside the meeting.

Question 5:

Members looked forward to receiving an update report next year.

55/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 7]

Andrew Milne introduced the revised tabled report which set out an update on highway schemes within the borough and asked for the committees agreement to the capital programme for 2016/17. The revised report contained an updated table of schemes for approval. It was noted that the capital budget for next year had not been set, but the proposals before members set out a flexible use of funds with a mixture of infrastructure and capital maintenance with at least one crossing scheme and if approved would enable a full spend of the budget.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2015/16 financial year
- (ii) Agree the proposed capital works programme for 2016/17 in the revised tabled report
- (iii) Note progress with budget expenditure
- (iv) Agree that any available parking surplus funding is set aside to support the capital works programme
- (v) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

56/15 2015 WOKING PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]

David Curl introduced the 2015 Parking Review and asked members to note the tabled amendments as set out in drawings 20105 and 20021 which removed some restrictions from the previous proposals and proposed an amendment for restrictions in a parking bay on Oaktree Road in Knaphill and Goldsworth West.

Public comments:

- It was noted that proposals set out on drawing 20089 should read Julian Close not Julian Way.
- In response to a question on Chobham Road, it was noted that the tabled amendment was put forward with less restrictions so as not to displace as many cars on the surrounding roads.
- A question was raised as to whether people who work in Woking are discriminated against as they get charged the same amount to park as commuters. In response officers noted that every employer has a responsibility to do what is best for its workforce.
- Residents on Walden Park Road have objected to the proposal and residents are requesting a CPZ instead.

Member comments:

- In response to residents comments on Walden Park Road, Mr Kemp has liaised with officers and agreed to remove the proposal for Walden Park Road from this review and to look to put a CPZ in the area. This would be taken forward in the New Year.
- Mr Kemp requested that the restrictions in Silversmith Way are extended past the garages.

- During the last review restrictions were agreed for Queens Road but the lower end of the road still does not have double yellow lines. Officers were aware and were following this up.
- In response to a member question it was explained that requests for disabled bays tend to be advisory. If these are abused then an order will be made.

Officers explained that the proposals were scheduled to be advertised for 28 days in February, and subject to any objections would be implemented in the summer. The next review will come before committee in March 2017, with the review being prepared at the end of 2016.

Members thanked officers for their work on this review.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Woking as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in annex A area agreed with the following amendments:
 - a. the changes to the restrictions as shown in tabled amendment for Knaphill and Goldsworth West - drawings 20105 (B) and 20021 (E)
 - b. The deletion of the proposed no waiting restrictions along Waldens Park Road on drawing 20016
 - c. The extension of the double yellow lines past the garages at the end of Silversmith Way with the removal of a small section outside number 68 Silversmith Way as shown on drawing 20089
- (ii) the Joint Committee allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) the intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Woking as shown on the drawings in annex A as amended and the tabled drawings 20105 and 20021 is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iv) if there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the County Council's scheme of delegation by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor.

57/15 ON STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 9]

Geoff McManus introduced the report which set out the annual report for on street parking management and enforcement within the borough. It was noted that the surplus from the on street parking budget available to committee was £108,893.

RESOLVED

The Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report.

58/15 ARMED FORCES COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE COVENANT IN WOKING (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 10]

Cllr Kingsbury introduced the report which set out an update of activities undertaken to implement the Armed Forces Covenant in Woking.

Capt McGarvey-Miles and WO1 Hendry from 27 Regt RLC explained that part of their role under civil engagement was to work with the boroughs of Woking, Waverley and Guildford. As part of this work they have engaged with schools, attended the opening of the Peace Garden at the Muslim Burial Ground, been part of remembrance parades etc. They have a role of co-ordinating the other units within the geographical areas of Woking, Guildford and Waverley (ATC Pirbright and 3PWRR) and their engagement with the authorities. Going forward there would be a focus on youth, employer and community engagement.

Canon Bruinvels explained the countywide role in taking forward the Covenant locally. Woking is an exemplar authority being led by Cllr Kingsbury. He highlighted the work to develop a job profile for Armed Forces Champions which has had national interest, the amount of Armed Forces Covenant grants brought into the county and the work being progressed with the Career Transition Partnership to advertise Surrey jobs to the Military. The county wide board has a key role to facilitate, signpost and enable.

Cllr Kingsbury led members through a presentation outlining the specific work in Woking. This included changes in the Council's policy for employment, Reservists and housing; gave examples of partnership events including First World War commemorations, a Victoria Cross Commemoration Service and the SERFCA Leadership Challenge; taking forward the Corporate Covenant with local businesses; supporting Service Charities; and successful funding projects including Beech Grove Play area and the Peace Garden at the Muslim Burial Ground, which was officially opened by HRH The Earl of Wessex KG GCVO on 12 November 2015.

Member comments:

- Members discussed whether they should look to give the Freedom of the Borough to a local Unit. This was proposed by Mr Kemp and seconded by Cllr Chrystie. It was agreed that it should be considered by the Freedom of the Borough Panel. Canon Bruinvels offered to assist.
- Members would like to see the Corporate Covenant signed by local businesses in Woking by 31 March 2016.
- The issue of Service Children and education was discussed. It was agreed that a meeting would be held between Mrs Kemeny and Canon Bruinvels to consider:
 - The implications on schools funding of children not being on school role by October and whether anything can be done to stop the schools being at a disadvantage

- How to address the issue of children being given a school near a unit address, and then having to reapply if the Service Family Accommodation is not close to the unit address or their allocated school
- Whether Service children could be moved up the admissions criteria.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee noted the report.

59/15 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE AND SURREY TRADING STANDARDS WORK IN WOKING 2014/15 (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 11]

This item was deferred until a future meeting.

60/15 FORWARD PROGRAMME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

Woking Joint Committee:

- (i) Noted and commented on the forward programme contained in the report with the addition of the following items:
 - Consider issue of HGVs in rural Woking – Dec 2016
 - Report looking at dealing with cars for sale/trading on Highways and how it can be addressed
 - Provision of information to public in a visual manner to show relevant highways information/schemes completed

61/15 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 13]

The updated Tracker was noted.

Meeting ended at: 8.30 pm

Chairman

Notes of Open Public Questions

Question 1: Mr Stubbs

When will the proposals for the A322 be made public?

Cllr Kingsbury explained that proposals have been discussed in private because of the commercial nature of the information. The intention is to improve the area around Brookwood crossroads and when there are firm proposals that can be shared, officers will let Mr Stubbs know.

Question 2: Richard Mackie

There is a need for a 20mph speed limit at Church Hill where it meets Brewery Road. It is very busy with a limited view. The issue of overhanging foliage from the Old Vicarage was also raised.

Mr Kemp supports a 20 mph limit and has met officers on site to discuss this as well as a potential crossing.

Andrew Milne will provide a response outside the meeting. Regarding foliage, the needs of the property owner have to be balanced alongside safety. Officers will look into this and provide a response by the end of the year.

Question 3: Mrs Marshall

What is the latest update on the bus bollards by The Vyne as they are still down?

Officers would raise this with colleagues. The delay had been due to contractual issues. The Chairman requested a meeting of interested parties in the New Year to see how the issue can be addressed, and asked that it be raised on each agenda until the issue has been resolved.

Cllr Kingsbury asked whether residents would welcome a consultation to see if the bollards should be left down. Mrs Marshall and Cllr Whitehand felt that they should be left in working order as when they are down they present a safety risk to Day Centre users, and once the new homes open there will be even more traffic locally.

Question 4: Will Forster on behalf of a resident

What enforcement is undertaken to stop cars repeatedly parking in the bus stops and in bus lanes on the Broadway by the station?

Geoff McManus explained that both sides of the station are priorities for parking enforcement officers. This issue will continue to be enforced as a priority.

Question 5: David Thomas

When will the signs along the High Street by Woking Station be made enforceable?

Douglas Spinks explained that the issue will be resolved when the High Street becomes one way as part of the enabling works for Victoria Square which will start in the third quarter of next year.

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 2 DECEMBER 2015

SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: WOKING

1. Question from Alan Blackburn

Inconsiderate Cycling An Unwanted Legacy of Cycle Woking

I previously emailed all Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Councillors on 24/10/15 on the subject of inconsiderate cycling on the footways and public spaces of Woking. I have received a reply from Mr Morgan who explained the reasoning around the delay in signage regarding cycling in the town centre. He also said that a positive campaign will be run to promote responsible cycling.

Apart from the Town Centre, I would also like to complain about the inconsiderate people who ride on normal non shared footways, who ride too fast and pass one too close in particular when coming from behind.

Could I ask the Chairman to consider the following?

1. That there be no further extension of the 'shared use' of pavements in the town centre and that cycling be banned from 'Market Walk' whenever it is in use as a market.

That public notices are fixed in close proximity to all the cycle parks and other areas as appropriate and advertising space in the local newspapers is used to emphasise the following four points:

1. That pedestrians always take preference over Cyclists (DfT Hierarchy of use)
2. That cycling on a pavement is in general against the Law. It may only be done on those pavements which have been designated for 'Shared Use' and are appropriately signed
3. That cyclists should not attempt to pass a pedestrian unless there is a clear space of at least 1m between them, and ring their bell at least twice, the pedestrian may well be deaf. If there is no reaction then you must dismount to pass them
4. That cyclists should not exceed a speed of 8mph when using a pavement.

Concerning the last point despite the vast amount of guidance given by the DfT on most aspects of cycling, nothing is said about speed anywhere. I suggest 8mph as

this is the maximum speed allowed for disability vehicles and it may require a Bye Law.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Although Cycle Woking has played an active part in encouraging and promoting cycling as an activity, it is not reasonable to assume that inconsiderate behaviour is as a result of this work. It is recognised that there are a small minority of cyclists who do not conduct themselves in a manner that shows consideration for other highway user groups. However, it is also important to recognise that examples of inconsiderate behaviour can be found in all highway user groups, including motorists and pedestrians, and that inconsiderate behaviour is in no way solely attributed to cyclists.

All shared use areas are considered on a case by case basis through the Woking Joint Committee, and the Committee will make its decision taking into account the views that are received through the statutory consultation process. For that reason it is not possible to commit in advance to prevention of additional shared use facilities in any area of the Woking Borough.

Having consulted both Surrey Highways, and Surrey Police, with regard to your proposals for addressing inconsiderate behaviour, I am afraid that none of these would be supported. Surrey Police, who are responsible for enforcement, have indicated that it would be impractical to implement enforcement of any minimum passing distance or speed limit, as these things could not readily be measured, would be contested by any cyclist challenged, and would be difficult to prove in Court. It is also the case that it would be very difficult for a cyclist to judge their speed or distance to this accuracy, and arguably unreasonable to impose such impractical constraints targeted at this one user group.

Although riding on the pavement is illegal and became a fixed penalty offence in 1999, the advice issued to the Police by the Home Office stated that "*the fixed penalty is not aimed at responsible cyclists who sometimes feel obliged to use the pavement out of fear of the traffic, and who show consideration to other pavement users. Chief police officers, who are responsible for enforcement, acknowledge that many cyclists, particularly children and young people, are afraid to cycle on the road. Sensitivity and careful use of police discretion is required.*"

Market research undertaken in Surrey to assess people's attitudes towards cycling found that one of the biggest barriers to encouraging more cycling by more people is the fear of sharing busy roads with heavy traffic flows. Consequently a key part of Surrey's cycling strategy is wherever possible to provide cycling facilities segregated from traffic to ensure that younger people, older people and people who would not otherwise cycle are able choose to cycle segregated from traffic. Utilising wide pavements and designating them for shared use between pedestrians and cyclists is a standard method of providing a cycling facility segregated from traffic and there are a number of national design guidelines available including those published by the Department for Transport, Transport for London and Sustrans advising on this. National guidance highlights the need to take into account for the needs of other road users (especially pedestrians) when providing shared use facilities, and only paths with suitable widths (depending upon the level of pedestrian and cyclist activity) should be designated as shared use. Therefore it is intended that shared use cycling facilities will continue to be used in Surrey, and taking into account the

needs of pedestrians within the design will continue to be an important part of this. All highway improvements are also subject to safety audit at the design stage and after implementation.

Analysis of Surrey's database of road casualties recorded by the police showed that in 2013 there were 362 pedestrian casualties, 11 of which were as a result of collision with a cyclist, of which 3 involved the cyclist riding illegally on the footway. There were no recorded injuries to pedestrians as a result of collisions with cyclists on paths designated as shared use. Although there may be incidents that are not reported to the police, the risk of being injured by a cyclist as a pedestrian is extremely small. None-the-less the fear of being knocked over by a cyclist can be a real concern for some people especially older people or those with mobility impairment.

Surrey Highways and Surrey Police continue to work closely together to address all aspects of road safety, and will target resources where they will provide the greatest public benefit. As accidents involving motor vehicles remain the highest risk in terms of leading to serious or fatal injuries, enforcement and other control measures will continue to be focused primarily on this area.

For Woking Town centre, works are in hand to implement the 10am to 4pm cycling prohibition through the centre of the Town and reinstate the permanent cycling prohibitions in Church Path, Mercia Walk and Market Walk. The physical works are planned for completion from mid January 2016 following which we will monitor compliance and consider enforcement and education measures as appropriate thereafter.

2. Question from Peter Bennett

Winston Churchill School is attended by approx 1500 pupils aged from 11-16 who commence at 0825 am. This school is located on Hermitage Road (A324) with its own adjacent traffic layby for pupil drop off. On the other side of this very busy, comparatively narrow, commuter route is a bike lane and a narrow footpath. Running parallel with this bike lane and footpath is a single yellow line parking restriction. The parking restriction starts at 0830 am. This is 5 minutes AFTER the pupils are sitting at their desks! Thus irrelevant, totally ineffective and not fit for purpose!!

This allows a small minority to PARK, NOT DROP OFF, without impunity whilst they escort their children across the very busy road. The school layby is easily accessible if they use adjacent roundabouts at the top and bottom of this road. In doing so they straddle the useless parking restriction, block the bike lane and also the narrow footpath as the main road is comparatively narrow. This unsights passing drivers and causes them to deviate towards the school's busy layby on a commuting road where 1500 young pupils are arriving for school.

I submit that this restriction is not fit for common sense purpose and is a dereliction of duty with regard to the safety of the 1500 pupils arriving at the same time as the busy commute is in progress.

The Woking Parking Project Team has rejected my request for an extension of the parking restriction to 0730am and will not consider the matter until 2017.

This is not acceptable with regard to pupil safety and I would appreciate the opportunity to bring this attention to Woking and Surrey Councillors.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Winston Churchill School and Parking in Hermitage Road

Since Borough wide parking reviews were started in Woking 6 years ago, this is the first request we have received for restrictions to be changed on this part of Hermitage Road. We have looked at this location and decided not to include any changes in the current parking review report because:

- I. Vehicles stopping briefly to allow passengers to board/ alight is allowed on a waiting restriction. Even if there were double yellow lines along Hermitage Road opposite Winston Churchill School this behaviour could still take place and the earlier operational time is unlikely to make any real difference to the number of vehicles stopping in this location at school times.
- II. If a longer (or earlier) restriction were imposed there could be an issue with displacement. Parents dropping off their children in the morning and/ or collecting them later in the day is going to continue for the foreseeable future. If prevented in one location it will just move to another.
- III. There are no other restrictions that begin at 7:30am in Woking Borough at the present time, (which may be interpreted as 'local policy'). For the general public's better understanding and for enforcement purposes it is better to have consistent restrictions across the borough.

We will however monitor this location over a longer period and in this process discuss with the school, the SCC School Sustainable Travel Team and Woking Borough Enforcement Team in order to decide whether any changes to the waiting restriction are needed or justified.



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 2 DECEMBER 2015
SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS
DIVISION: WOKING

1. Question from Mr Will Forster, Surrey County Council

I understand that Surrey County Council is working with a company called Ethos to establish detailed information about how people park in Guildford. Guildford is a very popular destination and experiences traffic congestion at busy times, this study will be used to change people's parking habits to reduce road and parking congestion and carbon emissions.

Woking's situation is very similar to Guildford's, therefore please will the Woking Joint Committee agree to work with Ethos to research people's parking habits in Woking and produce a plan to reduce congestion and the other negatives associated with parking?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

This is a Guildford Borough Council led project. It could be considered but it is unlikely that ETHOS would be able to do this for Woking in the immediacy. The reason is that ETHOS are being funded by central Government and the Guildford project is a pilot. When the pilots are completed, ETHOS might be able to undertake a study in Woking, but the scope would need to be agreed and we'd also need to establish what it will cost us. In particular, if we are committing funds to this, we need to identify what the problem is we are trying to resolve, and also ascertain whether there are any other ways of achieving the same outcome.

2. Question from Mr Will Forster, Surrey County Council

I understand that the Guildford Local Committee recently undertook a Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) review of the Shere area. As HGV movements are a serious concern amongst local residents in Sutton Green in my division, please will the Woking Joint Committee agree to undertake a similar review to Guildford and review HGV movements in Sutton Green, or Mayford and Sutton, or possibly even all of rural Woking Borough?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The HGV study encompasses a wide rural area south of Shere, mainly within the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In order to better determine the origins and destinations of HGV movements the study area has been extended to the A25 to the north, the A281 to the west and the A29 to the east, which affects some parishes within the Mole Valley and Waverley district areas.

The study will require a review of directional signing and street furniture. As it is being carried out throughout much of the same area where the Surrey Hills decluttering working group project to review and rationalise redundant road signs and street furniture is active, it was decided to combine work on both projects.

A third strand of this work is to trial the risk assessment approach developed by Norfolk County Council within their rural decluttering project which has led to the removal of many redundant road signs leading to significant financial savings.

The methodology being developed within the Shere area HGV study is being trialled with a view to possibly embedding the approach into Surrey County Council signing policy. It is recommended that further studies do not take place until after the current study is reviewed in the summer/autumn of 2016.

3. Question from Mr Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Please can the Woking Joint Committee explain why there are fewer buses on Number 34 bus in between 8 am and 9 am, Monday to Friday, and the Number 35 bus has no service in between 8 am and 9 am, Monday to Friday?

I assume this reduction in service is not linked to buses being used for school transport, as there is no similar reduction in service when children leave school. Please can the Joint Committee explain why there is a worse bus service when residents want to travel to work?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Bus services 34/35 through Woking are operated up to 7pm on weekdays by Arriva on a primarily commercial basis. The number of journeys operated at peak times is governed by relative actual demand for access to various points along the whole route between Guildford and Camberley and also by what each bus can physically achieve. Arriva point out that recent timetable changes have been required to cope with increasing traffic congestion. In order to achieve the best possible service reliability within the resources that can be deployed, they have had to give buses extra time to complete their journeys, particularly during the morning peak period. This reduces the amount of journeys that can be operated. Analysis of predominant overall passenger flows and demand has led them to reduce service 35 slightly, in favour of increasing resources on certain parts of route 34, which is said by them to be more popular. However, service 35 into Woking, is supplemented by service 81 from the Barnsbury area. In the current financial climate, against the background of the ongoing Local Transport Review, it is unlikely that the County Council would be able to pay Arriva or another operator to run more service 34/35 journeys during the morning peak period.

4. Question from Councillor Paul Smith, Woking Borough Council

A number of residents have told me of their concern about road safety within the Borough. In order to address their concerns, please could the Chairman explain how the County Council, Borough Council and Surrey Police work together to coordinate action around this issue at a borough level and what the best way is for members of the public to find out about what is being done by all partners locally?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

We are aware that many residents have concerns about road safety and we work closely with Surrey Police and colleagues in our Safety Engineering Team in order to alleviate these concerns. The best way for residents to find out what is happening locally is for them to submit an enquiry via Surrey Highways.

Surrey County Council work closely with Surrey Police and Woking Borough Council via a number of working groups and forums to deal with road safety issues.

Vehicle speeds can be a particular concern and our Speed Management Plan lists those road where speed has been raised as a concern. Surrey Police will endeavour to monitor all of the roads on this list and in some cases, the concerns about speeding turn out to be a perception of speeding. However, where there recorded speeds are high, the police will aim to undertake enforcement or temporarily deploy Vehicle Activated Signs. Multi-agency discussions about the Speed Management Plan may lead to the development of an engineering scheme, particularly if there is a history of personal injury collisions.

The collision history of a road will also be discussed at the meetings of the Road Safety Working Group if a location is flagged up due to there being a cluster of injury collisions either at a single location or along a length of road. Any fatal collisions that may have occurred will also be discussed at these meetings but the details of the collisions that are discussed may be sensitive or the incidents may be subject to ongoing investigation or prosecution, for which reason the minutes of these meetings are not made public.

Other work with Surrey Police includes School Speed Watch events outside of, or close to, schools and Roadside Education and Enforcement Days, where things such as mobile phone use, lack of seat belts are targeted amongst other things, as well as speeding.

There is less Borough Council involvement simply because SCC is the Highway Authority but that does not mean that Woking Borough Council officers are never involved, as there may be matters that are within the Borough Council's remit and which can improve road safety and in these instances the Borough Council's help can be invaluable. If the Road Safety Working Group meetings bring to light a problem within Woking town centre, WBC officers will be involved due to the maintenance agreement that exists between SCC and WBC with regard to that area. Woking Borough Council enforces waiting restrictions on behalf of Surrey County Council and this can have a positive effect on road safety.

5. Question from Councillor John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

Would the Chairman please advise me when resurfacing will take place on Church Road St Johns, which is in a bad condition and is included, as far as I am aware, in the Operation Horizon contract?

When will Members receive an updated report setting out the latest timetable for Operation Horizon going forward?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

In the Horizon programme report presented to Members in June of this year, resurfacing of Church Road, St Johns, was scheduled for Years 4/5 of the project. The Horizon team are presently undertaking assessments of all remaining sites and refining the programme on a priority basis. Although this work is not yet concluded, Church Road is scheduled to be resurfaced in the coming financial year (Year 4) from April onwards. Programme dates are not yet available, but it is anticipated that a revised Horizon report will be issued when the assessments and setting of programme dates have been concluded.