

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 6.30 pm on 27 November 2017
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Mary Angell (Chairman)
- * Mr Mark Nuti (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay
- * Mr Mel Few
- Mr John Furey
- * Miss Marisa Heath

Borough / District Members:

- * Councillor David Parr
- * Councillor Nick Prescott
- * Councillor Jacqui Gracey
- Councillor Barry Pitt
- * Councillor Mike Kusneraitis
- * Councillor Alan Alderson

* In attendance

159/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from:

Mr John Furey
Cllr Barry Pitt

All other members attended.

160/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting of 25 September were agreed and signed by the chairman as an accurate record.

161/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations were received.

162/17 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 4]

Two petitions were received which related to the proposed closure of Weystone Road and which was intended to be covered as part of item 10 of this agenda. Both petitions had been generated as a result of a consultation having been carried out by the County Council's Road Safety Team to gauge support for the closure of the road. The Chairman decided to bring this report

forward when addressing both of the petitions and as a result, the decision has been recorded below as part of this item.

Having reviewed residents' feedback (including the two petitions) and the most recent safety data, the Road Safety team were recommending that the closure was not implemented at this time.

The first petitioner, Mr Vink outlined his position.

He reported that the residents' association had contributed £30,000 for surfacing and signage of this road as it was recognised that the road provided important access.

He stated that he believes that the road is used not only by residents to access their homes but by those who visit as part of their work (such as carers and nurses) and those who visit recreationally, such as walkers and fishermen. In addition, there were concerns about emergency vehicles and community buses not being able to reach their intended destinations as a result of the closure.

The second petitioner, Mr Wolstenholme outlined his concerns. Firstly, he expressed that he felt the consultation on the proposal had not been long enough or widespread enough to be effective and that this may have led to residents being unaware that this closure had been suggested.

Secondly, he felt that the accident data that had originally brought about the proposed closure was not sufficient to have validated the measure. More incidents have been reported on a nearby street than for Weystone Road and yet no recommendations had been made to remedy this on that road.

Mr Wolstenholme suggested that if any improvements were proposed in the future to improve safety on Weystone Road then additional lighting, signage or the installation of a mini roundabout should be considered.

Tim Oliver, divisional member for Weybridge whose border lies very close to this junction was invited to the committee and asked to share his views. He stated his support for the petitions and reiterated Mr Wolstenholme's request that other methods to improve safety should be considered should this proposal be readdressed in the future.

The Area Highway Manager explained that this road came under the spotlight as a result of a sudden increase in incidents in 2014 that gave officers cause for concern and led to the proposal for a road closure being investigated. This in turn led to the consultation. The level of objections received prompted the officers to review the most recent data and found that the 2014 figures appeared to be a spike that was not reflected in subsequent years. Therefore the Road Safety team revised their plans to proceed with the closure and the recommendation is not to proceed at this time.

The Area Highways Manager acknowledged the alternatives that had been put forward but advised that mini roundabouts can be difficult to implement as they need a wide area of space in which to be installed. This would need to be fully assessed if taken forward in the future.

It was noted by the committee that often there is queuing traffic as you approach this junction from Weybridge and that additional signage may be useful to alert drivers to this possibility as they approach.

The Local Committee (Runnymede)

- (i) **Agreed** that the proposed closure of Weystone Road at its junction with A317 Weybridge Road is not implemented at the current time.
- (ii) **Agreed** that the safety record of the junction of Weybridge Road with Weystone Road and Hamm Court continues to be monitored to determine whether the recent improvement in safety is maintained.
- (iii) **Agreed** the implementation of safety improvements at the junction is reconsidered if the recent improvement in the safety record is not maintained.

163/17 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Question 1 was submitted from the Royal Holloway & Bedford University represented by Mr Michael Berry.

His suggestion is to set up a working group between the local authority and the university in order to manage on street parking around the residential areas surrounding the campus. Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) are suggested as a way forward.

His supplementary question was to ask whether there were any plans for a cohesive, and sustainable strategy for the local area.

In responding to the questions, it was reported that residents were consulted in 2014 regarding the option of having a CPZ implemented in the area but this was not a popular solution. The rise in housing of multiple occupancy seen in recent years has exacerbated the problem as this has meant that more people live in the area and in turn, there are more vehicles. Much of the housing in the area was built before car ownership was the norm and as modern cars get bigger, they take up more space.

If a consultation was to be held with residents now, it may be that the option for a CPZ might be more popular but this would be a costly and labour intensive exercise and this needs to be considered with regard to the council's current financial limitations. In addition, it can take 2-3 years to fully implement parking measures under current practices and this means that a full solution may be some time away.

It is recognised that as there is more development in places like Egham, this is likely to bring in additional car usage and compound the problem. The borough council has sought to alleviate this by refurbishing car parks to maximise existing facilities. To truly address the issue, plans need to be made that consider the next 10-15 years.

The idea of a working group was supported by the committee and it is suggested that this is attended by the Chairman, Divisional Member and a representative from the university. The Cabinet Member for Highways who

was also present at this meeting, offered to attend the inaugural meeting to ensure that the most appropriate personnel could be assigned to it.

This will be looked at as part of the next parking review.

Nick Prescott left the meeting, giving his apologies.

Questions 2-5

These questions were taken together as they related to the same issue. There is a shortage of parking on Herndon Close in Egham which is causing problems with access, an example of which is refuse collections being missed because the vehicle cannot enter and exit the close. There is also a concern about emergency access. This has recently been compounded by a property owner who has taken down a wall to the rear of his property on Herndon Close and made a drive which takes up space previously available for on-street parking.

Mr Thomas Wells attended on behalf of himself and neighbours who had submitted questions.

As a supplementary question, Mr Wells stated that he was pleased to see that the issues are being addressed but was aware that this might take some time. Are there any temporary measures that can be taken in the interim?

The Area Highway Manager advised that it was not possible to implement any temporary measures but that in the case of any obstruction to vehicles, these should be reported to the police who can take enforcement action, particular in the case of 'repeat offenders'.

The Divisional Member stated that she would be happy to work with residents to bring common issues to the attention of the police.

The Chairman closed the item by saying that whilst the committee cannot advise over the actions of any one individual house owner, they would be happy to keep a watching brief over this item to monitor the issue.

164/17 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No members' questions were received.

165/17 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]

It was agreed by the committee that the remaining item relating to a Rights of Way issue should be removed from the tracker. As the application was now subject to an appeal by the Secretary of State, the committee no longer has influence on the outcome.

166/17 ADDRESS FROM CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

The Chairman welcomed Surrey's Cabinet Member for Highways to the committee.

The Cabinet Member's primary purpose for attending was to look at the role that local and joint committees can play in influencing how highways funding should be spent in their area. He acknowledged that funding to the committee directly had been reduced by around 80% this year but that across the county, £90million had been spent but that he believed that there was not enough publicity about this. In future, he would like to illicit the committee's view on how it should be spent in Runnymede. Highways improvements especially new schemes and major design projects often take around 5 years to come to fruition and so early involvement by the committee could contribute to making them successful.

The Cabinet Member asked for Members' action and views on:

- How developers' funds can be used and accessed
- Scrutinising how parking enforcement funding has been applied
- Considering how to charge for parking around commercial centres to promote footfall for local businesses
- Charging for on-street parking

With regards to the latter, the Cabinet Member pointed out that a good on-street parking strategy can benefit local businesses and generate revenue, 60% of which can be allocated by the committee.

The Cabinet Member concluded that he would be happy to hear from any committee members from both the county and borough membership but requested that the appropriate county divisional member should be copied in on all correspondence.

The Cabinet Member would therefore like to attend the spring meeting of the committee to involve them in the planning for next year.

Committee members commented that they felt that Highways should have more input into planning applications for new developments to allow there to be provision for adequate infrastructure. It was noted that Surrey has always been an affluent area of the country and that prosperity would be undermined if the infrastructure could not adequately support local businesses and residents' lifestyle. Certain areas of the borough were already at full capacity with regards to properties and traffic.

The Cabinet Member accepted the committee's views and underlined the importance of taking a look at the wider picture when planning for future needs.

167/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

The Area Highway Manager (AHM) presented his report. He began by providing an update to the 2017/18 capital programme. The progress and budgetary position was noted by the committee. It was also agreed to carry forward the capital works programme into next year.

Recommendation (v) was to agree to use an amount of parking revenue surplus to offset some of the overspend that had accrued the previous year. In considering this recommendation, committee members asked what other options were available if the money was not put to this use. The AHM did suggest that an alternative use could be for revenue maintenance works but this would not include the repair of potholes which come from a central budget and which to many is the priority maintenance item. He did however state that the preference was for the reduction of debt as this would be seen as best practice. The committee agreed with this assessment.

Recommendation (vi) came about as a result of an item that was deferred from the previous meeting. The proposal was originally for two bus clearways to surround bus stops in New Haw Road in Addlestone. In recognition of councillors' concerns that it would take away valuable parking spaces, the report presented at this committee amended the proposal, reducing it one clearway with restrictions only being in place on one side of the road between the hours of 7am-7pm, which reflects the bus service's hours of operation.

The proposal originated from a complaint for an elderly resident who relies on buses, having no vehicle of her own and who found that vehicles parking in or alongside the bus stop obscured the bus driver's view of her which meant they did always see her and her signal to stop. This led her to move into the carriageway in order for the driver to see her which presented a safety issue. Whilst recognising that parking at bus stops is already illegal, it is also acknowledged that parking is at a premium in the area and this resulted in many residents choosing to park there regardless. The committee's deliberations therefore centred around how to balance the needs of those who relied on public transport and available parking for residents.

In regards to the availability of parking: whilst sympathetic to the challenges faced by the resident in question, some councillors felt that the issue didn't warrant the reduction in parking that would be afforded by this measure. Many pointed out that this bus stop had been in place for around 20 years and could not see why this bus cage was needed now. Although the request had come from the county council's Passenger Transport Team, no data had been presented to show bus usage in the area in order for some councillors to feel that they could accurately gauge how many residents would be affected.

Countering this argument, it was commented that if buses were no longer able to stop safely in the area, the bus company might apply to have the stop decommissioned which would be a loss of an important amenity. The bus route goes towards Woking and St Peter's Hospital and so benefits the community as a whole. It is also recognised that public transport is important if residents are to be convinced to reduce their reliance on their cars, otherwise parking problems will intensify as car ownership increases. In addition, it was felt that condoning those who were parking illegally could not be supported.

The Chairman offered committee members the option of requesting further information for decision at a future committee or voting on the topic as presented. The committee felt able to put this to a vote and it was carried by 4 votes to 3 in favour of agreeing the recommendation, with 2 abstentions.

The Local Committee were happy to accept the recommendation to convert the segregated to a shared path on the advice of the AHM. He reported that the path was not wide enough to continue being used as a segregated path

and that there was no cost implication in carrying out the conversion. The committee did however, feel it would be helpful to receive any data relating to the usage of cycle paths in Runnymede.

The Local Committee (Runnymede):

- (i) **Noted** the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2017/18 financial year.
- (ii) **Noted** the budgetary position.
- (iii) **Noted** that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iv) **Agreed** the undelivered proposed capital works programme for 2017/18 shown in table 1 at section 2.2 is carried forward to become the 2018/19 capital works programme.
- (v) **Agreed** that £15,619 of unallocated parking surplus is used to help reduce the existing 2017/18 Local Committee capital budget overspend.
- (vi) **Agreed** the introduction of a bus stop clearway (prohibiting stopping between 7am and 7pm from Monday to Saturday, except local buses) on A318 New Haw Road.
- (vii) **Agreed** the conversion of the section of footpath between the A308 The Glanty and Lovett Road (Staines-upon-Thames) from a segregated footpath/cycleway to a shared footpath/cycleway.

1.

168/17 ROAD SAFETY: PROPOSED CLOSURE OF WEYSTONE ROAD [FOR DECISION] [Item 10]

This item had already been dealt with as part of agenda item 4 (Minutes 162/17)

169/17 FORWARD PLAN [FOR DECISION] [Item 11]

The Local Committee agreed to include the following into their forward programme:

2.
 - Update on the River Thames Scheme
 - Community Safety Funding Update

- Highways Update and Budget
- Surrey Fire & Rescue
- Early Help provision
- Emergency Planning: Roles & Responsibilities

The forward programme as set out above was agreed. Gravel extraction in Egham was suggested as a topic for a future meeting.

Meeting ended at: 20:38

Chairman