

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 19 September 2017
at Council Chamber, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead,
Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Keith Taylor (Chairman)
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mrs Julie Iles
- * Mr Matt Furniss
- * Mrs Angela Goodwin
- * Mr David Goodwin
- * Mrs Marsha Moseley
- Mrs Fiona White
- * Mr Keith Witham

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Cllr Paul Spooner (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr David Bilbe
- * Cllr Nils Christiansen
- * Borough Councillor Nigel Kears
- * Borough Councillor Julia McShane
- * Borough Councillor Tony Phillips
- * Borough Councillor Mike Piper
- * Borough Councillor David Reeve
- * Borough Councillor David Wright

* In attendance

1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fiona White and Graham Ellwood.

2/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Guildford Local Committee agreed the draft minutes as a true reflection of the meeting.

3/17 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 3]

The report was provided to update Members on progress with Decisions made by the Local Committee. The Chairman and Vice- Chairman have recently updated it to ensure that it is still relevant.

4/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were no declarations of interest of made.

5/17 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

One petition was received from Heather Jones - Finish off relaying the Stoughton Road surface in Guildford.

Nick Holloway asked a supplementary question:

Why isn't this work to Stoughton Road in the Horizon plan and why has it been allowed to get into this state of disrepair? We would like to be present at any re-assessment of the road.

Local Members supported the petition and stated that there was heavy traffic on this road. The Highways officer response to the petition had been published as a supplementary paper to the agenda.

6/17 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

One question was raised in the informal public question session before the start of the Committee. The question and response is attached as Annex B.

Two formal written public questions were received.

The first public question was presented by Roy Davey, Chairman of Shere Parish Council

'Will the committee now actually consider and make a decision on our specific and localised petition, of June 2014 to establish a ban on HGVs over 7.5 ton from travelling through Shere Village?'

The officer response to the question was published as a supplementary paper to the agenda and is attached as Annex A.

Supplementary question:

Will the Committee re-look at the petition which was requesting a very specific local ban to stop HGVS going through Shere not an area wide ban.

Members commented that Middle Street in Shere is not able to cope with heavy vehicles and there has been damage to ancient buildings and asked the Committee not to lose sight of this issue.

The second public question was presented by Hugh Anscombe from the Guildford Society Transport Group.

Would SCC and GBC be prepared to consider two ideas relating to Onslow Park and Ride? The officer response to the question was published as a supplementary paper to the agenda and is attached as Annex A.

Supplementary question:

Please can we have a breakdown of the cost and number of users of the Onslow Park and Ride?

The Parking Manager informed the Committee that the park and ride facts and figures are published in his annual parking report.

7/17 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Two Member Questions were received.

At the July Local Committee meeting, it was explained that the urgent resurfacing work on the Hog's Back A31 was being funded out of the Project Horizon scheme which has resulted in a number of roads being knocked off the programme.

Question 1 from County Councillor Angela Goodwin

Question: Which roads have been knocked off the Project Horizon scheme and what does the latest prioritisation list / revised resurfacing list look like now for Guildford?

Answer 1

Unfortunately these costs, in the region of £800K, will need to be funded from the capital maintenance budget. At this stage SCC do not need to alter the published list of schemes on the Horizon 2 programme. Any scheme postponement will be identified through normal programme management e.g. where a clash with utility works occurs. The 'future schemes for consideration list' are only provisional and therefore replacement schemes will not be identified as future budgets remain uncertain.

Question 2 from County Councillor David Goodwin

Question: The Hog's Back A31 was resurfaced in the not too distant past. Was this work covered by its contractor and, if so, is Surrey Highways looking to claim the £800k costs (or part thereof) from the contractor and, if it is unable to do so, what is the permanent solution to source the missing funding that was required to undertake these urgent repairs?

Answer 2

The costs for emergency works on the A31 Hogs Back will not be recovered under any guarantee from previous surfacing scheme suppliers. The material that was removed from the top layer to allow the new surfacing to be applied was a previous surface dressing in excess of ten years old.

8/17 PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF ALL VEHICLES ON PART OF BYWAYS OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC NOS. 518 & 519 AMENDMENT ORDER (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

The Chairman introduced the item and explained that Rights of Way matters are dealt with slightly differently as they are a quasi-judicial function. The Chairman gave Members the opportunity to declare any interests in the item.

Members had resolved at their meeting on 6 July 2017 to advertise a Notice of Intention to make a TRO Amendment Order:

- (i) That a Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Amendment Order (TRO) be published as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/54/H22 (Annex A). Where significant (and relevant) objections are received, or no objections are received, to delegate to the Countryside Access Manager the ability to agree whether an Order may be made, in consultation with the Divisional Member, and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The TRO would not be made until a detailed highway improvement works plan for Ash Green Lane West has been approved.
- (ii) To delegate to the Countryside Access Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member the ability to accede to any unresolved objections and decide whether the TRO may be made.
- (iii) Where substantial (and relevant) objections are received, or significant modifications proposed, the Countryside Access Manager in consultation with the Divisional Member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, may refer the decision on whether the TRO be made back to the Committee.

The Notice, Draft Order, Statement of Reasons and details for making Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders were published on 14 July. Twenty-eight objections were received within the statutory period. In light of the public interest evidenced by the number of objections the Countryside Access Manager has referred this matter back to Committee. Members were asked to consider the objections and to decide whether the legal and policy criteria for making the TRO Amendment Order still apply. Members may then decide whether the Order should be made. Alternatively, Members may decide to hold a Public Inquiry to decide the matter. There is no legal requirement to hold a Public Inquiry. The recommendation to Members is that the TRO Amendment Order should be made as advertised.

Speakers in favour, objecting and the applicant's response:

In favour: (no notifications of speakers were received)

Objector:

Ms S Wyeth-Price stated that the TRO is no longer relevant and the Council have no legal obligation to lift the TRO on the BOAT in order to give the land over to the development. The TRO is not a requirement for planning permission.

In addition, the BOAT Modification Order Report is factually incorrect in many places and misleading. The report states that plans have been approved when they have not been and the BOAT Modification Order report has merged several statements into one quote to make it appear to the public, and to the councillors, that this is a condition imposed by the Planning Inspectorate when it is not.

Work has been started on the development, specifically the installation of a new surface to BOAT 518, safety and drainage are significant concerns. The road is not wide enough for motorised traffic and the proposal is unsafe.

The BOAT is used by walkers, horse riders and cyclists many of them children this section will connect to the made-up lane directly into the path of on-coming traffic. The BOAT will also increase parking on this narrow road making it more unsafe. The BOAT is unsuitable for the site conditions. The current development drains into the old surface causing flooding. The BOAT has already been temporarily re-surfaced and is already flooding to a greater degree. The new surface of the road is likely to de-grade in the first few years creating flooding water on the surface and exaceberating the flooding further.

This application should be referred to a public enquiry or be denied.

Applicant:

Andy Morris from Bewley Homes stated that they would be surfacing the BOAT and there would be a separate footway for pedestrians. The Planning Inspector had said that the BOAT Modification Order would be a change of use but it was acceptable to re-use the road. The applicant has entered into a S.278 agreement with Surrey County Council and were working to meet the requirements to clear all the ditches, lay the footpath and lay a porous surface on the road. The road will be suitable for motorised vehicles, they are aware of the concerns with drainage works yet to be completed however this will improve drainage and all year round accessibility.

The Countryside Access Manager responded to Ms S Wyeth-Price representations. He informed the Committee that the obligation to amend the TRO does not come directly from the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, but from the Council's own policy and the acceptance of the access road as safe and suitable for public use from the s278 agreement. Not amending the TRO would effectively contradict these documents/decisions.

He confirmed that the report to the Committee was correct/accurate and as far as he was aware the plans have been approved by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Drainage. He was not sure whether the works have been completed to the satisfaction of GBC Drainage, but this was an issue for them to follow up.

Comments on s.278 and planning process are not relevant. The temporary closure order is required to ensure public safety during works. SCC agreed construction of the temporary road. Site access for clearance would cause significant deterioration of the previous unmade surface, so permission was given to build a temporary road. Comments on s. 278 are not relevant for determination of TRO amendment. The route will remain open to persons on horseback or foot.

Road widths set out in the Council's Definitive Statement are legal widths, which are not always practically available for public use, due to issues such as vegetation growth.

Surrey county Council (SCC) are satisfied that the access road will be safe and suitable for public use. Flooding and drainage has been a longstanding issue on the BOAT. Implementation of the approved Drainage Plan aims to mitigate any effects from the development. The BOAT is already an adopted highway.

The Local County and District Councillors commented that there are issues around land ownership, flooding and drainage surrounding the BOAT, however there were no legal issues to prevent the BOAT going ahead. The Local County Councillor requested two actions to be included in the recommendation (please see amended recommendation below).

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that:

The Surrey County Council Ash Green Lane West (Right of Way No. 518, D80) and Spoil Lane (Right of Way No. 519, D74) in the Parishes of Ash, Normandy and Tongham) (Prohibition of Through Traffic) Amendment Order 2017 as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/54/H22 be made, **following the conditions being met:**

- (1) An adequate flooding plan is in place having been agreed by the Countryside Access Team Manager in consultation with the Strategic Network Resilience Team, Area Highways Manager and Divisional Member**
- (2) Highways plans are updated to include drainage for this scheme**

Reasons: Officers support the application to make an Amendment Order to allow public vehicular access to the new housing development on the basis that the BOAT will be surfaced to withstand traffic. The Order would meet the legal and policy criteria for making such Orders.

Members voted on the recommendations:

For: 15

Against: None

Abstaining: 3

9/17 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSALS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

The report presented the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals for new or changed parking restrictions listed in paragraph 1.2. The Committee was asked to consider the comments received and decide whether or not to make traffic regulation orders needed to introduce the proposals.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that, having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing as shown in Annex 3 of the agenda report, but that the proposals in Pewley Hill (upper) and Tormead Road are not progressed at the present time.

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the outcome of local stakeholder engagement regarding HGV management measures.

To enable the proposed concept to be brought to the Local Committees of neighbouring boroughs and districts (Mole Valley and Waverley) for agreement and subsequently included in a future Local Transport Strategy forward programme of transport measures for implementation via appropriate funding streams.

10/17 GUILDFORD SUSTAINABLE MOVEMENT CORRIDOR - PUBLIC CONSULTATION (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

The report presented details of the public consultation for the Sustainable Movement Corridor: West (SMC1) transport project. This project has been developed by Guildford Borough Council over the last two years and represents the first project from a package of transport measures which Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council will be submitting for funding this financial year. These works will be primarily funded by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP) with match funding from Guildford Borough Council, the Environment Agency and other sources.

The paper explained the process being followed and made all Members of Local Committee aware of the proposed plans and the consultation; the consultation formally commenced on 18th September with two public meetings planned in October.

Members endorsed the consultation approach to the Sustainable Movement Corridor West (SMC1) transport project.

The Local Committee (Guildford) acknowledged that the public consultation on the SMC1 is underway as described in the report.

Reasons for recommendations

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the project and the consultation process and to enable Members to provide their feedback on the proposals and share the information with constituents during the consultation period.

11/17 SHERE RURAL AREA HGV REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]

Members asked how the Quiet Lane/Unsuitable for HGV pilot zone would be enforced and what alternative routes would HGVs travel on. Officers informed members that advisory signs would be put up. Members commented that a proper monitoring investigation needs to be undertaken as part of the pilot in and around the area using base line data and then gathering data after the signs have been in place for a period of time. Officers stated that base line data was available in the feasibility report and that it would be of benefit to undertake monitoring.

Members discussed the usefulness of Sat Nav data from the HGV lorries which could be useful for monitoring purposes.

Action: Officers to look into whether there is route information available from sat Nav providers that would be helpful for data monitoring purposes.

Members also queried whether an HGV ban would be possible, the pilot wouldn't prevent an HGV ban in the future however HGVs still need to be given access to areas and it would be difficult to enforce a full HGV ban.

The Chairman stated that the pilot would be looking for financial support from Waverley and Mole Valley Local Committees also covering the pilot area.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Acknowledged the outcome of continued dialogue with local parish councils regarding the development of HGV interventions in the area.
- (ii) Agreed the concept of a proposed 'Quiet Lane / Unsuitable for HGV' pilot zone to cover a defined area of the Surrey Hills (as set out in Annex C) within the wider study area.

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the outcome of local stakeholder engagement regarding HGV management measures.

To enable the proposed concept to be brought to the Local Committees of neighbouring boroughs and districts (Mole Valley and Waverley) for agreement and subsequently included in a future Local Transport Strategy forward programme of transport measures for implementation via appropriate funding streams.

12/17 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS - UPDATE [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Highways Councillor Colin Kemp updated the Committee on highway budgets and funds spent in Guildford on road improvement schemes and the Horizon 2 project on roads and pavements. He confirmed that 80% of Local Committee highways funding had been reduced however overall 90 million was being spent this year on highways in Surrey. Councillor Kemp stated that more needed to be done to publicise the amount being spent on highways improvements.

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

- How developer's funds can be used and accessed
- Scrutinising how parking enforcement funding has been applied
- Considering how to charge for parking around commercial centres
- Charging for on-street parking

Members discussed the reduced Highways funding to the Committee and in Surrey. Councillor Kemp explained that criteria is used to prioritise which road schemes to undertake through Project Horizon. He recommended the Highways on-line system on the Surrey County Council website for members of the public and councillors to report highways issues. He asked for members views on local highways issues and asked them to copy the local County

Councillor in on any e-mails to him. Councillor Kemp also said that he would like to bring a report on what is being proposed in terms of highways for the next 12 months to a future Guildford Local Committee meeting.

**13/17 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE ANNUAL REPORT (FOR INFORMATION)
[Item 9]**

The Surrey Fire and Rescue item was postponed until after the Cabinet Member's Update item as the meeting had progressed more quickly than expected.

The report outlined the major strands of activity undertaken within the Guildford area by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) teams based at Guildford and Gomshall Fire Stations during 2016 – 17. It contained information on the various activities undertaken by the Borough team to reduce the risk from fire, water and road traffic incidents to the residents of Guildford Borough, including direct contact, public education programmes and campaigns. Relevant County wide activity was also included. Appendix 1 to the report provided specific Key Performance Indicators for SFRS.

Members asked how they could assist the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service the Group Commander for North West Surrey responded that the Committee could help by supporting the service's public safety plan and supporting Senior Fire Officers to meet their budgetary requirements sooner rather than later.

Members expressed thanks to the Fire and Rescue Service for all their hard work. Members also asked how the service compares with others across the country. The Group Commander informed the Committee that in the last 10 years there has been a significant reduction in fires across the United Kingdom and in Surrey the service has outstanding equipment and training and are the fittest in the country. Members requested that if any hotspots came up in Surrey to make them aware.

Guildford Local Committee agreed to:

Recognise the achievements of SFRS teams both within Guildford and across the County this year, support their commitment in further identifying and improving initiatives to reduce risk and make the Borough of Guildford safer especially for those more vulnerable within the community.

Reasons:

SFRS dedicates a great deal of time in supporting the safety of members of Guildford's Communities. It is important to appreciate that the requirement for and themes of initiatives will change to meet identified needs within the community, for which continued support throughout the year and into the future is essential to allow maximum effect.

**14/17 PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ON BRIDGE STREET, GUILDFORD (EXECUTIVE
FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 14]**

The report provided an update on the development of proposals to improve pedestrian safety on Bridge Street, Guildford. This followed a road traffic collision on 20 February 2016 that led to the deaths of two pedestrians. This

issue was the subject of a petition to the council on 17 May 2016. It was subsequently considered by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 9 June 2016 and then again on 2 March 2017 where it was recommended that officers continue to undertake work to refine the design proposals before presenting the final options to the Guildford Local Committee for approval and funding consideration.

Members asked the Cabinet Member for Highways if the proposals for Bridge Street would be centrally funded as originally agreed.

Action: Councillor Kemp to check the central Highways budget to ensure that funding had been allocated for this work and come back to the Committee and Road Safety Team Manager.

Members queried why the raised tables were going to be put in a different position at the pedestrian road crossing rather than the location of the collision. The Road Safety Team Manager informed members that there is a pattern of incidents that have occurred at the pedestrian crossing. Members also discussed whether it would be better to go with Option C in the report to improve the traffic signal sequence and signals for pedestrians. The officer stated that he wasn't convinced that signalling timing would reduce collisions but it was likely to increase delay times and traffic congestion. Members also discussed the general issues with pedestrians crossing that stretch of road such as not using the crossing and crossing in between traffic at different points on the road.

The question was raised whether possible issues of introducing raised tables at the crossing for cyclists and motorcyclists had been considered. Officers had discussed this with the police and consequently the tables will be made perpendicular with the road.

The Local Committee agreed that:

- (i) The proposals to provide raised road tables at the signalised crossing points across Onslow Street at the junction with Bridge Street, described within this report as Option B, proceeds to implementation. This will be funded from central county council budgets separate from the budget allocated to the local committee for highway improvements.
- (ii) A traffic regulation order to implement the raised road tables will be advertised and authority delegated to the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Members for Guildford South West and Guildford South East to consider any objections before proceeding.

Reasons: Analysis has highlighted a pattern of pedestrian casualties at the junction of Bridge Street with Onslow Street in Guildford. The proposals will help to reduce the risk of further pedestrian collisions and will improve the facilities for pedestrians when crossing the road at this important link between the railway station and town centre.

15/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 15]

The report provided an update on the 2017/18 programme of highway improvement and maintenance works funded by this committee. It also

provided an update on other centrally funded projects being promoted in the local area.

Members queried the location of the proposed raised tables on North Street and whether the road was going to be re-surfaced. The Road Safety Manager had highlighted with Guildford Borough colleagues additional safety work to be undertaken as part of any further development of North Street. The Highways Manager informed members that the intention is to re-surface North Street at the same time as the table is installed.

The Highways Manager updated the Committee that work on Compton Bridge will take place in March 2017 for 3- 4 months and HGV traffic will be diverted leading to lorries coming through Guildford town centre.

Action: Highways Manager to arrange a public meeting on the intended works to Compton Bridge.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Noted the capital works completed and expenditure to date.
- (ii) Noted the ongoing revenue works being carried out.
- (iii) Approved the introduction of the road table in North Street, as shown at Annex 2 (paragraphs 2.6.1 - 2.6.6 as per the agenda report)

Reasons for recommendations:

The recommendations are intended to facilitate delivery of the 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

16/17 FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

The Chairman updated Members that the Local Committee on 6 December had been moved to 13 December due to a meeting clash.

Meeting ended at: 9.35 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A

Guildford Local Committee
19 September 2017
Open Public Question Time

Public questions were web cast.

1. Question from John Fearnese, Ash

How does Surrey County Council view the Government's announcement on a requirement to add 40% more housing to local housing lists

Reply from Chairman of the Local Committee

The Chairman stated that it was too early to make a statement on this.

This page is intentionally left blank

GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE 19 SEPTEMBER 2017

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1 from Shere Parish Council

Will the committee now actually consider and make a decision on our specific and localised petition, of June 2014 to establish a ban on HGVs over 7.5 ton from travelling through Shere Village? Such consideration being based upon:

- The 'Shere Area Rural HGV Review' - to review and address HGV issues within the Shere Parish area and beyond - having been completed, concluded / recommended that an area wide ban should not be established.
- The detailed evidence and arguments provided in support of a specific and localised restriction covering solely Shere Village – as originally petitioned for.
- The availability of a more suitable and safer alternative route for vehicles transiting to and through the AONB, which avoids Shere Village.
- The response Shere and Albury Parish Councils received, from Graham Cannon of the Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Unit for the area, on the question of the more suitable and safer route available
- The supporting arguments and evidence being attached to this letter.

Background at Annex A

Answer:

The County's Freight Strategy encourages a twin-track approach regarding freight measures:

- **Countywide or strategic initiatives** - addressing wider issues of freight movements across areas and boundaries
- **Local freight measures** - addressing specific freight issues in the county

We are sympathetic to the issues raised by Shere Parish Council and do recognise that Surrey Police noted an alternative route through Albury to be "slightly more suitable for HGV's than Shere village" and that they "would have no objection to this proposal, so long as it had the support of the Albury Parish". Nevertheless, a 7.5t ban covering Shere village falls within the latter category of *Local Freight Measures* and therefore needs careful consideration of specific local issues and constraints – particularly the availability and suitability of alternative HGV diversion routes.

The strategy states such measures should be assessed against three criteria:

1. Policy compatibility, by assessing the contribution measures will make to meeting policy objectives, including impacts in relation to climate change and air quality;
2. Cost of implementation and requirement for future maintenance/operation, and potential funding opportunities;
3. Deliverability and risk, considering the likelihood of being able to implement interventions successfully.

The following points are relevant when considering a local HGV ban in Shere against the three criteria above:

Policy Compatibility (Effectiveness, Reliability, Safety, Sustainability)

- 'Safety' is the main policy objective relevant to the proposed ban.
- The likelihood of whether a ban would assist road safety objectives in the local vicinity should be considered, as should the impact on road safety of the proposed diversion.
- Surrey Police's statement notes the proposed diversion route is "slightly more suitable for HGV's than Shere Village".

Cost & Deliverability

- A cost to raise and advertise a TRO would apply, in addition to actually installing the scheme.
- Given that there are premises in Shere which require delivery via HGVs, the ban would need to exempt HGVs that enter the area for 'access only'. So any contravention could only be judged by determining whether an HGV had travelled through the zone without stopping.
- A potential funding source has not as yet been identified for the proposed 'mitigation measures' put forward in the letter by Albury Parish Council.
- Albury's letter also requests the proposed ban be extended to cover Little London and Brook Lane which Surrey Police's statement does not consider.

Risk

- If a banning order is not meaningfully enforced, there is a risk to the potential success of the scheme.
- Formal consultation on the TRO would be required during which any objections must be considered.
- The risk of traffic displacement to both intended and unintended routes should also be considered.

We would also refer members to Annex B of Item 12 on the Agenda which considered the feasibility of a 7.5t HGV ban in Ewhurst. Although not specifically focussed on Shere village, many of the points raised are relevant.

Question 2 from Guildford Society Transport Group Sept 2017, (Hugh Anscombe speaking)

Would SCC and GBC be prepared to consider these two ideas relating to Onslow Park and Ride?

Suggestion 1

Consideration should be given to encourage P&R use by groups of passengers in cars, during the day and particularly on Saturdays. A simple ticketing choice could be provided by a machine at the bus stop, between a low fee for a single driver and higher one for up to (say) 5 passengers.

Suggestion 2

One possibility, as an interim measure, rather than simply restricting the use of the car park to those using the bus into the town centre, would be to allow an area of the car park to double officially as a long stay car park.

Answer

We always welcome suggestions from the travelling public on ways to improve the park & ride services. Stagecoach operate the bus services to/from the four park & ride sites on a commercial basis however a payment is made in respect of the Onslow bus service while usage at the site grows.

We continue to see an increase of patronage, some of which has been driven by the new sign on the A3 and the completion of the waiting room.

Stagecoach have plans to improve the marketing and promotion of the park & ride services across Guildford. As part of this, they will be considering the fare structures and availability of ticket options. Currently park & ride offers free travel for up to two children under 16 with every fare-paying adult. Most recently contactless payment has been introduced across the park & ride network, which has helped speed up boarding time and improve service reliability. There are plans to operate the bus service for longer hours and possibly include further stops along the route. Surrey County Council have also recently been awarded DfT funding to introduce nine brand new fully electric buses onto all P&R routes. These measures should further increase usage.

A change of use of the car park to provide local long stay parking would require a change in the lease and an amendment to the planning permission. Highway's England are still working on their proposals for the A3 but we are encouraging them to include better access to the park and ride. The barrier operation at the car park is being implemented and should be operational in the next few weeks.

We are aware of parking pressures in the local area and are in discussion with the University and Hospital about improving the situation. One of the factors limiting further parking provision is the capacity of the A3 interchange at Edgerton Road.

Question 1 - Annex A - Background

1. In June 2014 Shere Parish Council presented a petition with 238 signatures for implementation of a 7.5ton HGV ban through Shere Village – this being an outstanding element of the Shere traffic calming measures previously approved but only partially completed.
2. At the September 2014 meeting the local members ‘requested that the task group review the matter in a holistic way considering also boundaries and parallel routes’
3. At the March 2015 meeting the Committee agreed to endorse a proposal from Peter Hitchins of the Transport Policy Team to establish a project entitled Shere Area Rural HGV Review ‘to review and address HGV issues within the Shere Parish area (and beyond)’ – this project to be run alongside the Surrey Hills Working Group project on Quiet Lanes and De-cluttering, to ensure common aims within the AONB were met.
4. In January 2017 Peter Hitchins presented to the Surrey Hills working group his report, prior to its scheduled submission to the Local Committee. The report is entitled ‘Proposed Quiet Lane (unsuitable for HGVs) Zones and Local Committee Update’
5. This study / report -- submission of which has already been deferred for consideration for 3 meetings, but is scheduled for the September 2017 agenda for consideration -- concluded: ‘none of the lanes through the area could be regarded as suitable for large vehicles’

But an area wide restriction would be impossible to control and enforce due to the multiple accesses and routes through the area. Surrey Police confirmed that they would not support a weight restriction’ through this area. It is accepted that positively directing large vehicles around the periphery by improved signage can only help reduce use of the current ‘de facto’ preferred route through Shere Village and over Hound House Rd - a route that is currently actually advised by sat-nav and route planning web sites.

An area wide ban would further and more forcibly modify vehicular behaviour. However If the Local Committee do not accept the logic and deterrent value of an area HGV ban then Shere Parish Council wishes to reprise its 2014 original petition and asks for a ban on HGVs through Shere Village, by the introduction of mandatory weight restriction signs at the start of Gomshall Lane, Upper Street and Sandy Lane.

Alternative routing to and through the area should then be signposted via New Rd and Park Rd as the safer and more appropriate ‘permitted’ route into and through the quiet lanes area.

The evidence in support of the requested HGV ban:

- Shere Village has a very busy centre, with many residents, children and tourists using the narrow roads and pavements, (where they exist), as they visit the village’s shops pubs and cafes, walk to the school and 2 children’s nurseries (catering for over 100 children) and attend the Doctors’ surgery.
- Middle St, the central and only street through the village is particularly difficult. It starts at a junction which has restricted manoeuvrability. It is narrow and invariably crowded with parked cars. It crosses the Tillingbourne via an ancient narrow one-vehicle width bridge and exits the village via a blind double bend into Sandy Lane.
- The village and community understand and willingly accept the necessity for the 3 / 4 regular delivery lorries that enter and exit the village centre each day to service the Co-op Store and the two pubs. And of course the 28 buses that transit each day along Upper St and Gomshall Lane. It is obvious however that when accommodating these essential vehicles it is difficult for other large vehicles to transit through the village

without causing congestion at the very least, mounting the pavements and threatening pedestrian safety, and frequently causing physical damage to the fabric of adjacent listed buildings by directly hitting them, not to mention the consequences of excessive ground reverberation

- If specific access for loading / unloading in the village is not the reason for entering the village (which is only possible via three roads – Gomshall Lane, Upper St and Sandy Lane) then a perfectly viable, straightforward, less busy, safer route avoiding the narrow streets of a conservation area is available by using Park Rd and New Rd to access the wider 'quiet lanes zone'.
- Roads where there is a weight restriction - a ban – are marked as such on UK and Continental lorry sat- nav systems. The current signs saying 'Unsuitable for HGVs' are not necessarily properly understood by foreign drivers. Also only being advisory and not weight/size defined they can encourage a driver to believe - take the chance - it really only means very large articulated trucks! Also such advisory classification is not shown as denied routes on sat-navs.
- The parish council organised a 7.00am to 7.00pm photographic record of all HGV movements into and out of Middle St for 3 days in July 2016 – Monday 4th, Wednesday 6th and Friday 8th. This ignored the 28 bus movements at the junction but still recorded an average of 45 HGV movements a day at the access and exit junction of which less than 20% were accounted for by regular 'in-village' deliveries. A ban will not prevent all of the challenges presented by HGVs meeting other traffic in the village but it would reduce the potential for such interactions by 80%. see attached log and dated photographic record of HGV movements
- Damage to the fabric of listed buildings and walls will continue unless all reasonable measures are taken to prevent unnecessary HGV movements through the centre of the village – see attached letters and photos re ongoing damage
- The police reluctance to support an area wide ban, citing lack of resources to enforce it, should not influence what is the Local Committee's decision on the matter. Reductions in police resourcing unfortunately mean there are many mandatory traffic regulations that are not actively enforced. However the fact that for drivers to ignore such a ban is a traffic offence and so carries the risk of prosecution, and penalty points, means its very existence would represent a deterrent to professional drivers who rely on their licence for their living.
- Report from Graham Cannon, Road Safety and Traffic Management Unit, to Shere and Albury Councils, copied to SCC - I quote

'Further to our recent meeting on the HGV restrictions, I have now had replies from others and can now give you an update. We discussed the possibility of a 7.5t HGV weight restriction that just covers Shere Village (from the A25 to Sandy Lane at the junction Park Road). Having driven the alternative route for HGVs, being Park Road, New Road and Sherbourne, with you I do consider this to be slightly more suitable for HGV's than Shere Village. I have checked the injury collision data on this alternative route and can confirm that there has only been two rtc's, but these did not involve a goods vehicle. Having said that I am still slightly uneasy about the issue of displacement and that it does not address the HGV issue in Hound House Road. However, after further consideration I informed SCC that I would have no objection to this proposal, so long as it had the support of the Albury Parish and that it was understood that it would not been seen as an enforcement priority. SCC acknowledged my comments on the above proposal, but indicated that that was not part of the current proposals. I suppose this is now a matter for you to discuss with them'.

Question 2 – Annex B – Background

By all accounts the Onslow P&R is substantially under-used and an annual operating cost of £300,000 has been quoted in the press. Although the number of trips increased by 28% between 2015 and 2016, the Onslow P&R is by some margin the least cost-effective of the four Guildford P&R sites, because it only delivers 10% of the passengers for 37% of the P+R costs. A fresh approach to the continued use of this facility is needed.

Cheap deals for Passenger Groups: Consideration should be given to encourage P&R use by groups of passengers in cars, during the day and particularly on Saturdays. A simple ticketing choice could be provided by a machine at the bus stop, between a low fee for a single driver and higher one for up to (say) 5 passengers. This would remove the need for the bus driver to collect fares. Either ticket would operate the exit barrier.

Longer term expectations: We hope we are correct in assuming that direct access to the Onslow P&R from the south would form part of any project by Highways England to increase the capacity of the A3. This should increase usage by making the site much more convenient for potential users. Also, we understand that plans are being prepared for increased parking capacity close to the RSCH. In the meantime it seems that, in the absence of barrier operation, vehicles have been able to park for long periods free of charge. Increase income through higher utilisation: Given the general acknowledgement that car parking spaces are at a premium in this part of Guildford, one possibility, as an interim measure, rather than simply restricting the use of the car park to those using the bus into the town centre, would be to allow an area of the car park to double officially as a long stay car park. This would not only meet a need but could also generate an income to reduce the net cost of the present P&R system.

There is no evidence that the car park has ever been full. The price for long stay users should be set so that the car park is better utilised but still always has spaces for people using it as a P&R facility.

GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE 19 SEPTEMBER 2017

WRITTEN MEMBER'S QUESTIONS

At the July Local Committee meeting, it was explained that the urgent resurfacing work on the Hog's Back A31 was being funded out of the Project Horizon scheme which has resulted in a number of roads being knocked off the programme.

Question 1 from County Councillor Angela Goodwin

Question: Which roads have been knocked off the Project Horizon scheme and what does the latest prioritisation list / revised resurfacing list look like now for Guildford?

Answer 1

Unfortunately these costs, in the region of £800K, will need to be funded from the capital maintenance budget. At this stage SCC do not need to alter the published list of schemes on the Horizon 2 programme. Any scheme postponement will be identified through normal programme management e.g. where a clash with utility works occurs. The 'future schemes for consideration list' are only provisional and therefore replacement schemes will not be identified as future budgets remain uncertain.

Question 2 from County Councillor David Goodwin

Question: The Hog's Back A31 was resurfaced in the not too distant past. Was this work covered by its contractor and, if so, is Surrey Highways looking to claim the £800k costs (or part thereof) from the contractor and, if it is unable to do so, what is the permanent solution to source the missing funding that was required to undertake these urgent repairs?

Answer 2

The costs for emergency works on the A31 Hogs Back will not be recovered under any guarantee from previous surfacing scheme suppliers. The material that was removed from the top layer to allow the new surfacing to be applied was a previous surface dressing in excess of ten years old.

This page is intentionally left blank