# Agenda

We welcome you to Surrey Heath Local Committee Your Councillors, Your Community

and the Issues that Matter to You



## Venue

Location: St Mary's Church, Park Road, Camberley, GU15 2SR

Date: Thursday, 13 July 2017

**Time:** 6.00 pm – Official Meeting starts 6.30 pm



## Discussion

Petition Response – Heathpark Drive

Highways Update

Additional Parking Schemes

# You can get involved in the following ways

#### Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

#### Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

#### Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.



#### Attending the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help.

*Email:* nicola.thorntonbryar@surreycc.gov.uk *Tel:* 01276 800269 (text or phone) *Website:* 

**. . .** 

Follow @SurreyHeathLC on Twitter

This is a meeting in public.

Please contact Nikkie Thornton-Bryar using the above contact details:

- If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language
- If you would like to attend and you have any **additional needs**, e.g. access or hearing loop
- If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern.



#### **Surrey County Council Appointed Members**

Ms Charlotte Morley Mr Mike Goodman, Chobham, Bagshot & Windlesham Mr Bill Chapman, Camberley East Mr Paul Deach Mr Edward Hawkins Mr David Mansfield

#### **Borough Council Appointed Members**

Cllr Vivienne Chapman, St. Paul's Cllr Valerie White, Bagshot Cllr Josephine Hawkins, Parkside Cllr Paul Ilnicki, Heatherside Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, Lightwater Cllr Pat Tedder, Chobham

Chief Executive **David McNulty** 

#### MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances. It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

Note: This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of **Legal and Democratic Services** at the meeting.

#### 1 ELECTIONS AND MINUTES

#### a ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

To elect the Chairman.

#### **b ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

To appoint a Vice-Chairman.

#### c MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING (Pages 1 - 12)

To agree the Minutes of the last meeting held on Thursday 2 March 2017.

#### 2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

#### 3 UPDATE ON DECISION TRACKER

(Pages 13 - 14)

To review the decision tracker.

#### 4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

#### **Declarations of Interest**

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter;

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

#### NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

#### 5 PETITIONS

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 68. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer at least 14 days before the meeting.

Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures (30) has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

NO NEW PETITIONS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED FOR THIS MEETING

#### a PETITION RESPONSE - HEATHPARK DRIVE SPEED LIMIT (Pages 15 - 36)

A petition was received at the Local Committee Public Meeting on 2 March 2017. The petition requested that the Committee consider introducing a 20mph speed limit, with relevant features, along Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road in Windlesham.

A report was presented in response to the petition recommending no further action at that time. However, the Local Committee agreed that more detailed consideration should be given to options for introducing a 20mph scheme and a further report presented to the Local Committee at its meeting on 13 July 2017.

#### **6 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

To answer any written questions from residents or businesses within the area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon, four working days before the meeting (Friday 7 July).

Three written questions have been received so far and will be tabled at the meeting.

#### 7 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice must be given in writing to the Community Partnership & Committee Officer by 12 noon 4 working days before the meeting (Friday 7 July).

#### 8 HIGHWAYS UPDATE

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2017/18 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

#### 9 PARKING IN SURREY HEATH

At local committee in December 2016, officers of the parking team presented the on street parking review of Surrey Heath, which was agreed subject to amendments made at the meeting. In early 2017, the parking team received correspondence from councillors and members of the public regarding some of the locations which were not (Pages 37 - 48)

(Pages 49 - 58)

taken forward as part of this parking review. After agreeing to reconsider the requests, it was later decided best to include the locations in the advertisement and to seek committee approval at a later stage, which is the purpose of this report. In addition, there are two borough wide amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders relating to consolidation and carers and operational permits.

#### 10 COMMUNITY SAFETY AND TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP

(Pages 59 - 66)

The local committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2017/18. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents.

The report also seeks the approval of Local Committee task group members and the appointment of representatives to external bodies.

#### 11 FORWARD PLAN

To receive a report on forthcoming meetings and planned agenda items.

(Pages 67 - 68)

This page is intentionally left blank

#### DRAFT

#### Minutes of the meeting of the Surrey HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE held at 6.00 pm on 2 March 2017 at St Lawrence C of E Primary School, Bagshot Road, Chobham, GU24 8AE.

#### Surrey County Council Members:

- \* Mr David Ivison (Chairman)
- \* Mr Chris Pitt (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Mike Goodman
- \* Mr Bill Chapman
- \* Mr Adrian Page
  - Mr Denis Fuller

#### **Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Vivienne Chapman
- \* Cllr Rodney Bates
- \* Cllr Valerie White
- \* Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- \* Cllr Paul Ilnicki
- \* Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans

\* In attendance

#### 62/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from C.Cllr Denis Fuller.

#### 63/17 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting (December 2016) were agreed and signed by the Chair.

#### 64/17 UPDATE ON DECISION TRACKER [Item 3]

The decision tracker was discussed. The outstanding item on the traffic lights at Frimley Green should be regarded as red as this issue continues to be unresolved. The updated decision tracker was noted.

#### 65/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 66/17 PETITIONS [Item 5]

#### 67/17 PETITION - PARKING IN LIGHTWATER [Item 5a]

At the December meeting, the Local Committee received two signed petitions by local residents requesting the Local Committee provide additional parking spaces in Lightwater.

One of the petitions, presented by Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, read "To ask Surrey County Council to investigate the viability and options to increase the number of parking spaces in Lightwater Village Centre". The decision on this petition was deferred to this meeting.

Thanks were given to Highways and Parking Officers, who had worked with Councillors and residents to provide options and a way forward.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted:

- (i) Residents of Lightwater have met with Officers and Members of Surrey County Council with a proposal to increase the amount of parking in Lightwater centre.
- (ii) The proposal was reviewed and determined to have a substantial cost implication that cannot be met by the Local Committee in the current financial climate.
- (iii) Surrey County Council Parking Team will review introducing time limited parking bays within the highway limit during the next Surrey Heath parking review.

#### 68/17 SPEED LIMIT IN WINDLESHAM [Item 5b]

A written petition was received in advance of the meeting, requesting the Committee consider a 20mph speed limit, with relevant features, along Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road, Windlesham.

The petition was received 15 December 2016 and was passed to Surrey County Council Officers to provide a report on the matter in time for this meeting.

The petition called for a 20mph speed limit on the estate. Although the County Highways report was not in support, the petitioners felt that common sense should prevail to ensure the safety of all residents. It was true that there had been no major crashes but their concern was to prevent any happening at all. Parents were particularly concerned for the safety of their children.

The petitioner stated that Heathpark Drive was the only residential road in Windlesham which was a "through road". Although Heathpark Drive was the main drag, Birch Road and Oakwood Road were also affected because drivers had to wait at a T-junction with Heathpark Drive to exit their roads. This was therefore a special case and granting their request would not cause a precedent.

It was claimed that traffic had increased dramatically over the last ten years and, due to the speed at which vehicles were coming through the estate, residents were angry and fearful of crashes occurring. Although the traffic situation might improve from a numbers point of view when the bridge reopened - it was believed that it would not have an impact on the speed at which vehicles travelled.

A petition suggestion was for an area-wide signed 20mph limit. Signs, lines, and road markings could indicate that the driver was entering a residential estate and could be introduced without expensive traffic calming. This would cost 50 times less than humped zones and studies showed lower speed resulted in 20% fewer casualties. Compliance would be increased by publicity, driver awareness and community involvement, with light touch policing or community speed watch. 20mph speed limits could be indicated by terminal speed limit signs with an option to put in repeater signs. These were relatively cheap and easy to install on lamp posts and residents believed that a limit scheme would cost £5-7K.

After much discussion, it was agreed that this was an exceptional case (with an 80% increase in traffic over the past 3 years) and the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed that:

- (i) The Area Highways Manager reconsider the recommendations with the local County Councillor with the aim of bringing a designated 20mph scheme back to the next Local Committee.
- (ii) The Chair of the Local Committee write to the relevant Cabinet Member stating Surrey Heath Local Committees' support for 20mph schemes within the local speed limit policy. (Step 6 of the policy states that if the Committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety).

The amended recommendations were proposed by C.Cllr Mike Goodman and seconded by Cllrs Valerie White and Bill Chapman.

#### 69/17 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were two written public questions submitted to the Committee. The questions and the written answers given out at the meeting are attached as Annex B.

The first question was about the Bagshot traffic lights and Members noted that the Cabinet Member had been asked to chase this work with the Contractor.

The second question regarding potential traffic through Chobham as a result of proposed new developments generated a lot of discussion. Residents raised a number of concerns about current traffic volumes and that any increase in traffic would be a disaster. Concerns were also raised that any mitigation measures would not decrease the volume of traffic and that a more joined up regional approach to traffic was needed. There was a lack of Community support for development without appropriate infrastructure.

#### 70/17 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There were no written Member questions.

#### 71/17 EDUCATION IN SURREY HEATH [Item 8]

Marc Scarborough, NW Area Education Officer, gave a verbal update on education issues locally.

It was noted that Surrey was facing some challenges. A number of very good head teachers were retiring, leaving vacancies. Recruitment of teachers was also a challenge, particularly in view of the cost of housing and living in the area. The Council had tried a variety of methods to attract staff, including inviting newly qualified teachers to come and visit local schools, but this had a very low take up. The numbers of newer teachers leaving schools had also increased. However, a "grow your own" scheme for non teaching assistants had worked well.

In Surrey Heath, there had been a spike year in terms of population and intake numbers would now go down (unless new houses were built). There were plans for a new school to accommodate the Deepcut development. There was a general mover towards Academies and partnership schools and the "no school left behind" scheme was encouraging partnership working.

Mark gave thanks to all the Heads and Teachers in Surrey Heath, who do a fabulous job!

#### 72/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 9]

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2016/17 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2016/17 financial year.
- (ii) Note the budgetary position.
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

#### 73/17 MEMBERS ALLOCATION REPORT [Item 10]

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation. For the financial year 2016/17 the County Council has allocated £10,296 revenue funding to each County Councillor. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2016 to date.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation budget, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

#### 74/17 FORWARD PLAN [Item 11]

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan and comment on the items that are currently anticipated will be received (paragraph 3).

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the forward plan outlined in the report

Meeting ended at: 8.50 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

#### Annex A

#### Surrey Heath Local Area Committee 2 March 2017 Open Public Question Time

There were approx. 45 members of the public present.

#### 1. Paul Hutchinson, Chair, Bagshot Society

The recent consultation in Bagshot was not very well advertised and gave suggestions for people to vote on for spending money. The Bagshot Society was not consulted on this and we believe that some of the choices given could be funded elsewhere.

#### Reply from Mike Goodman, SCC

SCC usually make this type of decision, but I asked for a consultation. I asked Officers to come up with suggestions, but we did not have the funds for a full consultation so we have done the best we can. We have delivered leaflets locally, as we wanted to ask Bagshot people and have consulted as widely as we can.

#### 2. Juliette Dunsmere, local resident

Chobham garage were granted a licence for 24 hour opening and have now applied for an alcohol licence from 12 to 6 am. Residents don't want 24 hour opening and certainly not with an alcohol licence.

#### Reply from Bill Chapman

I am on the Surrey Heath licensing Committee. Members of the public can make representations to the Committee and can come along on the day and speak. The Police are also consulted.

#### 3. David Mansfield, local resident

There has been a public meeting in Chobham about the proposed new Fairoaks development – have SCC Highways been asked for their views on development?

#### **Reply from the Chair**

SCC have not yet given their views but an Officer attended the meetings and listened to the views expressed.

#### 4. Lavinia Sealy, local resident

Are you signed up to the Green Belt policy in Surrey Heath and do you agree this should not be set aside?

#### **Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC**

I sit on the planning committee at Surrey Heath, so I am not allowed to prejudge any application.

#### Reply from Valerie White, SHBC

On any application the green belt policy would be taken into account, but I cannot predetermine any application.

#### Reply from Adrian Page, SCC

I am all for the green belt policy.

#### Reply from Rodney Bates, SHBC

I am a group leader at the Borough Council. I agree with the general principle of the green belt, but I don't get involved in planning decisions.

#### Reply from Bill Chapman, SCC

I support the green belt, but this may get overruled by Government.

#### 5. Lavinia Sealy, local resident

Would it be possible to look at the safety implications of cars / lorries turning into Chertsey Road and being faced with obstacles?

#### **Reply from Peter Orchard, Highways Officer**

We have looked at options for the junction with the consultation delayed until Summer 2017. I am happy to meet with yourself and Mike Goodman.

#### 6. Murray Rowlands, local resident

Are there plans to close the Surrey Heath Museum and have a virtual museum?

#### **Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC**

I am on the Executive Board, but have not heard of this.

#### 7. Carol Mancini, Parish Councillor at Chobham

The expression of interest for the Fairoaks development was put in without the Parish Council knowing. Are SHBC involved in the expression of interest and if so, can the PC give their views on this?

#### **Reply from the Chair**

The Parish should be involved. I would encourage you to write to Karen Wheelan, Chief Executive of SHBC.

#### 8. Ruth Hutchinson, SHBC Councillor for Bagshot

I understand that the Academy will be adding another classroom and this will mean more cars. We need to work together on these issues.

#### **Reply from Mark Scarborough, Education Officer**

We are very lucky that we have such fabulous schools in Surrey, which attract students. I will be meeting with the Headteacher to look at all the issues of expansion.

#### 9. Cyril Pavey, local resident

Air travel – what support do SCC give to the group representing the 3 villages?

#### Reply from Mike Goodman

I think you are referring to the Department of Transport consultation on a third runway at Heathrow – There have been consultation events held local – but Surrey Heath have been missed out. I have written to the Minister, asking for a meeting to be held here so that people can give their views / input.

#### 10. Cyril Pavey, local resident

Can Councillors give an update on the Camberley line and the potential loss of 3 trains.

#### **Reply from Mike Goodman**

Michael Gove and I are meeting the franchisees and will be making it clear that it is not acceptable to lose 3 trains.

#### 11. Graham O'Connell, local resident

Frimley Green Village Green is protected greenspace and registered as common land. What are the two Councils doing together to protect the village green as the proposed new traffic lights will take some of the green.

#### Reply from the Chair

I have met with you on this and this issue has been in the press. At the moment this is not resolved. I would like to see another meeting on this.

#### 12. Tony Murphy, local resident

Is the current green waste collection scheme to cease?

#### Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC

We have negotiated a new contract from Feb 18 with Amey. There will be a seamless changeover and the green waste service will continue.

#### **Reply from Mike Goodman**

This is a really good example with 4 Borough and District Councils working together with SCC on their waste contract – which will save over £2million of public money.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Surrey Heath Local Area Committee 2 Mar 2017

#### <u>Annex B</u> Written Public Questions, Responses and Supplementary questions

#### Q1. Written question from Mrs Day, local resident re the Bagshot Traffic Lights

I was very interested to see that there were proposals to improve the A 30 in the Camberley area, but very disappointed to see that no mention is made of the most serious and frustrating problem in the area - the traffic jams caused by the traffic lights put in to deal with traffic from the new Waitrose and housing estate just the Camberley side of Bagshot.

The queues back from those sets of traffic lights in the direction of Sunningdale in the late afternoon are appalling day after day. What is being proposed by SCC to deal with that problem?

#### A1. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

Surrey County Council are currently consulting on improvements to the A30 through from the junction with Knoll Road to the junction with Laundrey Lane. Surrey County Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council are putting a bid to the M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for some funds to improve this section of the A30 and Camberley town centre. The signals in Bagshot would not be part of that proposal as it falls outside of the scope of the bid.

That being said, Surrey County Council are aware of congestion on the A30 through Bagshot. The signals at Waterers Way have been upgraded to work on a more advanced method of traffic assessment. The process did identify a few minor defects in the detectors at the junction which has since been resolved and made the length of green time given to each arm more considerate of the queues on that arm. In addition to the repairs and improvement of Waterers Way, we have also repaired loops and connectors related to the junction to make queue length assessment more reliable.

In addition to the repairs undertaken, Surrey County Council are progressing the linking of these two junctions to improve the flow of traffic along the A30 as well as minimise the impact of traffic joining from the connecting roads. However, doing this is not a simple process and requires both the replacement of the controller on Yaverland Drive as well as design of the program that controls the two junctions together. As a result, we cannot give a timescale at this stage, but will work with our contractors to get the improvements implemented in the near future.

On the matter of this junction, we are aware of the development of the nearby property into a drive through Costa. Alterations to the highway are necessary as part of the planning permission, but we will continue to monitor the impact the change will have on the junction.

#### Q2. Written question from Mrs Anderson, local resident re traffic through Chobham

What are the plans to mitigate the increased traffic in the Chobham area from agreed new developments such as Longcross Garden Village?

How will these plans change if the proposed Fairoaks Garden Village goes ahead?

#### A2. Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:

The Longcross (DERA) development is in two parts, the 'northern site' and the 'southern site'.

The <u>'northern site'</u> has already been granted planning permission for a mixed use housing and commercial development by Runnymede Borough Council. The 'northern site' promotes a transport mitigation package, which includes Longcross Road highway access works and other highway works elsewhere north and east of the site, to help reduce the road transport impacts of the development. Longcross railway station will be improved, have public access and have an increased train service.

This development will provide £165,000 towards traffic calming measures in Chobham, Windlesham, Bagshot if traffic increase trigger levels are met or exceeded.

The <u>'southern site'</u> does not have a planning permission and is not yet subject to a planning application. Consequently, there is not yet an agreed transport mitigation package to accompany the proposal.

There are currently no other major development sites, which have a planning permission or which are subject to a planning application / appeal, that have any highly significant road transport effects on the roads in the Chobham area.

#### Fairoaks Garden Village

Fairoaks Garden Village does not have a planning permission and is not yet subject to a planning application. Consequently, and like the Longcross 'southern site', there is not yet any agreed transport mitigation package to accompany the development.

In considering the developer's proposals for Fairoaks, officers will assess its road transport implications, including its effects on the roads in and around Chobham Village. This assessment will include consideration of the Longross developments and highway works associated with those sites, as well as other committed developments.

## **Local Committee Decision Tracker**

This Tracker monitors progress against the decisions that the local committee has made. It is updated after each committee using the 'RAG' (red, amber, green) ratings below.

Green: Actions are on track and progressing as expected towards the agreed deadline.

Amber: Action is off track but corrective measures are in place to meet the original or updated deadline.

Red: Action has not been progressed and is off track. Deadline will not be met.

NB. Once actions have been reported to the committee as complete, they are removed from the tracker.

Page 13	Meeting Date	Decision	Due By	RAG	Officer	Comment or Update
	2 July 15 Item 6d	Bagshot - After improvements to the junctions and traffic signals, situation to be reassessed to determine whether a yellow box is necessary.	2015/2016	Amber	A Milne	Situation currently being reassessed following completion of improvements to traffic signals along the A30.
	6 Mar 16 Item 8	Four-Way traffic lights Frimley Green. To arrange a meeting to include the two key petitioners, Surrey Highways, Surrey Heath Planning and the developers to explore possible alternative solutions.	June 2016	RED	A Stokes	Initial meeting held. Awaiting subsequent meeting to be held with Developers
	2 Mar 17 Item 5b	A petition was received requesting a 20mph speed limit, with relevant features, along Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road, Windlesham. The Area Highways Manager was asked to bring a designated 20mph scheme back to the next Local	15 June 2017	Green	A Milne	The proposal is being presented in the latest petition response being taken to the Local Committee on 13 July 2017



ITEM 3

Meeting Date	Decision	Due By	RAG	Officer	Comment or Update
	Committee.				
	The Chair was asked to write to the Cabinet Member stating Surrey Heath Local Committees' support for 20mph schemes within the local speed limit policy.	ASAP	Green	Chair	Letter sent to previous Cabinet Member (John Furey) on 7 March and response received on 14 March.



#### SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

#### LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: THURSDAY 13 July 2017

LEAD ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)

OFFICER:

SUBJECT: PETITION RESPONSE – 20MPH SPEED LIMIT (WITH TRAFFIC CALMING FEATURES) IN HEATHPARK DRIVE, BIRCH ROAD AND OAKWOOD ROAD, WINDLESHAM

#### DIVISION: BAGSHOT, WINDLESHAM AND CHOBHAM

#### SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

A petition was received at the Local Committee Public Meeting on 2 March 2017. The petition requested that the Committee consider introducing a 20mph speed limit, with relevant features, along Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road in Windlesham.

A report was presented in response to the petition recommending no further action at that time. However, the Local Committee agreed that more detailed consideration should be given to options for introducing a 20mph scheme and a further reported presented to the Local Committee at its meeting on 13 July 2017.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

#### The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note that:

- (i) Relevant traffic survey data indicates a good level of drive compliance with the 30mph speed limit on Heathpark Drive and suggests the existing speed limit is appropriate,
- (ii) Implementation of a lower speed limit would require traffic calming measures to be introduced to meet Surrey County Council policy,
- (iii) Collision data indicates there have been no personal injury collisions in Heathpark Drive, Birch Road or Oakwood Road since 2000 (earliest available data) and the roads have a good compared to many other locations in Surrey Heath,

#### The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to agree that:

- (iv) The existing 30mph speed limit in Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road, Windlesham should be retained and no further action taken at this time.
- (v) A further speed survey should be undertaken in Heathpark Drive once the Woodlands Lane bridge has reopened and traffic conditions in the area have returned to normal.



#### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The closure of Woodlands Lane bridge has directly affected the flow of traffic along Heathpark Drive and data collected recently reflects a temporary situation whilst the bridge remains closed.

Data collected on Heathpark Drive prior to the restriction of Woodlands Lane bridge show that average speeds along the road were appropriate for a 30mph speed limit. However, average speeds are such that lowering the speed limit would require traffic calming features to enforce the lower limit.

Collision data indicates there have been no personal injury collisions in Heathpark Drive, Birch Road or Oakwood Road since 2000 (earliest available data). As a result, it would be very difficult to justify the introduction of costly traffic calming measures when other roads in Surrey Heath have a much poorer safety record.

#### **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

#### **Petition details**

1.1 The petition received by Surrey County Council states:

"Further to previous discussions, please find enclosed our Petition sheets. This Petition is requesting a 20mph speed limit + additional calming measures (i.e. signage) in Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road. This has been raised by Mrs Jane Burge and Mrs Jenny Creamer, who have both lived in Heathpark Drive for over 40 years.

These are purely residential roads with a total of 130 houses. Over a four month period each household was visited, 240 signatures obtained, 1 household abstained and two houses were unoccupied – so there is overwhelming support. Residents stated extreme concern about the volume and speed of traffic and expressed very strong and varying aspect, if cars are parked in the road larger vehicles are mounting the pavements to proceed. There are elderly people, schoolchildren, babies in pushchairs, etc in this residential area and this is a very dangerous and wholly unacceptable practice.

Although the situation has been exacerbated by the M3 Smart Motorway project and the temporary loss of the Woodlands Lane Bridge, the problems and concerns have been building up over a long period of time. An independent traffic count was undertaken in September 2016 as shown overleaf where a total of 1844 vehicles were logged. It does not take account of any vehicle movement before 7am and after 7pm and was undertaken before the demolition of the Woodlands Lane bridge (19 November 2016) which has resulted in a marked worsening of the volume of traffic flow.

We respectfully request that our Petition for a 20mph speed limit be considered."

#### Previous consideration of petition

1.2 A report was presented in response to the petition at the meeting of the Surrey Heath Local Committee held on 2 March 2017. Having considered traffic survey data, the safety record for the roads and the County Council's

policy on setting speed limits the report recommended no further action at that time.

- 1.3 However, the Local Committee agreed that the Area Highways Manager should reconsider the recommendations with the local County Councillor and bring a further report back to the next meeting of the Local Committee.
- 1.4 The Area Highways Manager has since held discussions with the local County Councillor and the County Council's Road Safety Team Manager about the residents' request for a 20mph speed limit and the different types of measures that could potentially be introduced to help reduce vehicle speeds. These options are analysed in more detail within this report.

#### Location

1.5 Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road (Windlesham) are a group of residential roads located in the east of the village. The identified roads are shown in green in figure 1 below. Heathpark Drive is a connecting road between Chertsey Road (B386) and Woodlands Lane (C4). Oakwood Road is a cul-de-sac that connects to Heathpark Drive via Birch Road. In addition to Heathpark Drive, Updown Hill and Highams Lane are the only other roads in the village that connect Chertsey Road and Woodlands Lane. (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Map of Windlesham

#### Woodlands Lane bridge closure and replacement

1.6 Between its junctions with Heathpark Drive and Rye Grove, Woodlands Lane runs along a bridge over the M3. A survey undertaken by Highways England

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

in 2014 identified that the structure of this bridge had weakened and required a lower weight limit than the posted 23 Tonne weight restriction at the time.

- 1.7 Subsequent discussions between Highways England and Surrey County Council (SCC) resulted in an agreement that a temporary weight limit (3.5 Tonne) and width restriction (6'6") would be placed on the bridge until Highways England could replace it as part of the Managed Motorway scheme for the M3.
- 1.8 The temporary weight and width restrictions were introduced in 2014 and then Woodlands Lane was initially closed in May 2016 with the intention of demolishing the structure soon after. However, further reviews of the demolition process meant that the works had to be delayed. The road was reopened in June 2016 to minimise the impact on the local community. The road was again closed in November 2016 with the demolition of the bridge completed in the same month.
- 1.9 The bridge is due to be replaced and reopened during winter 2017. When the bridge is reopened, all weight and width restrictions will be lifted and all vehicles will be permitted to use Woodlands Lane.
- 1.10 Figure 2 below shows the extent of the existing temporary road closure (in red) in Woodlands Lane and the signed diversion route (in blue).
- 1.11 Whilst Heathpark Road is not part of the signed diversion route some drivers with local knowledge use the road as a diversion.



Figure 2: Woodlands Lane closure (red) and diversion route (blue)

Surrey County Council Setting Local Speed Limits policy

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

- 1.12 SCC's Setting Local Speed Limits policy was implemented in July 2014 in line with national guidance issued in 2013. The document details Surrey County Council's policy for considering changes in speed limits.
- 1.13 When considering a change in speed limits, SCC review the personal injury collision data for the road over the previous three years as well as the average vehicle speeds recorded on the road. Using that data, SCC will assess the suitability of the proposal in consultation with Surrey Police.

#### 20mph Speed Limits

- 1.14 SCC's Setting Local Speed Limits policy includes specific guidance relating to the introduction of 20mph speed limits. There are two different types of 20mph schemes, a 20mph speed limit and a 20mph zone. A 20mph speed limit is a scheme that relies on signing alone. A 20mph zone is a 20mph area where a combination of traffic calming and signage is used to enforce the speed limit.
- 1.15 SCC policy reflects national guidance (Department for Transport Circular 01/2013) in encouraging 20mph speed limits in "urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential" to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists. However, it also makes it clear that 20mph speed limits should be self-enforcing and not reliant on Police enforcement.
- 1.16 Circular 01/2013 emphasises that research into signed-only 20 mph speed limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds. Signed-only 20 mph speed limits are therefore most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. As such, the county council's policy is to only introduce signed-only 20mph speed limits where average speeds are 24mph or below.
- 1.17 Where the existing mean speeds are above 24 mph then a 20 mph scheme with traffic calming measures will be required. In accordance with the county's policy the Area Highways Team need to assess what type of traffic calming measures (e.g. narrowing the road, chicanes, priority give-way arrangements, central islands, gateways, or vertical traffic calming such as raised junctions, speed tables or speed cushions) will be appropriate and effective in achieving the necessary reduction in speed.
- 1.18 Traffic calming features will typically need to be located closer together in a 20mph speed limit then than would in 30mph speed limit in order to reduce speeds to below the required average speed threshold.
- 1.19 Careful consideration of the type of measures used is also required to ensure a sufficient reduction in speed is achieved. For example, the use of horizontal traffic calming features in isolation may not result in an acceptable reduction in speed levels unless they result in a significant angle of deflection for traffic. Similarly, the use of speed cushions extensively in a 20mph zone may not result in an acceptable reduction in speeds.

#### Assessment of schemes to reduce speed limits

1.20 The County Council's policy on setting speed limits requires that surveys are undertaken following implementation of a scheme to check whether it has

been successful in reducing vehicle speeds towards compliance with the new lower speed limit.

1.21 If the scheme has not been successful in reducing speeds to a level below the threshold set out in the county's speed limit policy, then a report will be presented to the Local Committee. The report will consider further engineering measures that could be introduced to encourage greater compliance with the new speed limit or alternatively whether the new lower limit should be removed and the previous speed limit reinstated.

#### 2. ANALYSIS:

#### Traffic Survey Data

2.1 SCC undertook two sets of traffic surveys on Heathpark Drive in 2016 to review the impact the closure of Woodlands Lane bridge had on Heathpark Drive. The first survey was undertaken in May when Woodlands Lane was originally closed but was ultimately reopened soon after. The second survey was undertaken in July 2016 after the bridge had been reopened, albeit with a 3.5T weight limit and 6'6" width restriction in place. The results of the two surveys have been provided below.

Woodlands Lane restriction	Start Date	End Date	Total Vehicles	5 Day Ave.	7 Day Ave.	Average Mean Speed (mph)
Full closure	Thu 12/05/16	Wed 18/05/16	13,578	2,343	1,940	27.7
3.5T weight limit and 6'6" width restriction	Mon 11/07/16	Sun 17/07/16	11,793	2,111	1,684	27.3
Difference	-	-	1,785	232	256	0.4

Table 1: Traffic survey results

- 2.2 The data in table 1 suggests that the closure of Woodlands Lane bridge increases the number of vehicles using Heathpark Drive by approximately 200 to 300 vehicles a day. However, the closure of Woodlands Lane is a temporary measure whilst the bridge is replaced. Once the bridge has been replaced, all restrictions will be removed and traffic flows in Windlesham and the surrounding network will adjust to the new arrangement.
- 2.3 Any assessment to consider a change to the speed limit or the introduction of road safety measures should be undertaken when normal traffic conditions exist. However, the above data was recorded when there were restrictions in place that have temporarily impacted on traffic flows and speeds in Heathpark Drive.
- 2.4 SCC does not have any traffic survey data for the period prior to any restrictions being imposed and it is not currently possible to record data under normal traffic conditions since the Woodlands Lane bride is closed until winter 2017

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

- 2.5 However, Surrey Police undertook a survey on both Heathpark Drive and Woodlands Lane in 2013 prior to any restrictions being imposed on the bridge. This data is therefore the most valid information currently available to give an indication of vehicles speeds and volumes in Heathpark Drive under normal traffic conditions. As such, this data has been used in assessing the residents request for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit.
- 2.6 The data recorded by Surrey Police indicated a weekly total of 6,451 vehicles on Heathpark Drive and 27,208 vehicles on Woodlands Lane. The data also showed average speeds of 30mph.
- 2.7 The closure of Woodlands Lane bridge is expected to last until Winter 2017 when Highways England will reopen the bridge with no restrictions. Once the road has been reopened, traffic currently using Heathpark Drive as a diversion is likely to return to using Woodlands Lane.





#### Personal injury collisions

2.8 Personal injury collision data shows that there have been no personal injury collisions in Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road between January 2000 (earliest available data) and April 2017 (latest available data).

#### 3. OPTIONS:

#### **Recommended Option:**

3.1 Speed survey data indicates a good level of driver compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit in Heathpark Drive which suggests the existing www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

speed limit is appropriate. The road also has a very good safety record with no personal injury collisions having occurred in Heathpark Drive (or Birch Road or Oakwood Road) since 2011.

- 3.2 Furthermore, it would not be appropriate to introduce a 20mph speed limit with signing alone based on the existing average speed of 30mph. As such, it is recommended that the existing 30mph speed limit is retained.
- 3.3 However, it is also recommended that a further traffic survey is undertaken following the reopening of Woodlands Lane bridge to check vehicle speeds and volumes have not changed significantly from those recorded by the survey undertaken by Surrey Police in 2013.

#### Other options considered:

3.4 A number of alternative options have also been considered. These are detailed below together with the reasons why they are not considered appropriate and have not been recommended:

#### 20mph speed limit with signing only

- 3.5 The existing average vehicle speed is significantly above the threshold at which a 20mph with signing only can be introduced under SCC's speed limit policy.
- 3.6 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit with signing only would therefore be contrary to SCC policy. Furthermore, evidence suggests it is unlikely to result in a significant reduction in vehicle speeds.
- 3.7 A scheme of this type is likely to cost in the region of £10,000.

#### 20mph speed limit with vehicle activated signs (VAS)/road markings

- 3.8 The introduction of VAS can help reduce vehicle speeds. However, having considered this option in consultation with SCC's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police, it is considered that the introduction of VAS alone would not reduce speeds to below 24mph (given the existing average speed and the reduction in speed typically achieved at other locations where VAS have been installed in Surrey).
- 3.9 Measures such as road markings or coloured road surfacing which are likely to have a relatively limited impact on reducing vehicle speeds in isolation could be used as part of a package of measures in conjunction with VAS. However, the combined impact of such a package of measures is still unlikely to achieve the required reduction in average speeds from 30mph to 24mph or less.
- 3.10 A scheme of this type is likely to cost in the region of £15,000 £20,000.

#### 20mph zone with vertical traffic calming measures

3.11 It would be possible to introduce a 20mph speed limit together with vertical traffic calming measures (such raised junctions, speed tables or speed cushions) to reduce average vehicles speeds to below the 24mph threshold.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

- 3.12 The traffic calming measures would need to be spaced much closer together than they would typically be when introduced in a 30mph speed limit. As such, a significant number of features would be required over the length of Heathpark Drive. The overall cost of a scheme of this nature is therefore likely to exceed £100,000 (when including legal, consultation and design costs) depending on the type of traffic calming measures introduced. (Additional traffic surveys would also be necessary on Birch Road and Oakwood Road to determine whether features would be necessary on these roads as well.)
- 3.13 A scheme of this nature would be difficult to justify as a priority when Heathpark Drive has a much better safety record and level of driver compliance with the existing speed limit compared to many other roads in Surrey Heath.

#### 20mph zone with horizontal traffic calming measures

- 3.14 Similar to a scheme with vertical traffic calming measures, horizontal traffic calming measures (such as road narrowings, chicanes or pinch points) would have to be carefully designed to achieve the required reduction in speed. Measures would need to be spaced appropriately and designed to narrow the road sufficiently or create adequate deflection of traffic.
- 3.15 Given the nature of the location and traffic flows, lower cost measures are unlikely to achieve the required reduction in speed. For example, using staggered parking areas to create a chicane effect can be effective in reducing speeds where you have high levels of on-street parking throughout the day and relatively large vehicle flows. However, the low levels of on-street parking combined with relatively low vehicle flows over much of the day mean such a proposal would have limited impact in reducing vehicle speeds in Heathpark Drive. Similarly, relatively low vehicle flows over much of the day and good forward visibility would reduce the effectiveness of priority give ways in reducing speeds.
- 3.16 A scheme using horizontal traffic calming measures to achieve the required reduction in speed is therefore likely to cost a similar amount to a vertical traffic calming scheme. It would therefore be similarly difficult to justify in the circumstances.

#### 20mph zone with horizontal and vertical traffic calming measures

3.17 Based on the nature of the location and traffic flows, a scheme using a combination of horizontal and vertical traffic calming measures is likely to be more effective in reducing vehicle speeds than a scheme using horizontal traffic calming measures along. However, costs would still be significant and comparable to introducing a scheme using just vertical traffic calming measures.

#### 4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 Surrey Police have been consulted and provided the below comment:

 Surrey Police will only support the proposal should it meet the current policy. Based on current data, support for the 20mph speed limit would be reliant on average speeds being reduced to below 24mph through the introduction of traffic calming following the replacement of Woodlands Lane bridge.

#### 5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 There are no financial implications for Local Committee budgets resulting from the recommendations of this report.

#### 6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 The Highway Service is mindful of its needs within this area and to treat all users of the public highway with equality and understanding.

#### 7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works.
- 7.2 This report responds to concerns raised by members of the local community in Windlesham.

#### **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:		
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising		
	from this report		
Sustainability (including Climate	No significant implications arising		
Change and Carbon Emissions)	from this report.		
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications arising		
Children	from this report.		
Safeguarding responsibilities for	No significant implications arising		
vulnerable children and adults	from this report.		
Public Health	No significant implications arising		
	from this report.		

#### 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 Residents of Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road have requested the introduction of a 20mph speed limit.
- 9.2 Woodlands Lane is currently closed between it junctions with Heathpark Drive and Rye Close to allow Highways England to replace the bridge over the M3 (with the road due to reopen in winter 2017). This has resulted in an increased volume of traffic using Heathpark Road. As such, it is not currently possible to undertake a traffic survey to measure vehicle speeds and volumes under normal conditions.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

- 9.3 However, Surrey Police carried out a survey on Woodlands Lane in 2013 prior to any restrictions being imposed along Woodhams Lane. This data has therefore been used in the assessment of the residents request since it is the most valid data currently available to give an indication of vehicles speeds and volumes in Heathpark Drive under normal traffic conditions.
- 9.4 The Police's survey recorded an average vehicle speed of 30mph in Heathpark Drive which indicates a relatively good level of compliance with the 30mph speed limit and suggests the existing speed limit is appropriate.
- 9.5 The 30mph average speed is significantly above the 24mph threshold specified in SCC's speed limit policy for introducing a 20mph speed limit by signing alone. As such, if a 20mph speed limit were to introduced additional measures would also need to be implemented to reduce the existing vehicle speeds.
- 9.6 Surrey Police has advised it would only support the proposal should it meet the conditions in the current policy. When reviewing the possible options, Surrey Police supported the introduction of traffic calming, believing all other options to not reduce average speeds to below 24mph.
- 9.7 The different types of measures that could be introduced to reduce vehicle speeds have been considered in this report. However, it is considered that the very significant reduction in average speed from 30mph to 24mph or below could only be realistically achieved by implementing a comprehensive traffic calming scheme consisting of either vertical traffic calming measures or a combination of vertical and horizontal traffic calming measures.
- 9.8 It would be difficult to justify the cost of introducing such a scheme in Heathpark Drive when the location has a much better safety record than many other residential roads in Surrey Heath. Such a proposal would also conflict with the aim of achieving the greatest possible reduction in personal injury collisions with the limited funding that is available.
- 9.9 It is therefore recommended that the existing 30mph speed limit is retained and no further action is taken at the current time. However, once the Woodlands Lane bridge has been reopened it is recommended that a further traffic survey is undertaken to check vehicle speeds and volumes have not changed significantly from those recorded by the survey undertaken by Surrey Police in 2013.

#### 10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 A further speed survey will be undertaken in Heathpark Drive once the motorway bridge has been replaced in Woodlands Lane and the road has reopened.

#### Contact Officer:

Peter Orchard (Assistant Engineer – 0300 200 1003)

**Consulted:** Surrey Police

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

#### Annexes:

- Annex 1 - Surrey CC Setting Local Speed Limits Policy

#### Sources/background papers:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

Page 26



Making Surrey a better place

# **Setting Local Speed Limits**

### **Surrey County Council's Policy**





#### 1. Introduction

The aim of Surrey County Council is to set speed limits that are successful in managing vehicle speeds and are appropriate for the main use of the road. Reducing speeds successfully may reduce the likelihood and severity of collisions, and can help to encourage more walking and cycling. This can help to make communities more pleasant places to live, and can help sustain local shops and businesses. The desire for lower speeds has to be balanced against the need for reasonable journey times and the position of the road within the county council's Strategic Priority Network.

The purpose of this policy is to explain the roles, responsibilities and the procedure that will be followed by Surrey County Council when deciding whether to change a speed limit. The policy also provides advice and guidance on the factors and additional supporting measures that may be needed to ensure successful management of vehicle speeds.

This policy has been developed with reference to national policy issued by central government "Setting Local Speed Limits, Department for Transport Circular 01/2013" and national policy issued by the Association of Chief Police Officers, "Speed Enforcement Policy Guidelines 2011 to 2015: Joining Forces for Safer Roads". This policy was approved by the county council's cabinet on 24 June 2014 and became effective on 3 July 2014.

#### 2. Key Principles

#### **National speed limits**

The three national speed limits are:

- the 30 mph speed limit on roads with street lighting (sometimes referred to as Restricted Roads)
- the national speed limit of 60 mph on single carriageway roads
- the national speed limit of 70 mph on dual carriageways and motorways.

These national speed limits are not, however, appropriate for all roads. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities like Surrey County Council to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a need for a speed limit which is different from the national speed limit. For example while higher speed limits are appropriate for strategic roads between main towns, lower speed limits will usually apply within towns and villages. A limit of 20 mph may be appropriate in residential areas, busy shopping streets and near schools where the needs and safety of pedestrians and cyclists should have greater priority. Changing from the national speed limit on a road will require that speed limit repeater signs are provided along the route to indicate the new speed limit.

#### **Decision making and responsibilities**

Within Surrey decisions over most highway matters including setting speed limits are delegated to local committees of elected county council and borough/district councillors. There is a local committee in each of the 11 boroughs and districts within Surrey. Each local committee is provided with an annual budget from Surrey County Council for highway improvements throughout their area, and then the local committee decides


where best to invest their budget in response to local concerns to tackle congestion, improve accessibility, improve safety and support the local economy. Therefore any proposals for changing speed limits including the signing, legal speed limit order and supporting highway measures would require agreement and allocation of funding by the local committee from their budget for highway improvements.

The county council's Area Highways Team, who report to the local committee, will lead the process to assess a potential change in speed limit. The Area Highways Team will be assisted by the county council's central Road Safety Team and will consult with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. The output would be a report and recommendations (in accordance with this policy) for consideration by the local committee, who will then decide whether to allocate funding for a scheme to change the existing speed limit or not.

## Speed limits and speed management

Experience shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic by very much if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. There should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. It is also important to set reasonable speed limits to ensure consistency across the country.

Therefore speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased police enforcement to penalise substantial numbers of motorists.

## 20 mph speed limits and zones

Within the latest central government guidance issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) there is greater encouragement for local authorities to introduce more 20 mph schemes (limits and zones) in urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential, to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Circular 01/2013 emphasises that research into signed-only 20 mph speed limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds. Signed-only 20 mph speed limits are therefore most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. If the mean speed is already at or below 24 mph on a road, introducing a 20 mph speed limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit. Table 2 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a signed-only 20 mph speed limit.

Where the existing mean speeds are above 24 mph then a 20 mph scheme with traffic calming measures (known as a 20 mph zone) will be required. Research has shown that 20 mph zones with traffic calming measures have been very effective in reducing speeds and casualties, may encourage modal shift towards more walking and cycling and may result reductions in traffic flow on the road as vehicles choose alternative routes.



However traffic calming measures are more expensive and are not always universally popular. Table 1 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a 20 mph zone with traffic calming.

It is possible to implement 20 mph schemes that consist of a combination of physical features (where existing speeds are high), and signs alone (where speeds are already low) on different sections of the same road.

Research has shown that mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits that apply only at certain times of day (using an electronic sign) are not very effective at managing vehicle speeds. Surrey police do not support 20 mph speed limits that are not generally self enforcing. The electronic variable message signage that would be required for a mandatory variable 20 mph speed limit would also place an additional maintenance burden on the county council for little benefit. Therefore Surrey County Council will not support the use of new mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits.

#### Speed limits outside schools

Requests are often made for lower speed limits outside schools as a result of concerns over the safety of children outside schools. It is the policy of Surrey County Council that there should always be an overall assessment of the safety issues outside a school to investigate and define the problem rather than consideration of the speed limit in isolation. For example the problems may be associated with inconsiderate parking or difficulties in crossing a road that will not be solved through a change in speed limit on its own. Therefore the county council have published a separate policy "Road Safety Outside Schools" that describes how concerns over road safety outside schools will be investigated.

School leadership and parents also have a vital role to play in ensuring the safety of children on the journey to school. Therefore an assessment of the road safety education provided within the school and the school's travel plan will always be undertaken alongside an assessment of the road safety situation outside the school gate.

Department for Transport regulations now allow the use of advisory "20 when lights show" with amber flashing lights on the approach to schools. However the influence of these signs on vehicle speeds is likely to be minimal and is not enforceable as it is an advisory sign, not a compulsory change in the speed limit. Regulations do not permit amber flashing lights to be used on the approach to signal controlled crossings or zebra crossings.



# 3. Procedure to decide whether to change a speed limit

#### STEP 1: Request to change a speed limit is received

Any requests to change speed limits should be submitted to Surrey Highways via www.surreycc.gov.uk or by calling 0300 200 1003. The Area Highways Team will then consider the request and if necessary will consult with the local member and local committee to decide whether to proceed with a full speed limit assessment. Reference will be made to the position of the road on the county council's Strategic Priority Network. If necessary the local committee may need to allocate funding for the speed limit assessment to be completed (to pay for speed surveys for example).

The Area Highway Team will determine the extent of the road to be assessed. The length of road over which a speed limit change is being considered should be at least 600m. This should ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist within a short space of road. However in some cases a slightly shorter length may be suitable where existing highway or roadside features provide a natural threshold which may complement a change in speed limit.

#### STEP 2: Measure existing speeds and analyse road casualty data

The Area Highways Team will commission one week automatic surveys of vehicle speeds (in both directions) in order to gather comprehensive data on existing mean vehicle speeds on the road. Several different speed survey locations may be required for longer stretches of road. If automatic surveys of vehicle speeds are not possible then a sample of speeds will be undertaken using a hand held speed measuring device at different times of the day to ensure the sample is representative.

Research has shown that reduced vehicle speeds reduce the risk of collision and also reduce the consequences and severity of any injuries, irrespective of the primary cause. Therefore the Road Safety Team will assess the number and pattern of road casualties along any route where a new speed limit is proposed, with particular attention given to vulnerable road casualties such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. This analysis will help inform the need for any speed management measures to reduce the risk of collisions and to reduce the severity of road casualties, especially vulnerable road users.

#### STEP 3: Compare the existing speeds with the suggested new speed limit

National policy issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) provides formulas derived from real examples of speed limit changes to predict the likely impact on traffic speeds of a change in speed limit. Table 2 shows the predicted reductions in mean vehicle speeds following a change to a new lower speed limit using the Department for Transport formulas.

For each speed limit change scenario within Table 2, a threshold is shown by a vertical line. If the measured existing mean speeds are below the threshold then the council will allow a change to a signed-only lower speed limit without supporting measures. If this is the case then proceed to STEP 5.



If the measured existing mean vehicle speeds are above the threshold, then the county council will not allow a lower speed limit without consideration of supporting engineering measures. In this case proceed to STEP 4.

It is anticipated that Table 2 presents data for the vast majority of speed limit change scenarios. However if there happens to be a scenario not covered by the table, then the Area Highways Manager will choose the example in the table that in their opinion provides the closest match to the case in question.

If more than one speed survey has been completed on a longer stretch of road, then it is possible that supporting engineering measures may be required on one part of the road, but not the other. Another option may be to introduce the proposed new lower speed limit on only one part of the road. Caution should be taken in cases where the proposed lower limit is above the existing measured mean speeds as this could have the effect of increasing mean speeds if drivers treat the new speed limit as a target.

Nearly all requests received in relation to speed limits are for a reduction in a speed limit. However though it is likely to be rare, it is also possible to consider a request for an increase in a speed limit. In these cases it should be assumed that this would have the effect which is the exact reverse of the effect of the equivalent speed limit reduction described within Table 2. Extreme care should be taken in any decision to increase a speed limit as this could result in increased speeds and increased risk and severity of collisions.

## STEP 4: Conduct feasibility of supporting engineering measures

Where it is found that the existing measured mean vehicle speeds are too great for a signed-only change to a lower speed limit to be successful, then consideration of supporting engineering measures will be required.

The Area Highways Team will commission feasibility work on what measures may be possible. These may include traffic calming such as narrowing the road, chicanes, priority give-way arrangements, central islands, gateways, or vertical traffic calming. Speed reducing features could also form part of improved facilities for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. However some forms of traffic calming will not be appropriate on major routes with large traffic flows and heavy vehicles, and it may be the case that speed reducing features and a reduction in speed limit is not always viable or desirable for some strategically important roads. For example vertical traffic calming cannot be used on roads that are 40 mph or greater. Accordingly the feasibility work and decision to change a speed limit will need to take into account the position of the road within the county's Strategic Priority Network.

## STEP 5: Consult with Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team

As Surrey police are responsible for the enforcement of speed limits it is essential that they are consulted on any proposals to change a speed limit and consideration of supporting engineering measures. Surrey police have a specialist Road Safety and Traffic Management Team who will be presented with the proposals for the new lower speed limit and any supporting engineering measures along with evidence of existing and predicted mean speeds and road casualty analysis. The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team will be recorded in writing and included within the subsequent report to the local committee. It may also be helpful to seek the views of local parish council's for inclusion within the report to the local committee too.



# STEP 6: Local committee decision and allocation of funding

A report describing the outcome of the speed limit assessment and recommendations will be submitted to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The report will include:

- a description of the position of the road within Surrey's Strategic Priority Network
- a summary of existing speed survey results
- a summary of the history and pattern of road collisions resulting in injury reported to the police, highlighting especially any vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people
- the predicted speeds following a change in speed limit
- recommendations for a new speed limit and supporting engineering measures if required
- estimated costs of the scheme
- the views of Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team

The local committee will then decide whether to proceed with the change in speed limit or not, along with supporting engineering measures (where also recommended). If the committee decide to proceed, then the committee will need to allocate money from their budget to fund the scheme. Alternatively the committee may decide not to proceed because the scheme is not warranted, or because they may have other priorities for investment of their budget at that time.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety.

## STEP 7: Advertisement of legal speed limit order and implementation

If the local committee decide to proceed with a speed limit change, then in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, a legal speed limit order will be advertised so that people have the opportunity to comment on the proposals if they wish to. Any objections will be considered in line with the county council's constitution. Following advertisement, and after any objections are resolved or over-ruled, then the scheme will be implemented by the county council's highway contractors. Alternatively if the objections are upheld, then the scheme will not proceed.

## STEP 8: Monitoring of success of scheme

After at least three months following implementation of the scheme, a one week automatic speed survey will be commissioned by the Area Highways Team. The "after" surveys will be undertaken using the same method as the "before" surveys to allow for a direct comparison to check whether the scheme has been successful in reducing vehicle speeds towards compliance with the new lower speed limit. The county council's Road Safety Team will compile data on before and after speed monitoring following speed limit changes so as to inform the need for any updates to this policy.

If the scheme has not been successful in reducing speeds to a level below the threshold contained within Table 2, then the Area Highway Manager will submit a further report to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The report will include a summary of the before and after speed surveys and consideration of



any further engineering measures that may be possible to encourage greater compliance with the new speed limit. An alternative could be to remove the new lower speed limit and return to the original or different, higher speed limit.

The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management team will be sought, recorded in writing and included within the report to the local committee. This will include an explanation of whether any additional police enforcement would be possible to encourage compliance with the new lower speed limit.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety.

# Tables to Show Predicted Change in Mean Speeds Following a Change in Speed Limit

The following definitions are used in the tables below and are the same as those used nationally by the Department for Transport in relation to setting speed limits. The formulas used to generate the values within the tables are taken from Annex A of "Setting Local Speed Limits", Department for Transport Circular 01/2013.

Urban – roads with a system of street lighting (three or more lamps throwing light on the carriageway and placed not more than 183 metres apart). Rural – roads without a system of street lighting described above.

Rural Village – roads without a system of street lighting described above but with 20 or more houses (on one or both sides of the road); and a minimum length of 600 metres; and an average density of at least 3 houses per 100 metres, for each 100 metres.

#### Table 1 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a reduction to a 20 mph speed limit (with traffic calming)

Measured mean speed before	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Predicted mean speed after	14.9	15.1	15.3	15.5	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.5	16.7	16.9	17.1	17.4	17.6	17.8	18.1	18.3	18.5	18.7	19.0	19.2	19.4
able 2 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a signed-only reduction in speed limit																					
Change from urban and rural 30 mph speed limit to 20 mph speed limit (without traffic calming)																					
Measured mean speed before	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Predicted mean speed after	19.9	20.6	21.4	22.2	23.0	23.7	24.5	25.3	26.1	26.8	27.6	28.4	29.2	29.9	30.7	31.5	32.2	33.0	33.8	34.6	35.3
		New low	er spee	d limit a	llowed	New lo	wer spe	ed limit	only allo	wed wit	h suppo	rting hig	hway m	easures	;						
Change from urban 40 mpł	n spee	ed lim	it to 3	0 mp	h spe	ed lim	nit														
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	30.5	30.7	30.9	31.2	31.4	31.7	31.9	32.2	32.4	32.7	32.9	33.2	33.4	33.7	33.9	34.1	34.4	34.6	34.9	35.1	35.4
			New low	er spee	d limit a	llowed	New lo	wer spe	ed limit	only allo	wed wit	h suppo	rting hig	hway m	easures						
				••••				•.													
Change from rural village 4	0 mp	h spe	ed lim	nit to :	30mp	h spe	ed lim	lit													
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	29.3	30.1	30.9	31.6	32.4	33.2	33.9	34.7	35.4	36.2	37.0	37.7	38.5	39.3	40.0	40.8	41.6	42.3	43.1	43.8	44.6
			New low	er spee	d limit a	llowed	New lo	wer spe	ed limit	only allo	wed wit	h suppo	rting hig	hway m	easures						
Change from rural village 5	0 mp	h or 6	0 mpl	n spe	ed lim	it to 3	30 mp	h spe	ed lin	nit											
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	29.2	29.9	30.7	31.4	32.1	32.8	33.5	34.2	35.0	35.7	36.4	37.1	37.8	38.6	39.3	40.0	40.7	41.4	42.2	42.9	43.6
	New lower speed limit allowed New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures																				

ITEM 5a

# Table 2 Continued

Page 36

Change from rural village	e 50 mp	h or 6	50 mp	h spe	ed lin	nit to	40 mp	oh spe	ed lir	nit											
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
Predicted mean speed after	37.5	38.1	38.8	39.4	40.1	40.8	41.4	42.1	42.8	43.4	44.1	44.8	45.4	46.1	46.7	47.4	48.1	48.7	49.4	50.1	50.7
				New lov	wer spee	ed limit a	llowed	New lo	ower spe	ed limit	only alk	owed wi	th suppo	orting hig	ghway n	neasure	S				
Change from rural single	e carriag	jeway	/ 50 m	ıph sı	beed l	imit te	o 40 n	nph s	peed	limit											
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
Predicted mean speed after	37.5	38.1	38.8	39.4	40.1	40.8	41.4	42.1	42.8	43.4	44.1	44.8	45.4	46.1	46.7	47.4	48.1	48.7	49.4	50.1	50.7
				New lov	wer spee	ed limit a	llowed	New lo	ower spe	eed limit	only all	owed wi	th suppo	orting hig	ghway n	neasure	S				
Change from rural single	e carriag	jeway	/ 60 m	ıph sp	beed l	imit te	o 40 n	nph s	peed	limit											
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
Predicted mean speed after	38.7	39.4	40.1	40.9	41.6	42.3	43.0	43.7	44.5	45.2	45.9	46.6	47.4	48.1	48.8	49.5	50.2	51.0	51.7	52.4	53.1
				New lov	wer spee	ed limit a	llowed	New k	ower spe	ed limit	only all	owed wi	th suppo	orting hig	ghway n	neasure	S				
Change from rural single	e carriag	jeway	/ 60 m	ıph sp	beed l	imit te	o 50 n	nph s	peed	limit											
Measured mean speed before	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70
Predicted mean speed after	47.6	48.3	49.1	49.9	50.6	51.4	52.2	53.0	53.7	54.5	55.3	56.0	56.8	57.6	58.4	59.1	59.9	60.7	61.5	62.2	63.0
					New lov	wer spee	ed limit a	llowed	New lo	ower spe	eed limit	only all	owed wi	th suppo	orting hi	ghway n	neasure	S			
Changes on rural dual ca	arriagew	/ays f	rom 7	70 mp	h, 60	mph,	or 50	mph	to a lo	ower	limit										
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
Predicted mean speed after	42.8	43.3	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	45.9	46.5	47.0	47.5	48.0	48.6	49.1	49.6	50.1	50.7	51.2	51.7	52.2	52.8	53.3
			New lov	ver 40 m	nph spee	ed limit a	llowed							New low	ver 50 m	nph spee	ed limit a	llowed			
Measured mean speed before	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
Predicted mean speed after	53.3	53.8	54.4	54.9	55.4	55.9	56.5	57.0	57.5	58.0	58.6	59.1	59.6	60.1	60.7	61.2	61.7	62.2	62.8	63.3	63.8
					New low	ver 60 m	iph spee	ed limit a	llowed												

REY

# SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 13 JULY 2017

LEAD ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)

OFFICER:

SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

# SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2017/18 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2017/18 financial year.
- (ii) Note the budgetary position.
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

## **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

# **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users, through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

# 2. ANALYSIS:

## 2.1 Capital works programme for 2016/17

- 2.1.1 The 2016/17 capital works programme shown in Table 1 was formally approved by the Surrey Heath Local Committee in a public meeting held on 10 December 2015.
- 2.1.2 The 2016/17 Committee capital budget was £268,430. In addition, there were a number of other sources of income (including developer relating funding and reimbursements received for works undertaken on behalf of utilities in 2015/16 ) which resulted in an overall available budget of £366,592.
- 2.1.3 The outturn budget figure shown in Table 1 indicates an over spend of £5,911 which will be carried forward. This overspend is due to unexpected costs from last year's schemes.

Scheme Name	Detail/Limits	Progress	Estimated cost (£)	End year Outturn(£)
Carry forward cost (2015/16)	From works		50,551	50,551
Borough Wide Signal Update (2015/16)	Installing MOVA at A30/A325 Junction, Camberley	Final implementation of MOVA due end of June	0 (Now being funded by Traffic Signals team)	0
A319 High Street jctn with Chertsey Road – junction improvement	Feasibility, consultation and design - The scheme will consider options for the junction and consult the public on the options that come out of the assessment	Modelling of scheme complete. Public consultation to start in September.	10,000	16,617
A322 Guildford Road jctn with Brentmoor Road – pedestrian facility improvements	<b>Construct only</b> - Assessment of junction still with SCC Traffic Signals Team	Scheme complete. Stage 3 Safety Audit to be reviewed.	83,575	89,314

D3448 Coleford Bridge Road/Hamesm oor Road – traffic management	Feasibility, design and construct - The road is currently on the Surrey Heath Speed Management Plan and surveys by Surrey Police suggest further	Scheme complete	30,000	21,815
	improvements are required.			
A319 Bagshot Road, Chobham – new footway	Design only – Establish a cost for a footway between Chobham and Halebourne Lane to complete the footway between Chobham and West End.	Design and cost estimation complete.	14,142	14,737
B311 Upper Chobham Road, Frimley – Traffic calming measures	Design only - Determine accurate costs for the scheme proposals arising from safety outside school report, including speed cushions, speed tables and waiting restrictions.	Detailed design complete.	10,000	4,944
D3448 Coleford Bridge Road – new footway	<b>Design only</b> - drawing from any previous design work available.	Scheme complete	12,000	11,155
A319 Chertsey Road, Chobham – speed reducing features.	Feasibility, consultation and design - This scheme should be progress in conjunction with 06 to combine consultation opportunities.	Consultation complete.	15,000	22,578
A30 London Road, Camberley LSR	LSR - Golf Rbt & approaches	Completed	109,586	109,586
Ferniehurst microsurfacing	LSR	Completed (but costs to be met from 2017/18 budget)	8,877	0

Kier Overhead	Estimated Forecast	-	21 621	21.206
and Profit			51,031	31,200
Total			£375,362	£372,503

Table 1 – Capital works prog	ramme for 2016/17
------------------------------	-------------------

## 2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2016/17

2.2.1 The 2016/17 revenue maintenance allocation for Surrey Heath was £150,529. Table 2 shows how these funds were allocated, and the end of year outturn figures.

Item	Allocation (£)	Committed to date (£)
Drainage / ditching	30,000	7,385
Carriageway and	35,000	53,575
footway patching		
Vegetation works	60,000	74,586
Signs and markings	10,000	3,959
Low cost measures	15,529	15,051
Kier OHP		4,971 (included in allocation figures)
Total	150,529	£159,527

#### Table 2 – 2016/17 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

#### 2.3 Community Enhancement Fund 2016/17

- 2.3.1 The total 2016/17 Community Enhancement allocation for Surrey Heath is £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members.
- 2.3.2 The outturn position is shown in Table 3.

Member	Allocation	Committed to date(£)
	(£)	
Bill Chapman	5,000	5,000
Denis Fuller	5,000	5,000
David Ivison	5,000	5,000
Chris Pitt	5,000	5,000
Mike Goodman	5,000	5,000
Adrian Page	5,000	5,000
Total	30,000	30,000 committed

Table 3 –	Community	y Enhancement	Fund	spend	progress
-----------	-----------	---------------	------	-------	----------

## 2.4 Capital Works Program for 2017/18

2.4.1 When the Highways Update report was presented to the Surrey Heath Local Committee on 8 December 2016, the 2017/18 Committee capital budget for Surrey Heath had yet to be confirmed. Whilst a reduction in the budget was expected, the pressures that are being placed on the County Council's www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath budgets generally have meant that the reduction is more significant than anticipated. The capital budget for 2017/18 has been confirmed as £36,363 which is a reduction of £232,067 on the 2016/17 figure of £268,430.

- 2.4.2 In addition there are total developer contributions of £402,980 available and an over spend of £5,911 to be carried forward from 2016/17. This therefore gives an overall budget of £433,432.
- 2.4.3 The capital works programme is presented as a combined programme of ITS and capital maintenance works to provide a clearer picture of works and budgets. The programme shown in Table 4 below was formally approved by the Surrey Heath Local Committee at its public meeting held on 8 December 2016.
- 2.4.4 In addition to the schemes approved by the Local Committee in December, a new scheme has been identified to provide a shared cycle route along London Road (A30) in Bagshot. The scheme will connect the shared cycleways from outside Waitrose in Bagshot to The Maultway roundabout and will be funded through developer contributions.
- 2.4.5 The reduction in the Local Committee's capital allocation will clearly reduce the scope of this year's work programme from that which was originally approved by the Local Committee and we will continue to deliver the schemes in the priority order below. The schemes that are now likely to be unaffordable have been retained in table 4 as contingency schemes.

		Estimated	Update
Scheme Name	Detail/Limits	cost (£)	
High Street,	Consultation, Design and	130,000	Public
Bagshot	<b>Construction -</b> Public consultation		consultation
(Developer	and implementation of developer		complete.
Contribution	funded improvements in the village		Relevant
scheme)	centre		options being designed
A30 London Road	<b>Design and Construct</b> – Design and	272,980	Design
(Developer	construction of a shared cycle lane		underway
Contribution	between Waitrose and The		
scheme)	Maultway roundabout		
Windlesham &	Design, consultation and construct -		Traffic
Chobham Weight	Implementation of decision relating		Regulation
Limit Introduction	to the petition received by Local	30.000	Order (TRO)
	Committee	30,000	currently out
			for statutory
			consultation
D517 Watts Farm	Design and Construction - One-way	5,000	Design
Parade	section along Watts Farm Parade		underway
B311 Upper	Construction only - Implementation	40,000	Contingency
Chobham Road,	of design work undertaken in		Scheme
Frimley	2016/17		
D3588 Old Bisley	Design and Construction - Design of	20,000	Contingency
Road, Frimley	staged implementation of traffic		Scheme
	calming features with		

	implementation of VAS in first year		
A319 Chertsey	Construction only - Implementation	25,000	Contingency
Road, Chobham	of speed reducing features being		Scheme
	designed in 2016/17		
D3532 Park Road,	Design only – Design of formalised	10,000	Contingency
Camberley	parking spaces with built out		Scheme
	protection and lining works		
A30 London Road,	Design and construct – Alter current	10,000	Contingency
Camberley	traffic island to allow for		Scheme
	uncontrolled pedestrian facilities		
A325 Portsmouth	Design and construct – Install new	13,000	Contingency
Road, Camberley	pedestrian island near M3 bridge		Scheme
D28 Lucas Green	<b>Design and consultation</b> – Design		Contingency
Road – One Way	and consult on proposal to	10,000	Scheme
	implement informal one way system		
- Franciski sve	for HGVs		Calcara
Fernienurst,	Waintenance – From Waverley Dr to	0.000	Scheme
Camperley	end of Culdesac – LSR Surface Course	9,000	completed in
Orchard May	Maintenance Link outside Orebard		2016/17
Comborlov	Court – LSP Surface Course	17,680	Schome
Groufriars Drive	Maintenance – Eull Length – LSP		Contingency
Rislev	Surface Course	35,550	Scheme
Burr Hill Road	Maintenance – From Delta Rd to		Contingency
Chobham	I/W Windsor – I SR Surface Course	55 170	Scheme
chobhann	Court Road	33,170	Scheme
Windsor Court	LSR Surface Course - From Windsor		Contingency
Road, Chobham	Court Rd to J/W Bowling Green Rd	53,685	Scheme
Berkshire Road,	LSR (Strengthening required) -	424.200	Contingency
Camberley	Whole length	134,200	Scheme
Elizabeth Avenue,	LSR Surface Course - Whole length	50,000	Contingency
Bagshot		59,680	Scheme
Higgs Lane, Bagshot	MicroSurfacing - Cul de sac section	2 500	Contingency
	from outside no. 8 to end	2,500	Scheme
Warren Rise (Cul de	MicroSurfacing - From no. 27 to 45a	2 500	Contingency
sac), Frimley		2,300	Scheme
St Catherines Rd/	LSR Surface Course - From point		Contingency
Regent Way,	adjacent to no. 2 Regent way for a	12 735	Scheme
Frimley	distance 0f 63m down towards	12,733	
	StCatherines Rd		
Gosnell Close,	Block paving & footway - Whole cul	27.315	Contingency
Camberley	de sac		Scheme
Mytchett Place	LSR Surface Course - From West of		Contingency
Road, Mytchett	Ent to "Bracklands" to top of rail	56.070	Scheme
	bridge. Include section of Salisbury	56,970	
	Torrace)		
Saddleback Road /	ISB Binder & Surface Course - From		Contingency
Rowan Close	junction with Larch Close to end of	37.840	Scheme
Camberley	cul de sac	07,040	Joneme
Regent Way.	Surface dressing (Skid issue) - From	3 408	Contingency
		3,100	

Frimley	outside no.19 to outside no.29		Scheme
Hartford Rise,	MicroSurfacing - Whole Length	6 500	Contingency
Camberley		0,300	Scheme
Robins Bow,	MicroSurfacing - Whole Length	22.000	Contingency
Camberley		22,000	Scheme
Dell Grove, Frimley	MicroSurfacing - Whole Length	14 520	Contingency
		14,520	Scheme
Spencer Close,	MicroSurfacing - Whole length	3 500	Contingency
Frimley Green		3,300	Scheme
T3019 Town Path,	LSR Surface Course - TOWNPATH		Contingency
Camberley	from The Avenue to The Recreation	10,500	Scheme
	Ground		
Lupin Close,	MicroSurfacing - Whole length	10 215	Contingency
Bagshot		10,215	Scheme

## Table 4 – Capital works programme for 2017/18

## 2.5 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2017/18

- 2.5.1 The revenue budget for 2017/18 has been reduced from £180,529 (including Community Enhancement) to £40,909. In consequence, it is not possible to allocate Community Enhancement monies as in previous years. This budget will be retained as one sum and managed by the Highways Maintenance Engineer to best meet the maintenance demands of the area.
- 2.5.2 The reduction in budget will have a significant impact on the amount of revenue maintenance works that can be carried out. To put this in context, Members will see from Table 2 above that during 2016/17 almost double the total 2017/18 budget was spent just on vegetation works (£74,586).

2.5.3	Table 5 below shows the spend progress to date.
-------	---

Item	Allocation (£)	Committed Spend to date (£)
Revenue maintenance allocation	£40,909	21,398
Contractor OHP	Included in allocation figures	713
Total	£40,909	22,111

#### Table 5 – 2017/18 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

## 2.6 Other highways related matters

#### 2.6.1 **Customer Service Performance**

Highways & Transport received 37,104 enquiries and reports during the first quarter of 2017, an average of 12,368 per month, this is in line with the same period of 2016 but an increase from 2015.

For Surrey Heath specifically, 3,390 enquiries have been received of which 1,238 were directed to the local area office for action, 97% of these have been resolved. This response rate is above the countywide average of 95%.

For the first quarter, Highways received 100 stage 1 complaints of which eight were for the Surrey Heath area. In addition two were escalated to Stage 2 of the complaints process, neither of which were upheld following independent investigation.

The Service is continually looking for ways to improve its service and has recently made improvements to the online reporting, allowing customers to see defects that have already been reported and track open reports. The aim is to reduce the number of duplicate reports and remove the need for repeat site visits.

# 2.6.2 Parking Update

The 2016/17 review proposals were advertised from 12 May for 28 days. (This included a small number of locations that were added with divisional member and chairman approval after the December committee, a report about which is going to the 13 July meeting for full committee approval). The objections and comments received are being analysed and collated prior to sharing with members.

## 2.6.3 Major Schemes

A331 Shared Pedestrian/Cycle Route

Works commenced in October 2016 and were completed in March 2018.

The Yorktown and Watchmoor Park Business Association with the support of Surrey County Council, Surrey Heath Borough Council will hold a lunchtime event day to promote the use of the shared pedestrian/cycle route on 20th June 2017 to businesses in the area.

Pedestrian and cycle usage of the route is continuously being monitored.



Figure 1 – New shared pedestrian and cycle path along A331

#### Meadows Gyratory

The proposed scheme will provide:

- a right turn from the A30 into the A331 (southbound);
- Pedestrian and cycle crossings and off-carriageway routes;
- Enhancement of traffic signal controllers.

New traffic signals and vehicle detectors will be installed. When completed the new signals will operate under 'real-time' urban traffic control. This means that the vehicle detectors will continuously monitor traffic queues on all road sections at the gyratory and adjust the signal timings to minimise queues and reduce delays. The improvements include the provision of new and improved signal crossings and traffic islands to protect pedestrians and cyclists.

Phase 1 A331/Stanhope Road junction has been upgraded to provide improved traffic signals, vehicle detectors and pelican crossings. This improvement is part of the north section of the A331 shared pedestrian/ cycle route.

The scheme is currently in the tender process stage and it is hoped that a contractor will be appointed by the end of 2017. Construction works are planned to begin in spring 2018 and be completed within 12 months.

#### A30 and Camberley Town Centre Improvements

Surrey County Council is planning a package of transport improvement measures for the A30 and Camberley Town Centre highway network. The proposed changes aim to reduce peak hour delays along the A30, maintain bus reliability and improve accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists on routes to and within Camberley town centre. Public consultation was held between 20 February and 16 April 2017 to seek views on the proposals and analysis of the results is expected to be completed by the end of July 2017.

Surrey County Council is applying for Local Growth Funding from the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to fund the majority of this project, in partnership with Surrey Heath Borough Council. A business case is expected to be submitted to the LEP by end of 2017 and confirmation of EM3 LEP funding is anticipated April 2018

Construction of the proposed improvement on the A30 will commence after the completion of Meadows in spring 2019 to minimise traffic delays.

Information about all the Surrey Heath major schemes is updated regularly on the Major Projects web-page on the County Council's web-site.

## 2.6.4 M3 Managed Motorway and Woodlands Lane bridge replacement

The reopening of the M3 and initiation of the Managed Motorway scheme is currently planned for 30 June. Further works are expected following the opening of the motorway to complete snagging items. Any works are currently expected to be undertaken with a combination of lane and road closures during nights only.

Highways England currently plan for the Woodlands Lane bridge in Windlesham to be reopened during the winter of 2017.

#### 3. OPTIONS:

3.1 Options, where appropriate, have been presented in this report.

## 4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties, including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

## 5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, Officer proposals follow the Countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future, and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated.

# 6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. Appropriate and proportionate consultation is carried out with residents, and bodies representing particular user groups, to ensure that the interests of all highway users are considered.

## 7. LOCALISM:

7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

## **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes, and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising
	from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate	No significant implications arising
Change and Carbon Emissions)	from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications arising
Children	from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for	No significant implications arising
vulnerable children and adults	from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising
	from this report.

## 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 9.2 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

## <u>10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:</u>

10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

#### Contact Officer: Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager (NW) – 0300 200 1003 Consulted: Annexes: Sources/background papers:

This page is intentionally left blank

# SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 13 July 2017



LEAD JACK ROBERTS (Engineer, Parking Strategy & OFFICER: implementation team)

SUBJECT: PARKING REPORT – ADDITIONAL SCHEMES ADVERTISED

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS IN SURREY HEATH

#### SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

At local committee in December 2016, officers of the parking team presented the on street parking review of Surrey Heath, which was agreed subject to amendments made at the meeting. In early 2017, the parking team received correspondence from councillors and members of the public regarding some of the locations which were not taken forward as part of this parking review. After agreeing to reconsider the requests, it was later decided best to include the locations in the advertisement and to seek committee approval at a later stage, which is the purpose of this report. In addition, there are two borough wide amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders relating to consolidation and carers and operational permits.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

## The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to agree that:

- (i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Surrey Heath as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in annex A are agreed.
- (ii) 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 Surrey Heath as shown on the drawings in annex A are advertised (as taken place) and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iii) 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. An additional member may be invited for comment.

#### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annex A. They will make a positive impact towards:-

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles

- Easing traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking
- Better enforcement
- Better compliance

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 At local committee in December 2016, officers of the parking team presented the on street parking review of Surrey Heath, which was agreed subject to amendments made at the meeting.
- 1.2 In early 2017, the parking team received correspondence from councillors and members of the public regarding some of the locations which were not taken forward as part of this parking review. After agreeing to reconsider the requests, it was later decided best to include the locations in the parking review advertisement and to seek committee approval at a later stage, which is the purpose of this report.
- 1.3 The three additional locations where parking restriction amendments are proposed are listed below. It is important to note that all three locations and issues were known by the parking team during the review which took place last year and were listed in the report under 'other locations assessed'.

## 2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 Site visits for the three locations took place earlier this year, and proposals were drawn up in time to be included in the parking review advertisement which ran over May and June of this year.
- 2.2 Parking restrictions can be advertised without committee approval, as long as the approval is obtained prior to the making of the Traffic Regulation Orders. Whilst this is not something that we normally like to undertake, bearing in mind the opportunity to add to the review advertisement, it was deemed to be the best option in terms of moving forward.

## 3. OPTIONS:

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

(Relevant drawing numbers in brackets)

## 3.1 CAMBERLEY EAST

## Park Road (Drawing No. 1330)

Outside numbers 133 and 135, fill in the gap in the single yellow line with the same 'no waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm' restriction. Parking in this gap has been deemed to be too close to the roundabout junction with Park Street and is significantly obstructing driveway sightlines for the properties that are located next to this gap. It is therefore proposed to restrict this gap in order

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

Page 50

to maintain road safety and sightlines for both through traffic and also for the residents of the adjacent properties.

## 3.2 HEATHERSIDE AND PARKSIDE

#### Upper Chobham Road j/w Green Hill Road (Drawing No. 1388)

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction to maintain road safety and sightlines.

# 3.3 BAGSHOT, WINDLESHAM AND CHOBHAM

## The Grange, Chobham (Drawing 1387)

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction with **Windsor Road**, extending on the south eastern side of The Grange up to the start of the granite sets. On the north western side of The Grange - after the double yellow lines for the junction - introduce a 2 hour limited waiting bay applying Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm for three cars. Double yellow lines will then continue up to the granite sets. This will help manage parking in this part of The Grange, which is frequently used for short term parking by visitors to the dentists and pharmacy located on Windsor Road. Short term parking is also required by carers visiting residents of The Grange. The double yellow lines will help keep parking within the parking bay only, and will help maintain road safety, access and sightlines at all times, particularly on the junction. The 2 hour limited waiting period will create a turnover of visitors and will prevent all day parking.

## 3.4 BOROUGH WIDE

## Traffic Regulation Order Consolidation

One of the principles that were accepted by the county council when it decided to proceed with Decriminalised Parking Enforcement (DPE) later called Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) was to keep the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to a minimum and to consolidate them when a number of amendments had been made. Since Surrey Heath was 'converted' to CPE there have been several amendment TROs made which have supplemented the original TROs. The stage has now been reached for these to be consolidated and committee approval is required in order to proceed. There are no cost implications as this has been advertised as part of the latest parking review.

## **Carers Permits**

Introduce operational and carers' permits to all of the parking permit schemes in Surrey Heath, excluding Service Area number 3 as this is within the Atrium Pedestrianisation Zone controlled by rising bollards and key cards.

This reflects the way the borough council are currently operating the parking permit schemes.

**Carers' permits** are for use by non-professional carers visiting residents who require home visits for assistance with day to day living tasks. This is issued to the resident at a cost of £10 per annum.

**Operational permits** are for use by doctors, nurses and community care personnel, who are required to make visits to residents, which will be free of charge and will allow them to park in any of the permit parking places.

# 4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The three locations detailed in this report and shown on the plans in Annex A were advertised as part of the parking review advertisement in May and June of this year.
- 4.2 The responses to the advertisement will be considered outside of the committee with county members. The parking team's officers will make a recommendation on how to proceed at each location. The relevant county councillor, including the chairman and vice chairman along with the parking team manager, will then make a final decision.

# 5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 There are no cost implications as this has been advertised as part of the latest parking review.

# 6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications for this report.

# 7. LOCALISM:

7.1 Each location where parking restrictions are proposed to be amended will have an impact on the local residents and visitors in that area. This effect will vary from slight to significant depending on the resident's/businesses circumstances and requirements for parking on street. The advertisement stage will allow these effected parties to get involved and comment or object to the proposals. This will impact on what decisions are made following the advertisement. Local councillors can also help in this process by liaising with residents who may not want to contact the parking team directly, and prefer to deal with their local councillor instead.

<b>8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change	No significant implications arising

and Carbon Emissions)	from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising
	from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable	No significant implications arising
children and adults	from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising
	from this report.

#### 8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

There should be fewer instances of obstructive parking as a consequence of the restrictions.

#### 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annex A. They will make a positive impact towards:-
  - Road safety
  - Access for emergency vehicles
  - Access for refuse vehicles
  - Easing traffic congestion
  - Better regulated parking
  - Better enforcement
  - Better compliance

## 10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The parking team will be compiling all of the responses to the advertisement into a 'consideration of objections' report. This will be sent to county members and the parking team manager for a final decision.
- 10.2 Once this stage has concluded, detailed design can begin in preparation to order both the lining and signing work required on the ground. Around the same time Traffic Regulation Orders will be made with a 'go live' date for enforcement to begin.

## Contact Officer:

Jack Roberts (Engineer – Parking Team)

#### Consulted:

Local members and local residents where necessary.

#### Annexes:

Annex A.

#### Sources/background papers:

There are none.

This page is intentionally left blank



ITEM 9



ITEM 9



ITEM 9

This page is intentionally left blank

# SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)



DATE: 13 July 2017

LEAD PARTNERSHIP & COMMITTEE OFFICER OFFICER:

- SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING AND REPRESENTATION ON TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES
- DIVISION: All

# SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The local committee has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2017/18. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents.

The report also seeks the approval of Local Committee task group members and the appointment of representatives to external bodies.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

#### The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to agree that:

- (i) The committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 for 2017/18 be retained by the Community Partnership Team, on behalf of the Local Committee, and that the Community Safety Partnership and/or other local organisations be invited to submit proposals for funding that meet the criteria and principles set out at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (ii) Authority be delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the local committee, to authorise the expenditure of the community safety budget in accordance with the criteria and principles stated at paragraph 2.4 of this report.
- (iii) The committee receives updates on the project(s) that was funded, the outcomes and the impact it has achieved.
- (iv) The committee approves the membership of the task groups, terms of reference and appointments to outside bodies, as detailed at paragraphs 2.8 to 2.17 and annex 1 of this report.

# **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The report sets out a process for allocating the committee's delegated community safety budget of £3,000 to local organisations.

It also proposes local committee task group membership for the forthcoming year to enable the provision of informed advice and recommendations to the committee. The appointment of councillors of the Local Committee to external bodies enables the committee's representation on and input to such bodies.

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 Prior to 2016, the local committee had historically chosen to passport its delegated community safety funding to the local Community Safety Partnership (CSP) to assist in their efforts to tackle crime and anti- social behaviour on behalf of residents.
- 1.2 Following countywide analysis of the projects that were funded through CSPs and the outcomes achieved, the local committee agreed that its local CSP should firstly be invited to provide an outline of any prospective projects that could be supported from the committee's funding for approval. This aimed to provide greater oversight of the committee's expenditure. In the context of the County's Medium Term Financial Plan and the requirement upon all county services to contribute to significant savings, the process would also help to achieve better value for money from projects in support of the County Council's wider community safety priorities.
- 1.3 Local committee task groups are established at the start of each municipal year. Membership of each task group is nominated and decided by councillors of the local committee. Representation on external bodies is similarly decided and is reviewed and agreed by local committee members annually. The proposed membership and terms of reference for the committee's task groups are contained in Annex 1 of this report. The committee is requested to make appointments to the external bodies and task groups, as detailed in paragraphs 2.8 to 2.17 of this report.

## 2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 In 2016/17, the committee awarded £3,000 to 2 projects in Surrey Heath.

## CCTV equipment to deter fly-tipping within Surrey Heath

Previously, CCTV equipment covered Gracious Pond Road, Chobham, and a proposal was agreed to extend this to cover Loveland's Lane and Penny pot, Chobham. The impact of the CCTV cameras being located in Gracious Ponds Road had seen an 80% reduction in the number of fly tips, however the problem was moved elsewhere. The £2,000 project expanded the CCTV coverage and enabled evidence to be gathered for further prosecutions building a strong deterrent within Surrey Heath. The camera installations

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

Page 60

have deterred fly-tips within the vicinity, and eight prosecutions have been successfully undertaken with the council actively publicising this within the community.

#### Surrey Heath Young Citizen

This fantastic project delivers a community safety message to over 400 year 7 students at Collingwood College and Kings International whereby a drama production is performed entitled 'last orders' and the different sets around this pick up different aspects of keeping safe, including healthy relationships, internet safety, prevent, anti-social behaviour, fire safety, and the reporting of incidents to crime stoppers.

The annual cost is approximately £3,500 from which £1,000 was provided from the Local Committee. A survey is carried out directly after the event to recall the messages learnt, and also again after a 6 month period to ensure the retention levels.

- 2.2 As in the previous year, a clear and simple process designed to support CSPs will be adopted in order that funds can be processed efficiently this year.
- 2.3 Local CSPs will be invited to submit a brief outline of the projects that they would like to put the committee's funding towards, on a simple template designed for this purpose.
- 2.4 To assist CSPs in identifying suitable projects, the following criteria will be provided as a guide:
  - (a) Results in residents feeling safer

(b) Has clear outcomes that align with the priorities of the Local Committee and/or the CSP

- (c) Is non recurrent expenditure
- (d) Does not fund routine CSP activities (e.g. salaries, training)
- (e) Is not subsumed into generalised or non-descript funding pots
- (f) Does not duplicate funding already provided (e.g. domestic abuse

services, youth work, transport costs, literature which could be co-ordinated across all CSPs )

- 2.5 To ensure funds can be utilised within the current financial year, it is suggested that a deadline of **29 September 2017** is imposed for the submission of outline projects by CSPs and/or local organisations. This deadline will be communicated widely to local CSPs and partner organisations.
- 2.6 To ensure that funds can be distributed speedily and efficiently, it is recommended that authority is delegated to the Community Partnership Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, to authorise the expenditure of the committee's funds outside the formal quarterly committee meeting cycle. This should allow local organisations to obtain approval, initiate and implement projects with the minimum of delay.
- 2.7 Once implemented, the CSP and any other recipients of this funding will be required to provide the local committee with a short update on each project,

outlining how the funding was used and the difference and impact it has made in the local community.

# **Task Groups**

2.8 Each year the Committee is asked to consider the work that would be considered at formal meetings and the relevant task groups that should be established to support the Committee in its work.

## Surrey Heath Early Help Advisory Board

- 2.9 In 2012-13, the Local Committee established a Surrey Heath Youth Task Group, to monitor and report back to the Local Committee. This Task Group is now being replaced by representatives onto an Advisory Board.
- 2.10 The Committee is asked to nominate Members to attend the Early Help Advisory Board as set out in Annex 1.

## Surrey Heath Major Projects Task Group

- 2.11 In 2014-15, the Local Committee established a Major Projects Task Group, to monitor and report back to the Local Committee on major highways related projects. The membership of the Task Group last year was 3 County and 3 Borough Councillors.
- 2.12 The committee is asked to re-establish the Major Projects Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.

## Surrey Heath Local Cycling Plan Task Group

- 2.13 In 2015-16, the Local Committee established a Local Cycling Plan Task Group, to monitor and report back to the Local Committee on cycling related projects. The membership of the Task Group last year was 2 County and 2 Borough Councillors.
- 2.14 The Committee is asked to re-establish the Local Cycling Plan Task Group, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference as set out in Annex 1.

## Membership to Outside Bodies

- 2.15 The Local Committee can make appointments to various outside bodies. Members are asked to act as the Local Committee ambassador on the group, ensure that the local committee is informed of activities relevant to the work of the committee and report back on the achievements of the group on an annual basis.
- 2.16 The Committee is asked to agree appointments to Outside Bodies as set out in Annex 1.

## 3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 All viable options were considered and appraised when forming the recommendations to the Local committee. The previous arrangement, whereby the committee transferred both its funding and the decision-making about how the funding could be used to the CSP was not considered to provide sufficient information on the impact that the funding or the outcomes it had achieved.
- 3.2 The recommended funding arrangements will employ a simple process for the commitment of funds by the committee to enable greater scrutiny over the use of this funding.
- 3.3 The committee can confirm the task groups and the corresponding terms of reference as set out in the report. Alternatively, it can establish new task groups, or dispense with previous task groups. If a new task group is established, provisional terms of reference should be agreed.
- 3.4 The committee can either make the appointments to external bodies, as set out within the report, or amend these appointments.

# 4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Local committee chairmen were collectively consulted about the process for allocating community safety funding, as recommended in this report.
- 4.2 Local committee member views are being sought on the nominations for representatives on external bodies and on the membership of local committee task groups.

## 5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 The costs of the recommendations in this report are contained within existing revenue budgets. Early scrutiny of proposed projects by CSPs and local organisations will help to achieve better value for money for the Committee's funding.

## 6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 There are no direct equalities or diversity implications. However, through its membership of the local CSP and external bodies, the County Council can help to ensure that local services are accessible to harder to reach groups. The CSP also maintains ongoing monitoring of hate and domestic abuse crimes.

# 7. LOCALISM:

7.1 The proposals contained in this report will enable CSPs and/or other suitable local organisations to submit projects that support the County Council's strategic goal of enhancing resident experience. Membership of task groups and representation on external bodies allows local councillors to consider,

recommend and influence policies and services in response to local residents' needs.

# 8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below
Sustainability (including Climate	No significant implications.
Change and Carbon Emissions)	
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications.
Children	
Safeguarding responsibilities for	No significant implications.
vulnerable children and adults	
Public Health	No significant implications

# 8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

The county council's membership of local CSPs helps ensure the achievement of its community safety priorities. The committee's funding for local community safety projects enables the CSP and/or other local organisations to help to promote safety, reduce crime, and tackle antisocial behaviour and raise awareness of safer practices and behaviours.

## 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 The recommendations contained in this report are intended to secure greater oversight of the committee's community safety expenditure and achieve better value for money through projects that help to achieve the County's community safety priorities.

## 10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 The CSP will be advised of the funding process agreed by the Local Committee and invited to access this funding.

## Contact Officer:

Nicola Thornton-Bryar, Partnership and Committee Officer, Telephone 01276 800269

#### Consulted:

Surrey's local committee chairmen and local committee members.

## Annexes:

Annex 1 – Task Groups, Terms of Reference and Membership of External Bodies

## Sources/background papers:

Not applicable.
# SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

### Annex 1

# TASK GROUPS AND MEMBERSHIP OF EXTERNAL BODIES

### Representation on the Surrey Heath Early Help Advisory Board

Further details on the Terms of Reference for the Advisory Board are to follow.

Suggested representatives are:-

- Valerie White
- Vivienne Chapman
- Rebecca Jennings-Evans

# Major Schemes (Surrey Heath) Task Group – Terms of Reference

1. The Task Group will advise the Local Committee on the progress of the Major Schemes within Surrey Heath during the next year and subject to obtaining funding, specifically but not exclusively on

- A311/A30 Corridor Improvements (Meadows Gyratory) EM3 LEP Prioritised Scheme
- Blackwater Better Connectivity (cross boundary) EM3 Camberley Growth Package Bid
- Camberley Sustainable Transport Package – EM3 Camberley Growth Package Bid

2. Officers supporting this Task Group will consult that Group and will give due consideration to the Group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the Local Committee.

3. The Task Group is suggested to include three county councillors and three borough councillors from the Local Committee. In addition the Task Group can invite up to two Officers from Surrey Heath Borough Council to attend, all with equal status. The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

4. The role of the Task Group is primarily strategic. The Task Group members will act in the interests of the borough as a whole, rather than representing the interests of their divisions or wards.

5. The Task Group will take into account the results of previous and new consultations in determining future programmes.

6. Any recommendations to the Local Committee will be supported by a summary of the reasoning behind the Task Group's position and reflect any professional advice from officers.

7. The Task Group will meet in private, at appropriate times during the year (at a suitable time before a Local Committee) and actions from the meetings will be recorded.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

Suggested members of the Major Projects Task Group are:

- Bill Chapman
- Charlotte Morley
- Edward Hawkins
- Valerie White.
- SHBC Officers Jenny Rickard and Jane Ireland

# Terms of Reference for the Surrey Heath Local Cycling Plan Task Group

As part of the Surrey Transport Plan, the Surrey Cycling Strategy was approved by Cabinet in December 2013. The Strategy set out a role for Local Committees to oversee the development of Local Cycling Plans.

Surrey Heath Local Committee were asked to consider the establishment of a Local Cycling Plan task group to oversee the development of the Surrey Heath Local Cycling Plan.

The Task Group will develop for agreement by the Local Committee a programme for producing a Local Cycling Plan for Surrey Heath, setting out:

- Scope and priorities
- Data and information requirements
- Timetable for developing final recommendations to the committee

The Task Group will consider the aims and objectives of Hampshire County Council's Cycling Strategy and how this may impact on the content and priorities of the Surrey Heath Local Cycling Plan.

It is suggested that the Task Group contain up to four appointees from the Local Committee – two county and two borough councillors.

The Task Group may also consult with other relevant members of the Committee.

Recommendations made to the Local Committee will be supported by a summary of the reasoning behind a task group's position and reflect and professional advice of officers.

Officers supporting the Task Group will consult the Group and will give due consideration to the group's reasoning and recommendations prior to the officer writing their report to the parent Local Committee.

Suggested members of the Local Cycling Plan Task Group are:

• TBA

### Membership to Outside Bodies

The Committee is asked to agree the following appointments:

- Surrey Heath Partnership TBA
- Surrey Heath Strategic Parking Group 2 x TBA
- Surrey Heath Youth Council Stakeholders Group TBA

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

# SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)

DATE: 13 July 2017



SUBJECT: Forward Plan

DIVISION: All

### SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan and comment on the items that are currently anticipated will be received (paragraph 3).

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note and comment on the forward plan outlined in this report.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The report contains an updated version of the Local Committee's forward plan.

#### **<u>1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:</u>**

1.1 The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) may receive a forward plan at each meeting setting out the anticipated reports for future meetings. The forward plan will be used in preparation for the next committee meeting. However, this is a flexible forward plan and all items are subject to change.

#### 2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 No analysis was required for this report.

#### 3. OPTIONS:

3.1 In addition to the following, requests from Members for other reports would be welcomed.

### Thursday 5 October 2017

- 1. Update on Decision Tracker
- 2. Highways Update
- 3 Members Allocation Report
- 4. Forward Plan



# 4. CONSULTATIONS:

Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

### 5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 There are no financial implications of the forward plan.

### 6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising out of the forward plan.

### 7. LOCALISM:

Future reports and discussion topics for the Local Committee are included in the forward plan, giving all residents and businesses in the Surrey Heath area notice of topics on future agendas.

### **8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

Area assessed	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising
	from this report
Sustainability (including Climate	No significant implications arising
Change and Carbon Emissions)	from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After	No significant implications arising
Children	from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for	No significant implications arising
vulnerable children and adults	from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising
	from this report

### 9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 The committee is asked to note the forward plan contained in this report.

#### **10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

10.1 No further action is required.

**Contact Officer:** Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Community Partnerships and Committee Officer (Surrey Heath) - 01276 800269

**Consulted:** Members and Surrey County Council officers have been consulted.

Annexes: None

#### Sources/background papers: None