

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 22 March 2017
at Council Chamber, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead,
Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB.

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Matt Furniss (Vice-Chairman)
- * Borough Councillor David Bilbe
- Borough Councillor Nigel Manning
- * Borough Councillor Julia McShane
- * Borough Councillor Tony Phillips
- Borough Councillor Tony Rooth
- * Borough Councillor David Wright
- Borough Councillor Illman
- * Borough Councillor David Reeve
- Borough Councillor Matthew Sarti

* In attendance

192/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Marsha Moseley, Michael Illman, Nigel Manning, Tony Rooth and Matthew Sarti. Jo Randall substituted for Matthew Sarti.

193/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016 were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting and were duly signed by the Chairman.

194/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

195/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman reported that John Hilder was currently recovering after surgery and his role would be covered by Frank Apicella until he returned. The Committee extended their best wishes to John for a speedy recovery.

It was also noted that this would be the last meeting for County Councillors Bill Barker and Pauline Searle who would not be standing in the May elections. They were both thanked for their contributions to the work of the Committee.

196/16 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

There were two petitions presented to the Committee.

The first petition was presented by Mrs Candace Brooks:

Following yet another serious car crash at the intersection between the A25 Shere Road and A248 Albury Road, we the residents of Shere, Albury and the surrounding villages ask that the council put this junction under immediate review and put in place some sort of solution to this treacherous piece of road. As residents of the area, we are all too familiar with the sight of an air ambulance parked on the road, air lifting someone to the nearest trauma hospital. Today, we witnessed yet another accident which has resulted in 3 people being seriously injured, one of which life threatening. It is time to put a halt to these unnecessary and deadly accidents. The junction needs to be reconfigured and with speed calming measurements to ensure the safety of all motorists and cyclist alike.”

The following written response was provided:

Whilst we recognise that there have been collisions occurring at the junction, it is hoped that the reduction of 20mph on the approaching speed limit will have a beneficial influence and reduce the occurrences of these collisions. The scheme has only recently been completed and whilst it generally takes about 6 months for these changes to settle down and take effect, we will continue to monitor the location. If it is deemed that further works are required then this will be investigated further by the Casualty Reduction Working Group, and an integrated Transport Plan scheme may be the solution.

It was noted that at their meeting in June 2016 the Committee agreed to introduce a 40 mph speed limit on the A25 Shere Road between Clandon Crossroads and a point approximately 50 metres to the east of Sherbourne Road. This new speed limit had recently been implemented.

The new limit leaves Sherbourne Road unrestricted (subject to the 60 mph national speed limit) between the A25 and the existing 30 mph limit on the approach to the village. The proposal under agenda Item 10 was to introduce a 40 mph limit in the interest of consistency and road safety. This measure is supported by the police and Albury Parish Council.

It was noted that detailed statistics of accidents on the road needed to be brought to the Committee when being further considered.

In the second, Mr Simon Slater presented a petition to insist that Surrey County Council must reinstate Byrefield Road as part of 'Project Horizon' to replace the crumbling concrete sub-layer and resurface the whole road. Originally scheduled under this project, the road was suddenly dropped from the list despite its appalling condition. Currently used by approximately 70 buses a day, together with considerable through traffic, we contend the road's current state is causing long term damage to houses, vehicles and other traffic, together with issues over safety. We urge SCC to reinstate Byrefield Road, Stoughton Ward on the Project Horizon list as a matter of urgency.

Mr Slater also passed the Chairman a letter from Aviva supporting resurfacing due to the negative impact that the current road surface had on their vehicles.

The following written response was given to Mr Slater:

We are currently in year 4 of Operation Horizon, our innovative 5 year road resurfacing programme. To date the programme has achieved a 30% reduction in the length of roads that are in a poor condition, a 15% reduction in cost, and improved quality, with 95% of schemes having a 10-year warranty.

However, we have more schemes on the list than we can afford to do in the five years. We are also facing further challenges from reduced budgets and increased pressure from other roads that have deteriorated since the original Horizon lists was published.

Over the last 18 months we have been assessing existing schemes from the original Horizon list along with recently identified potential schemes generated from condition surveys, which we carry out in accordance with best practice guidance, for inclusion on Surrey's Horizon 2 programme.

All roads on the Horizon programme have been prioritised in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management and in accordance with the cabinet approved prioritisation process. The process does not take account of customer complaints as you have inferred but criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

The full prioritisation process is published on our website:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-maintenance-and-cleaning/maintaining-our-roads-and-pavements/how-we-prioritise-road-maintenance>

All the schemes have been prioritised against others countywide into a new list and unfortunately Byrefield Road did not score enough to feature in our planned works programme. The number of schemes involved (some 800+) means not all the schemes on prior Horizon lists or newly identified schemes from condition surveys will now appear on the new version.

I realise that this information will be disappointing for you. It will continue to be inspected and any defects at intervention level will be repaired under routine maintenance.

The Divisional County Councillor thanked Mr Slater for bringing the petition to the attention of the Committee. It was noted that upto 8 buses per hour used the road and had been on a priority list for some considerable time.

It was agreed that the issue would be taken back to the Horizon Team and ask them to check that it had been accurately assessed and also include the letter from Aviva.

197/16 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Five written questions were received.

Question 1 from John Oliver

Given the continuing reduction in free parking areas within Guildford and in the rest of the borough, what steps are being taken by the Committee to ensure that motor homes, dormobiles, caravans and the like are banned from parking on the public highway in the borough.

A written response was provided as follows:

Surrey County Council does not discriminate against motor homes, dormobiles or caravans parking on the public highway. Occasionally residents report incidences of long term parking by such vehicles which highways officers will investigate on a case by case basis. Thankfully such incidences are infrequent. In the controlled parking zone where there is often pressure on the availability of space we are looking at ways of restricting parking for large leisure vehicles.

Question 2 from John Oliver

The pedestrian crossings closest to London Road on Clay Lane, Burpham contribute significantly to traffic congestion in Burpham. The Guildford Local Committee administration team contacted the Traffic Lights Team on 15 December about my public question concerning the possibility of carrying out a survey of the crossings to assess whether any safe improvements can be made to them which would improve the flow of traffic. To date, 14 March, I have not been made aware of any response to this request. Could you, please, explain why this is the case and arrange for me to receive a response.

The traffic signal team provided a written response as follows:

In its current format the pedestrian and cycle timings cannot be reduced for safety reasons as this is effectively a fixed time (for pedestrians) crossing. However, if we were to install kerbside detectors and on-crossing detectors these timings could be more flexible. Kerbside detectors would cancel the demand if a pedestrian presses the button and decides to cross without waiting for the Green Man. On-crossing detectors would detect pedestrians on the crossing and lengthen or shorten the Vehicle Red / Red Man and Red Cycle period.

Vehicle Maximum Green time (the maximum time the signals will run vehicle green if there is a constant flow of traffic after the button has been pressed) = 30 seconds, which is our standard. This could be increased to 40 seconds if required.

On advice from the Highways Manager (SW) the Vehicle Maximum Green Time has been increased to 35 seconds in the first instance.

As the signal equipment is fairly old (mostly installed in 1998) it might need a full upgrade to be compatible with on-crossing detectors. This would cost approximately £16,000 to £20,000. At the moment it is not planned for refurbishment until about 2023 as there are other sites higher up the list.

However, the Traffic Signals Team are going to try and fit on-crossing detectors to the existing equipment. If it works, it won't be necessary to carry out the full refurbishment just yet. These will be funded from the last of this year's budget. However, they may not be able to be installed until April as the contractors engineers are all fully occupied on other jobs, but the equipment will be obtained and stored.

Question 3 from Dr Nigel Burke

At the Local Committee meeting on 23 March 2016, a list of Quick Wins for cycling was discussed. One set was approved for immediate funding and action, and a second set was recommended for inclusion in the Local Committee highways forward programme and immediate funding where possible. It appears nothing has been done: please would you indicate what will be done to progress these?

A written response was provided as follows:

As GBUG have recently been informed, the highways officer who developed and presented the Guildford Cycle Plan in March 2016 left the county council in the Autumn without progressing any of the measures described above. The area team are now working with Surrey's cycling officer to progress the 'Quick wins' in particular and the cycling officer will keep GBUG apprised of developments.

Question 4 from Dr Nigel Burke

It is understood North Street is soon to be resurfaced. Will the Council take this opportunity to introduce measures to favour cycling, for example, providing cycle lanes, and enabling two way cycling along the full length of the street?

A written response was provided as follows:

At their meeting in December 2016 the committee asked that the Transportation Task Group met to nominate roads for inclusion in Horizon 2 (the 20% element recommended by elected members). The task group met in early January and the following roads were submitted to the Asset Management team in priority order, with North Street the number one priority.

North Street (Guildford)	500m
Horsham Road (Shalford)	448m
Chantry Lane (Shere)	340m
Tangier Road (Guildford)	513m
Lawn Road (Guildford)	85m
Ash Street (Ash)	241m
Madrid Road (Guildford)	240m
Total	2,367m

The Task Group will look at the possibility of increasing pedestrianisation and cycle priority as part of the possible North Street redevelopment in conjunction with Guildford Borough Council.

Question 5 from Dr Nigel Burke

Can you report on progress with implementing the trial closure of Walnut Tree Close?

A written response was provided as follows:

A trial for Walnut Tree Close is due to commence in August subject to Surrey County Council reaching agreement with land owners to create sufficient space for drivers to safely turn around at the point of no-entry/closure. The plan is, as agreed with Local Committee, to trial both a one-way operation and full closure; each trial will last approximately one year to allow us to collect sufficient data to consider which to take forward in the long term. The full details are being designed at the moment.

198/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

One written question was received from County Councillor David Goodwin asking how many, and what were the locations of publicly available electric vehicle recharging points in the Borough of Guildford? What plans were there for further installations?

It was noted that Guildford Borough Council operate a green permit scheme in their car parks. Electric car owners can get a permit which allows them to use free parking bays in Bedford Road Multi Storey or three hours free in addition to any time they purchase in any of the council's pay and display car parks. The number of users has increased rapidly over the last few years and there are now 70 registered with the scheme.

There are a number of existing electric vehicle charging points in the borough:

Waitrose, York Road (4), Philips Electronics, Guildford Business Park (2), Vines BMW (5) and Toyota Guildford (2), Slyfield Industrial Estate, Earth Station, Normandy Business Park (2), Little Chef (2) Wisley South, RHS Gradens (4), Wisley North, White Hart Meadows (4) and Talbot Hotel (2), Ripley

In addition, there were electric charging points to support car club cars in: Dapdune Road, Walnut Tree Close and Poltimore Road

Further charging points were planned for: Millmead Car Park, G Live, Millbrook and the new Guildford Park Car Park.

199/16 TUNSGATE PUBLIC REALM SCHEME [Item 8]

This item was introduced by Gaurav Choksi, Development Project Officer with Guildford Borough Council. It was noted that this area fell within the Guildford South East Division, not Guildford South West as stated in the report.

It was noted that this area contained a high proportion of Guildford's heritage and cultural assets and institutions. It is anticipated that there would be a significant increase in footfall when the shopping area is opened in October 2017.

It was noted that the intention of the scheme was to provide enhanced public realm in the area, with improved connections between the castle and its grounds with the rest of the town centre through enhancements of Tunsgate.

Members were extremely complimentary about the scheme and in particular passed positive comments about the level of local consultation that had taken place in relation to adequate provision for disabled parking.

It was noted that care would need to be taken during the construction phase to ensure that large delivery vehicles did not block Castle Hill.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) The following principles for the Tunsgate Public Realm Scheme :
 - a. That Tunsgate becomes a gated pedestrianised road from the junction with Castle Street. Access restrictions for vehicles will be similar to those in the High Street but extend later into the evening.
 - b. That the existing pay & display and disabled parking spaces in Tunsgate are removed, with alternative disabled spaces introduced in the near locality.
- (ii) That decisions regarding details of the scheme are delegated to Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and local councillors.
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Area Highways Manager to take necessary steps to implement the scheme and advertise any formal orders needed to create the changes agreed. Should any objections be received to proposed orders delegate determination of those objections to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.
- (iv) That Surrey County Council work in partnership with Guildford Borough Council on this project and in delivery of the scheme.

200/16 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - DEVELOPED PROPOSALS REPORT [Item 9]

This item was introduced by Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager for Guildford Borough Council and presented recommendations for proposed changes to the formalised parking controls, to address various 'local' issues raised, primarily within the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone.

The following addendum was circulated to Members:

Additional proposed changes to disabled only parking places

- Alresford Road, Guildford – outside No.15 – introduce a new formalised disabled parking place, converting part of the existing 2-hour limited waiting or Permit J shared-use parking place,
- Spiceall, Compton – outside No.36 – revoke and remove the existing disabled parking place,
- The Oval, Wood Street Village – outside Nos.17&19 - revoke and remove the existing disabled parking place.

It was noted that Blue badge holders could park in disabled parking bays without time limit or on yellow lines, not subject to loading restrictions, for up to three hours and were exempt from charges for parking on-street. They could also park for an unlimited period in residents only, shared-use or limited waiting parking places.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- To formally advertise Surrey County Council's intention to make an order to give effect to the proposals shown in ANNEXE 2, and also those included in the ADDENDUM, which propose to amend the provision of disabled parking places in Alresford Road (Guildford), Spiceall (Compton) and The Oval (Wood Street Village). If any representations are received they be reported to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration, or if no representations are received, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made.

201/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 10]

This item was introduced by Frank Apicella, Acting Highways Area Engineer (SW). It was noted that five ITS schemes would not be completed in the current financial year and that some cluster fund work would also be outstanding. This amounted to about £137,000 in total.

It was noted that the 2017/18 budget had not been determined and it was felt sensible to convene a further meeting of the Transportation Task Group when the budget was announced if appropriate.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- To note progress of the 2016/17 programme of highway works and operations detailed at **Annex 1**.
- That the first call on the budget for 2017/18 is the cost of completing 2016/17 schemes, estimated at 137k
- That once the available budget for 2017/18 is known the Transportation Task Group meets to review the allocations made at the December meeting with their recommendations coming to the committee meeting in June.
- To promote a 40mph speed limit in Sherbourne Road, Albury between the newly introduced 40mph limit on the 25 Shere Road and the existing 30mph limit on the approach to the village.
- To note the responses to the formal consultation on proposed parking restrictions in the Boxgrove area at **Annex 2** and to proceed with their introduction.

202/16 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

Members noted progress on the decision tracker.

Meeting ended at: 8.45 pm

Chairman