

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 13 March 2019
at Surrey History Centre, 130 Goldsworth Road, Woking, GU21 6ND.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Liz Bowes (Vice-Chairman)
- * Ms Ayesha Azad
- * Amanda Boote
- * Mr Ben Carasco
- * Mr Will Forster
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mr Colin Kemp

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr David Bittleston (Chairman)
- * Cllr Ann-Marie Barker
- * Cllr John Bond
- * Cllr Graham Chrystie
- * Cllr Beryl Hunwicks
- * Cllr Louise Morales
- * Cllr Melanie Whitehand

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM

Public questions were invited. 12 public questions were asked as follows:-

- Community Infrastructure Levy process – 10 questions
- Safe to Play petition for a crossing point at Sopwith Drive
- Surrey Half Marathon – alternative routes / resurfacing at Westfield Avenue

The full questions and answers given are recorded in Annex A.

53/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence.

54/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

55/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

56/18 PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no petitions received.

57/18 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Three written questions were received as follows:-

- VAS signage outside Pyrford Primary school
- Damage to street furniture (railings)
- Pavement parking in Knaphill

The full written questions and answers given are attached as Annex 1.

One supplementary question was asked and the response given recorded in the annex.

58/18 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5a]

59/18 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were no written member questions.

60/18 WOMENS SUPPORT CENTRE - A PRESENTATION [Item 7]

The Committee received a presentation from Kate Paradine, Chief Executive of Women in Prison and Carol Appleby, Manager of the Womens Support Centre.

The presentation reviewed the issues experienced by women in prison and highlighted the national good practice example of the Woking Womens Support Centre in the High Street. The centre provides help with tackling a range of issues, including counselling, anger management and parenting support. The following points were noted:

- A third of all women in prison have been in care
- Prison is an expensive way of making problems worse
- It costs approx. £40,000 p.a. for each woman in prison
- For every £1 spent, £4.68 is saved
- Women can be diverted to the Support Centre instead of custody for minor offences
- The introduction of the Support Centre has seen a 36% reduction of Women in prison locally, set against a national increase

- Referrals are via a variety of routes (Police, Childrens Services, Family support), including self referrals (Domestic Abuse can mean that women are forced to shoplift)

The Centre would like to see more facilities available Surrey wide and now are awareness raising to attract external funding and to encourage more Districts and Boroughs to fund and / or provide similar central and accessible services.

61/18 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Area Highways Manger (AHM) presented a report which gave an updated position on current schemes and proposed a priority list of Capital Budget schemes for 2019/20. Members noted that there would be no revenue budget for the year and that the AHM encouraged them to use their allocations for this. The Committee also discussed the proposed traffic calming scheme at Westfield Road and noted that a good scheme should not increase pollution levels.

The Local Committee agreed to:

- i. Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2018/19 financial year.
- ii. Note the budgetary position.
- iii. Agree the proposed capital works programme for 2019/20 shown in table 2 at section 2.3
- iv. Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

Reasons for Decision:

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

62/18 HIGHWAYS BRIEFING - CABINET MEMBER [Item 12]

The Committee welcomed County Councillor Matt Furniss, Cabinet member for Highways to the meeting. Cllr Furniss introduced himself and highlighted that the County Council were working on the future highways contract for 2021. He noted the budget constraints highlighted in the Highways Report

and encouraged Members to use their allocations for revenue maintenance when possible.

63/18 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - ARRANGEMENT ON MANAGING THE PROPORTION OF THE CIL INCOME EARMARKED FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 9]

The Committee received a report on Community Infrastructure Levy community receipts. Members noted the comments made by the various Neighbourhood Forum representatives during the public forum, especially the concerns over the project management of agreed schemes. As a result, it was proposed and agreed that the process be implemented as recommended, and be carefully monitored and be reviewed in 12 months time. The recommendations of the report have been amended to include this agreement (proposed by Cllr Bittleston and seconded by Cllr Carasco).

Members also noted the following points:

- The consultation on the draft report could have been wider, to include all Members and the Forums – although it was noted that every Councillor would be included in the training.
- The Planning Policy Manager and his team had been working closely with the Neighbourhood Forums and had also studied how other local authority are managing the use of their CIL income. The report takes into account lessons learnt from these other authorities.
- Although Councillors are being asked to manage the delivery of the identified community projects, in practice, it is likely that there would be significant Officers input by way of providing advice and some help. The nature of the assistance can only be determined on a case by case basis depending on the nature, scale and type of community project. The Joint Committee will monitor the situation and make any changes to the process in due course if it is deemed necessary.,
- The process has been designed to be local, open and transparent. In this regard, Officers will provide monthly updates on money received and how much has been earmarked for each Ward/Neighbourhood Area. Each Councillor will receive the update from end of April and thereafter at the end of each month.
- It was clarified that the use of the 75%/85% that went to the Borough Council is the sole responsibility of the Council through the Joint Committee., The Council has published a Regulation 123 priority list (that was widely consulted on) of schemes that it wishes to the use CIL income on.

The Woking Joint Committee agreed that :

- (i) The arrangement for managing the proportion of the CIL receipts earmarked for local community projects as set out in Section 2 of the report be noted and approved;
- (ii) Local Ward Borough Councillors in conjunction with County Divisional Councillors take the leading role in identifying local community infrastructure projects that CIL receipts could be used, and in doing so should work in partnership with designated Neighbourhood Forums

and other recognised stakeholders within the Ward or Neighbourhood Area.

(iii) That the process be subject to review in one years' time.

Reason for decision:

To enable the effective and efficient management of the proportion of the CIL receipts that is earmarked for local community projects.

64/18 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Thornton-Bryar, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Woking Joint Committee noted the decision tracker.

65/18 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nicola Thornton-Bryar, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Woking Joint Committee noted the forward plan of items expected to be received in 2019.

Meeting ended at: 8.05 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A**Woking Joint Committee
13 March 2019
Open Public Question Time****COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

The following questions were submitted by email prior to the meeting and were answered during the open forum.

The questions were submitted by Stewart Dick, Chair, Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents' Association, Wade Pollard, Chair of West Byfleet Neighbourhood Forum and Geoff Geaves, Chair, Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum.

Questions from the Byfleets**Question 1:**

We welcome the paper from Ernest Amoako - it is a good framework for moving forward. However we are surprised and indeed disappointed that it is not a draft for discussion but is a policy paper for agreement. The Agenda states that the Paper is a report - somewhat different from a submission for agreement. In addition to the below questions, we believe that greater detail and clarity are required for example on the consultation process and the reporting ambitions.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

The Joint Committee has informally discussed this matter in detail. The overwhelming view of local residents is that a decision must be made as quickly as possible to set the framework for managing the CIL money. It is therefore appropriate that the Joint Committee is acting accordingly.

If this question relates to the consultation that Ward Councillors has to undertake to identify priority projects, this is a matter for the relevant Councillors to agree at the Ward or Neighbourhood Area level. The briefing that Members will receive is likely to include various ways to go about this.

Question 2:

Paragraph 2.3 stating what CIL receipts can be used for

We believe that paragraph 2.3 is lacking in detail. The legislative definition should be quoted and the definition published on the Woking Borough Council webpage.

Paragraphs 1.6 and 2.2 Role of Ward and County Councillors

It is not clear which Councillors nor indeed how many Councillors will be involved in the decision chain. We would suggest one Ward Councillor and one County Councillor who sits on the Woking Joint Committee.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

Paragraph 2.3 is precisely the legislative definition. However, we can easily add the Core Strategy's definition of infrastructure to the webpage.

All Ward Borough Councillors and County Divisional Councillors for the respective Wards or Neighbourhood Areas are expected and encouraged to be involved. In this

regard, the Joint Committee is not intending to prescribe or recommend that only one Ward Borough Councillor and one County Divisional Councillor for each Ward or Neighbourhood Area should be involved. If the respective Councillors agree to delegate responsibility to individual Councillors, that is a matter to be determined by them

Question 3:

Paragraph 2.6 and Paragraph 6.3, Management of projects

We believe that the main involvement of the Community in the expenditure of CIL is the selection of projects and the decision re priorities. It is not for the Community then to manage the projects nor for Councillors to provide oversight and have tight control. The skill base is not there. It is for WBC to take the contract in house and manage it as they would any other project.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

The whole ethos of the Government's proposal is to pass on a proportion of the CIL income to local communities to use to address the impacts of development on local infrastructure. In this regard, it is not intended that the Council will take on the commitment as suggested. The Council would not have the necessary resources at this stage within the existing Service Plan budgets to undertake such commitment. If the Joint Committee wish to refer the matter to the Executive of the Council to decide, I will seek to facilitate that. (The Joint Committee agreed to implement the process as recommended and monitor and review it in 12 months time).

Questions from the Pyrford Neighbourhood Forum

Question 4:

Paragraph 1.6 - is it just those ward councillors who are on the joint committee, or all ward councillors.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

As before, the reference to Ward Councillors in this context refers to all the Ward Borough Councillors and the County Divisional Councillors representing the Ward.

Question 5:

Paragraph 2.3 Please can the council have on its website a CIL page that includes the definition of infrastructure

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

The Council's website already has a web-page on CIL and as above, we will add the Core Strategy's definition of infrastructure to this.

Question 6:

Paragraph 2.9 just a clarification of the word 'by' - if we wanted to instruct a contractor to make some planters in April, at present all we will be able to do is tell the contractor that they will be paid by 28 October. We think this is too long and we won't be able to get anyone to do the work.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

'By' in this context means on or before the specified dates. The prescribed dates are in accordance with the CIL Regulations. The intention to specify the 'by' date is to avoid delays in the payment of the money by the Council.

The Chair emphasised that the Council always seek to make payments on time and in an efficient manner.

Question 7:

Paragraph 2.10 - monthly budget reports, when can we expect the first of the updates please?

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

Subject to the Joint Committee approving the recommendations of the report, the first of the updates will be provided to all Councillors by the end of April 2019 and thereafter, by the end of each month.

Question 8:

Para 2.11 Could the training please be extended to members of the neighbourhood forums.

Response from Ernest Amoako, WBC

The Joint Committee agreed to make the training available to the various Neighbourhood Forums but this will be organised separately.

Question 9: Marion Melcher, Footpath Officer,

I refer to footpath 24 that crosses the road at Sopwith Drive, Brooklands across the boundary into Elmbridge and gives access to the play area. This has been subject to a petition that was taken at the Elmbridge Joint Committee in November 2018. Can I ask: Are all the Committee Members aware of the petition? Are all the Committee Members aware of the dangers in this area? When will a highways assessment be undertaken in this area? What area will the assessment cover? The Committees are supposed to be joined up but what actions are being taken to liaise and join up with the neighbouring area of Elmbridge on this matter?

Response from the Chair

I agree that this case is complicated by the fact that it falls onto the boundary. The Joint Committees join up Surrey County Council and the District / Borough Councils, but we do need to look at how the Committees deal with cross boundary issues.

Response from Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager

This petition was raised at Elmbridge committee and Members are aware of this. We do have a list of priorities in Woking and we have to prioritise these based on public safety and deliverability. The petition responses are not just dealt with by the Committees, but by the teams of Officers and the 2 area highways managers have liaised on this. Some cross boundary issues can cause friction as to who should fund the works, but we do work together and we are looking to see if this issue can be addressed alongside works in Elmbridge.

Question 10: Miles Harvey, Mount Hermon

Does CIL money have a time limit to spend money?

Answer from Ernest Amoako

Working Borough Council will hold all the CIL money and there is no time limit.

Question 11: Bob Shatwell, local resident

I think more could be done to publicise the Committee meetings and all residents associations could be informed. I am concerned that the Surrey Half Marathon, discussed at the last meeting brings everything to a halt once a year, as we cannot get in or out. Could I suggest that alternative routes are used each year in order that the same residents are not inconvenienced each time. Also, when Willow Reach was developed we were assured that Westfield Avenue would be resurfaced by the developer but this has not been done.

Answer from the Chair

We advertise all the meetings on our website and social media and we are now taking them out into the community to make them more accessible. We will look at what we can do to make more of the residents associations aware of items of interest.

I will ask the organiser of the Surrey Half Marathon whether alternative routes could be considered.

Answer from Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager

I am unsure of the details on Willow Reach or how this was promised or prioritised so will have to answer this outside of the meeting.

Question 12: Deborah Hughes, Councillor

I welcome the CIL report and framework but am surprised that this did not come to full council for consultation.

Answer from the Chair

Council gave CIL to the Joint Committee and we will be providing training for all Councillors and, as mentioned above, to Neighbourhood Forums as well.



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 13 MARCH 2019

SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS x 3

DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1: Mr Bob Tilley, Woking resident

Please can you advise when the vehicle activated signs (VAS) on Coldharbour Road, outside Pyrford Primary, which is now a very large school, will be mended?

Answer from Highways Officers

Officers have previously been in correspondence with Mr Tilley about this issue and, specifically, with regard to the budgets that are available to repair faulty Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS).

Maintenance of VAS is undertaken by our Safety Engineering Team using a relatively modest budget that is also intended to fund the maintenance of School flashing signs, sometimes referred to as “wig-wags”. This budget is also intended to fund the task of programming the “wig-wags” so they flash at the correct times of day and during term-time only. Our colleagues in the Safety Engineering Team have advised that out of their £20,000 maintenance budget for the 2018/19 financial year and which is for the entire county and not just Woking, the “wig-wag” maintenance and programming accounted for approximately £12,000 which leaves just £8,000, county-wide, for VAS maintenance. This is insufficient for the maintenance that is required to bring all of the County’s non-working VAS back into operation. It is expected that the Safety Engineering Team’s budget will remain the same for the 2019/20 financial year.

The existing signs, which flash “30” and “SLOW DOWN” when working and triggered, are solar powered signs and were installed in May 2007. Experience with this type of sign by this manufacturer suggests that the issue might be with the battery that is stored in the base of the post on which the sign is mounted and which is charged by the solar panel. Replacement of the battery can be relatively inexpensive (the last time that this had to be done, several years ago, the cost was in the region of £300) but there will be also be a cost for the contractor to attend site and assess the sign to determine exactly what the problem is. Given the age of the sign and based on experience, it is likely that additional problems will be identified. These could include the need for a new control board – the last time this had to be done, the cost was just under £1,000. In another instance, when a new control board and some replacement LED clusters were required, the cost was in the region of £1,900 (compare this to the cost of a mains powered speed limit repeater type VAS that could be installed for approximately £2250 and which would have a 6 year warranty).

As a result and assuming that it is actually cost effective to do so, getting these two signs back into working order could require a significant amount of the VAS element

of the Safety Engineering Team's budget. Even if the signs were repaired, the original units will still be 12 years old and will potentially be more susceptible to further faults and expense. Complete replacement of the units, with mains powered versions of a type that experience has shown to be more reliable, might be the most appropriate option, although to replace both units, including the removal of the old solar powered units, would cost in the region of £5,500.

The Woking Joint Committee will have noted that there is no revenue maintenance budget for the 2019/20 financial year and so the repair of the solar powered units could not be undertaken by the Joint Committee. Whilst there is a recommendation that £10,000 of the capital budget is set aside for signing and lining work and for the provision of dropped kerbs, it is not proposed that this should be used for the provision of Vehicle Activated Signs because of the individual unit cost of these signs; VAS have previously only been funded from the capital budget if they form part of a larger speed reducing / safety scheme. The Safety Engineering Team's maintenance budget is intended to be used for the maintenance of existing signs rather than their complete replacement with new ones.

Members have their own allocation which has sometimes been used to fund VAS. However, with the absence of a revenue budget during 2019/20, it is recommended that this allocation is not fully or substantially committed on a single project such as the provision of VAS as this may be required to deal with routine maintenance issues that are likely to arise throughout the year.

We will continue to work with our colleagues in the Safety Engineering Team to identify other potential sources of funding that could be used to repair, or ideally replace, the VAS in Coldharbour Road.

Supplementary Question taken at the meeting

I understand that capital funds are needed to replace the VAS signs and note that WBC have funds to upgrade car parking signage and systems, so could this be used?

Answer given at the meeting

The car park funds are not appropriate for this, but Cllr Liz Bowes proposed to look at whether she could use her Members allocation.

Question 2: Mr Richard Thomas, Woking resident

When street furniture [railings] are damaged by RTCs etc are these replaced /repaired and painted and within what timescale?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the Committee

When pedestrian guardrails are damaged, they are not always replaced; more often than not, repair of a damaged panel in-situ is not possible due to the type and extent of the damage.

For a number of years, there has been a general move towards trying to de-clutter the highway, which includes the rationalisation of guardrailing. In this same vein, Transport for London undertook an assessment of guardrailing with a view to removing as much unnecessary and redundant railing as possible.

Whilst Surrey County Council has never undertaken a similar exercise, damaged guardrailing is often assessed to see if it needs to be replaced and whether

www.woking.gov.uk
www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking

removing the damaged railing (and possibly additional lengths) would compromise pedestrian safety. It is commonly thought that guardrailing must improve pedestrian safety but it is interesting that after TfL had removed large amounts of railing, an “after study” found that, “*The results showed that following the removal of railings at the 70 sites there was a statistically significant fall of 56% (43 to 19) in the number of collisions involving pedestrians who were killed or seriously injured. There was also a fall of 48% (109 to 57) in the number of KSI collisions for all users.*”

Replacement guardrails are generally unpainted, galvanised steel units and they are usually not painted after installation, principally for cost and maintenance purposes.

If a damaged guardrail is causing a danger, it is likely to be removed quickly via our “A & E” emergency response mechanism. However, replacement of railings can take between 3 and 6 months, although depending upon our contractor’s workload and our priorities, it can be longer.

Question 3: Ross Daniell, local resident

Can a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) be introduced prohibiting vehicles parking on the Foot (pavements) and Cycle paths within the boundaries of Knaphill?

Answer from Parking Strategy and Implementation Team

Firstly, the Joint Committee do not support pavement parking because it is antisocial and causes problems for pedestrians and vulnerable road users, however we have limited powers to prevent it.

Pavement parking is a growing problem in many parts of Surrey and the UK as the number of vehicles on the road increases and off street parking is not always available. Outside of Greater London, in the absence of waiting restrictions, it is not specifically prohibited to park on the pavement and when it takes place can only be enforced by the police where an obstruction has been caused.

As you suggest councils do have powers to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO’s) to formalise or ban pavement parking (and then enforce this) but it can be an expensive process requiring a statutory advert in the local paper and extensive signing to impose the restriction over an area on each occasion. For example in Knaphill, the national regulations covering parking restrictions would require us to put up boundary signs and repeaters on lamp columns across the whole area. This could cost tens of thousands of pounds for one area so we rarely have these resources to seriously consider this type of approach.

We carry out regular parking reviews in Woking Borough and respond to parking problems with this process. It is possible this more targeted approach could help solve any specific pavement parking difficulties you experience. Requests for new restrictions to be included in the next Woking Parking Review [can be made here](#) (on the SCC website) and a report detailing the proposed locations will be considered by the committee in September this year.

In the meantime the best course of action is to call Surrey Police on the non emergency number (111) when there are clear cases of obstruction caused by pavement parking.

This page is intentionally left blank