

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 11 November 2020
at VIRTUAL MEETING.

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

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr David Bittleston (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr Simon Ashall, Heathlands
- Cllr Gary Elson
- * Cllr Tahir Aziz, Canalside
- * Cllr Ann-Marie Barker
- * Cllr Graham Chrystie
- * Cllr Melanie Whitehand

* In attendance

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE - 6.30PM [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllrs Colin Kemp and Gary Elson.

2/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020 were agreed and will be signed by the Chair.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were made.

4/20 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR [Item 4]

Cllr Simon Ashall was proposed for the position of Vice Chair by Cllr Ayesha Azad and this was seconded by Cllr Liz Bowes.

5/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS - 6.45PM [Item 5]

4 written public questions were received as follows:

- Claire Johnston, local resident re crossing at Sopwith Drive

- Trevor Caldwell, Sally Cormac and Andrew Murrin, Woodham Road residents re speeding and dangerous driving on Woodham Road
- Adam Kirby, Claire Draper and Neil McPherson, Horsell Moor residents re traveller incursions
- Maddie Key re parking and traffic issues at Marshall Parade, Pryford

The written public questions and answers given were reviewed by the Committee and 3 supplementary questions were put forward.

Details are included in Annex B and are attached to these minutes.

6/20 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

3 written member questions were received as follows:

- Will Forster re Rydens Way and Woking College
- Will Forster re road surfacing at Granville Road
- Ann-Marie Barker re Lakers Youth Centre

The written questions and answers given were tabled at the meeting and there was 1 supplementary question asked. The questions are attached as Annex C to these minutes.

7/20 PETITIONS [Item 7]

There were 2 Petitions received:

- Implement a shared pedestrian and cycle path on the remainder of the south side of the A245 Parvis Road between Byfleet Queens Head and West Byfleet Highfield Road - Keith Cresswell
- Sutton Green traffic calming

Written responses were given and circulated with the supplementary agenda. The petitioners were not able to attend. Members raised the following points:

Shared Cycle Path – Cllr Boote thanked the petitioner for bringing this item as this was an important stretch of road that did have an almost complete pathway with only a small stretch to be completed. This was part of the main cycle Surrey route and Cllr Boote also offered some funds toward this. Cllr Barker also supported the completion of the route which was used by school children. Cllr Chrystie asked whether the developer contractors on site could complete the works.

The Area Highways Manager confirmed that it was always helpful when cycle paths could be completed, but that the council had its own contractors for this type of work and that developers were unlikely to complete additional works on site without further funding. The next committee cycle would determine the highways works for the next financial year and this could be looked at, at that stage if the figures were within budget.

It was therefore agreed that this would be considered in the March 2021 budget round, alongside other priorities.

Sutton Green – Councillor Forster felt it was work in progress and that the speed survey would be key in identifying what was needed. He also felt that wooden entry / gateway markers would also be useful .

8/20 HORSELL 20MPH SPEED LIMIT - 7PM [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 that highlighted the need for an area of 20mph speed limit in Horsell, including side roads. This was supported by Members to include busy parts of the village and outside the school. Officers were thanked for their work on this.

Members did raise other areas that could benefit from 20mph limits and were referred to the speed management policy and the processes for getting these considered.

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) Lych Way, Wilson Way, Pares Close, South Close and Meadway Drive, extending approximately 165m northeast from its junction with High Street, Horsell are included within the previously approved proposal for a 20mph limit on part of Church Hill and High Street; and
- (ii) a notice is advertised in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which would be to introduce the proposed 20mph speed limit in the aforementioned roads; and
- (iii) any objections to the Traffic Regulation Order should be considered and resolved by the Area Team Manager for Highways in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee and the local Divisional Member, and that this issue only be returned to Committee if any objections prove insurmountable; and
- (iv) the Order be made once any objections have been considered and resolved.

Reason for Recommendation:

The recommendation, to include several cul-de-sacs and part of Meadway Drive in the previously approved scheme for a 20mph limit on parts of Church Hill and High Street, Horsell, would result in less signage and street clutter and would result in a more sensible, coherent scheme.

9/20 PROPOSED PEDESTRIANISATION OF CHOBHAM ROAD AND COMMERCIAL WAY FROM THE JUNCTION WITH CHERTSEY ROAD TO THE EXISTING PEDESTRIAN ZONE IN COMMERCIAL WAY [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Tony Otterson, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Officer presented a map of the area in question and highlighted the need for a pedestrianised area as part of the wider improvements in Woking Town. This would mean the reduction of disabled spaces from 10 down to 8. Letters would be dropped to local businesses and access groups as part of the consultation process.

Woking Joint Committee noted that:

A permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for the creation of a pedestrian zone within Chobham Road and Commercial Way, between the junction with Chertsey Road and the existing pedestrian zone in Commercial Way.

Reason for decision:

The pedestrianisation of this section of Chobham Road and Commercial Way is sought to enable improved pedestrian access to the town centre as well as the provision of a high quality urban environment as part of the major public realm improvements to Woking Town Centre.

10/20 PROPOSED PEDESTRIANISATION OF CHURCH STREET EAST FROM THE JUNCTION WITH CHOBHAM ROAD TO THE TOWN SQUARE [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Tony Otterson, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Officer presented a map which explained the pedestrianisation of the areas. This would result in a net loss of 3 disabled parking spaces and would affect the turning area that is used for drop offs into the Town. The Officer confirmed that the turning area was being moved elsewhere, with less pedestrian activity and more space (near the Town gate). Conversations were continuing with disabled access groups on provision overall throughout the Town.

Woking Joint Committee noted that:

A permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for the creation of a pedestrian zone within Church Street West, between the junction with Chobham Road and the Town Square.

Reason for decision:

The pedestrianisation of the section of Church Street East between Chobham Road and the Town Gate is sought to enable improved pedestrian access to the town centre as well as the provision of a high quality urban environment as part of the major public realm improvements to Woking Town Centre.

11/20 PARKING REVIEW REPORT - 7.30PM [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Peter Wells, Parking Officer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Parking Officer (PO) presented a report on parking proposals under the 2020 parking review. He outlined that the work had been undertaken during Covid restrictions, so the usual joint site visits with Members were not possible and public involvement with schemes had been limited. The parking task group had also not met to feed into the proposals. The majority of requests had been received prior to lockdown in March 2020. Lockdown had also significantly changed parking patterns in the Town so the parking recommendations report was smaller than usual. Future lockdowns might delay implementation so the smaller review seemed opportune in this regard.

The PO also outlined that a scheme for Hillside (Woking South) was also being added to the proposals. This was discussed at the previous review, but not taken forward, but residents had now changed their views on this, so it would be re-advertised.

Eve Road and Arnold Road (discussed earlier in the meeting) may also need some changes to double yellow lines and these would be agreed by the County Member and the Chair if needed. Cllr Carasco offered some of his Highways budget toward this if required. Cllr Kemp (in his absence) requested a very small change to double yellow lines in Horsell, which would be followed up outside the meeting and added to the advertisement.

The PO outlined the annex that identified locations for Electric Vehicle Charging points throughout the Borough, as part of a County wide scheme.

The PO was thanked for his work in difficult circumstances.

The Joint Committee (Woking) agreed that:

- (i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Woking as described in this report **and in the Hillside supplementary papers** and shown in detail on drawings in annex A are approved.

- (ii) the joint committee allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) the intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Woking as shown on the drawings in annex A is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iv) if there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor.
- (v) the intention of the county council to advertise the making of a consolidation Order (without change) of the existing Traffic Regulation Orders to Woking is approved, and that approval for future consolidations, when they become necessary, can be granted by the committee chairman.
- (vi) the five parking bay locations identified for conversion into on-street Electric Vehicle charging points are approved. These locations are listed in each County Councillors division of this report, and displayed in their own set of drawings. There is one in Goldsworth East and Horsell. One in The Byfleets. One in Woking North and two in the Woking South divisions.

Reasons for decisions:

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

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles
- Easing traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking
- Better enforcement

12/20 COMMUNITY SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT - 8PM [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Camilla Edmiston, Community Safety Manager, WBC and David Bentley, Surrey Police

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Community Safety Manger (CSM) presented a report on the excellent work of the Community Safety team and partner organisations during

2019/20. It was noted that work had continued during 2020, but significant adaptations had been made due to lockdown and restrictions.

Members discussed crime figures included in the report and noted that these had generally decreased in Woking. Members were concerned that Domestic Abuse (DA) may have increased during Lockdown both County wide and Nationally. It was confirmed that additional funding had been given locally to DA helplines. The situation was being closely monitored going forward and additional funds were being sought at all levels to cope with any increases.

Vehicle crime was a rising issue with thefts from vehicles on the increase, together with the theft of newer vehicles with electronic access keys. Awareness campaigns were planned for this. Cannabis usage was also being monitored together with drug use during lockdown.

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report and progress made in 2019/20
- (ii) Note the community safety budget spend during 2019/20 (Annex 3)
- (iii) Note that the Community Safety Task Group receives updates on the project(s) funded, on behalf of the committee and provides information on those projects in the quarterly community safety reports circulated to councillors.

**13/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - ONE YEAR REVIEW - 8.20PM
[Item 13]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Planning Policy Manger (PPM) presented a report the review of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding. The Officer review had taken account of feedback from Members (Overview and Scrutiny Committee) and funding bids received during the year. The main concerns were the delay between Joint Committees, addressed by the recommendation for a sub group to approve smaller bids and the appeal process, which has been addressed in the report. Members were asked to volunteer for the sub group by contacting the Committee Officer.

Members raised concerns that larger funding bids were difficult and the responsibility for the project management of large bids was unclear. It was noted that the process allowed flexibility and that professional project managers could be employed and paid for from the funds. Ward Councillors were still concerned about the overall responsibility, but would work with Officers on each individual scheme as it arose. An application form with a

checklist was also noted as helpful and a draft would be circulated for agreement. Cllr Graham Chrystie strongly disagreed with the review report but no amendments to the recommendations were put forward.

More work will be done on advertising the funds available, with CIL being more prominent on the webpages of the Joint Committee (both SCC and WBC sites) and the Borough website.

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The current arrangement for the use of CIL money to deliver local community infrastructure projects should continue subject to the proposed recommendations of the report set out in recommendations (ii) to (iv).
- (ii) The Flowchart attached to the Overview and Scrutiny report to this meeting is user-friendly, provides clarity on the arrangement for local communities to use their CIL money and should be circulated to all Borough Ward Councillors and County Divisional Councillors (subject to any amendments approved by the Joint Committee).
- (iii) A Sub-Group should be set up to determine applications submitted by Ward Councillors to use CIL money to deliver community infrastructure projects. The Sub-Group should be able to determine applications outside Joint Committee meetings and approve applications up to the value of £10,000.
- (iv) The Joint Committee will promote the revised CIL arrangement to Councillor and encourage them to be proactive in engaging with residents on where the CIL money could be best used.

Reason for decision:

To enable local communities to use their CIL money to deliver local community infrastructure projects.

14/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - FUNDING BID - KNAPHILL WARD [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Cllr Whitehand, Ward Member recommended support for the funding bid for Knaphill Ward.

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Knaphill Ward to install three picnic benches, two benches and a rubbish bin at Sussex Road Playground be approved;
- (ii) The Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to approve payment for the total cost of installing the benches when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The cost of installing the benches and the rubbish bin is estimated at £2,000.00 and will be drawn from the total CIL income earmarked for the Knaphill Ward, this currently stands at £12,864.00; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for the Knaphill Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the benches in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reasons for decision:

To enable funding to be secured for the installation of three picnic benches, two benches and a rubbish bin at the Sussex Road Playground, Knaphill Ward.

15/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - FUNDING BID - ST JOHNS WARD [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Cllr Cundy detailed and recommended support for the funding bid for St Johns War Memorial.

Working Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for St Johns for the paving of the St Johns Church War Memorial Ground be approved;
- (ii) The Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to approve payment for the total cost of the paving when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The cost of the paving is estimated at **£5,600** and will be drawn from the total CIL income earmarked for the St Johns Ward, this currently stands at £14,389; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for St Johns Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the paving in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reasons for decision:

To enable funding to be secured for the paving of the St Johns Church War Memorial Ground, St Johns Ward.

16/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING BID - PYRFORD [Item 16]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Cllr Graham Chrystie, Ward Councillor and Cllr Liz Bowes, County Councillor recommended support for the bid for repairs of the Cricket Pavillion. Cllr Bowes noted that she had also put £1,000 of her Members allowance towards the project.

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Pyrford Neighbourhood Area for the repair of the Cricket Pavilion be approved subject to the conditions set out in the application;
- (ii) The Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to approve payment up to a total of £14,000 when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The £14,000 will be drawn from the total CIL income earmarked for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Area, this currently stands at £28,246.98; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for the Pyrford Neighbourhood Area be asked to oversee all works relating to the repair of the Cricket Pavilion in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control

Reasons for decision:

To enable funding to be secured for the repair of the Cricket Pavilion at Coldharbour Road, Pyrford.

17/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING BID - GOLDSWORTH PARK [Item 16a]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, Ward Councillor and Cllr Hussein, County Councillor recommended support for the funding bid.

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Goldsworth Park Ward to install benches, picnic tables and refuse/recycling bins at Goldsworth Park Recreation Area be approved;
- (ii) The Deputy Chief Executive be authorised to approve payment for the total cost of installing the benches, picnic tables and bins when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The cost of installing the benches, picnic tables and bins is estimated at £6,897.56 and will be drawn from the total CIL income earmarked for the Goldsworth Park Ward, this currently stands at £7,489.99; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for Goldsworth Park Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the benches, picnic tables and bins in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reason for decision:

To enable funding to be secured for the installation of benches, picnic tables and bins at the Goldsworth Park Recreation Area.

18/20 TASK GROUPS AND MEMBERSHIP - 8.45PM [Item 17]

Declarations of Interest: None

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

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

The Partnership Committee Officer (PCO) presented a report on task groups and membership, which are reviewed annually. It was noted that the Health and Wellbeing Task Group terms of reference were updated in Sept 2019 but the old version was included in the Annex.

It was noted that in the TOR for each, the minutes are marked as private. However, it was suggested that they should all be public unless otherwise stated.

Membership of the Health and Wellbeing Task Group was adjusted as Cllrs Azad and Ashall had stood down. Cllrs Liz Bowes and Saj Hussein were appointed. The other groups would remain as listed.

Woking Joint Committee agreed:

- (i) The terms of reference for the following (as set out in Annex 1):

- a. Health and Wellbeing Task Group
 - b. Community Safety Task Group
 - c. Parking Task Group
 - d. Infrastructure Working Group
- (ii) The County Councillor and Borough Councillor appointments to the following:
- a. Health and Wellbeing Task Group (up to 2 County and 2 Borough)
 - b. Community Safety Task Group (up to 2 County and 2 Borough)
 - c. Parking Task Group (up to 2 County and 2 Borough plus Chairman and Vice Chairman)
 - d. Infrastructure Working Group (1 County, 1 Borough)

Reasons for Decision:

The Task Groups will enable the Joint Committee to carry out its functions in an efficient and expedient manner.

19/20 DECISION AND ACTION TRACKER [Item 18]

The decision and action tracker was noted.

20/20 FORWARD PLAN - 8.55PM [Item 19]

The forward plan for 2021 was noted. The proposal was for 3 meetings next year, with proposed dates of 17 or 24 March, 23 June and 10 November.

Cllrs noted the reduction from 4 meetings to 3 per annum. This reflected the scheduled priorities and items to be heard and the setting up of a task group for CIL bids. The 3 meetings would be supplemented with private meetings if required and also with public engagement sessions. This would be discussed fully with Members to plan a way forward to fit the needs in Woking.

Meeting ended at: 9.31 pm

Chairman

Annex A**Woking Joint Committee**
11 November 2020
Open Public Question Time**Question 1: Stuart Lanceman, 12 Paxton Gardens, Woking regarding Garden Licences issued along the Basingstoke Canal**

I would like the garden licences of 12 and 14 Paxton Gardens re-examined as I think a mistake has been made, resulting in me losing about 2/3 of my canal frontage.

The problem is the garden licences go down to a bend in the canal. I always thought I had a garden licence that was at an angle which would reflect a reasonable amount of access to the canal in relation to my house/garden width, something which I thought I'd always enjoyed over the last 36 years of residency. If the garden licence for number 14 is deemed to be correct, I would lose practically all usable access.

Therefore I would like both garden licences to be rewritten to give us a fair amount of land. I would also like to know why I was not consulted when number 14 Paxton Gardens was issued their licence thus causing this neighbourly dispute.

Answer given by the Chair

The Chair asked if the questioner had approached the Basingstoke Canal Authority, which had taken place but the answer given was stated to be unsatisfactory.

Cllr Ben Carasco clarified that the canal frontage was owned by the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA) but that Garden Licences were issued by Surrey County Council to allow residents to use the land but not own it. He asked that the Joint Committee work with the County Council to ensure a resolution.

The Chair noted that there was a BCA Joint Management Committee on 18 Nov and that the questioner should address that Committee, but that the Joint Committee would try to assist following that if required.

Question 2: Tammy Nathan on behalf of residents (Sally Hodgkins, Bridget Nicholson, Robert Hopkins and WBC Cllr Mohammed Ali)

Five residents of Eve Road and Arnold Road and the Councillor for the area attended to ask about residents permits in their road (under the parking review).

The questions were:-

1. Are the residents correct in understanding that this proposal to introduce Residents Permit Scheme in Eve Road and Arnold Road being presented today by Parking Strategy and Implementation Team is for approval?
2. And if so, once approved by the joint committee, the formal consultation with the residents concerned is likely to happen during the first quarter of 2021?
3. Are you able to give us an idea of when the implementation of the scheme is likely to happen once completion of consultation with residents?
4. Can you give assurance to the residents that they can discuss /communicate the details of consultation with the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team during consultation period with regards to items such as
 - a. Business permits criteria

- b. Control hours for the scheme – options available (e.g. Mon-Sat 8am to 8pm etc.)
- c. Existing road markings which could be redundant.
- d. Waive admin fee for resident's permit whose car changes regularly (weekly/Monthly) due to work commitments.
- e. Update on where we are with regards to the process of inclusion of two car parks at the end of Arnold Road

Response from Peter Wells, Parking Officer

The Officer confirmed that he had been in touch with the resident with answers to these questions, but confirmed in the meeting that:

- The parking review was a proposal and agreement was sought to advertise this and consult with residents to gain support or objections by residents.
- This would likely be in the first quarter of 2021 with leaflet drops and questionnaires to all households (tenants not landlords)
- If the proposal is not supported by the majority, it would not be progressed.
- If supported, then the questionnaire would be used to ascertain preferred hours etc
- Implementation could be Summer 2021 (dependant on lockdown conditions)
- Business permits could be considered if required (one per business is used in the Town Centre)
- Flexibility could be applied to residents that regularly use different cars
- The two car parks did not form part of the public highway so would not be included, but the parking team would work with WBC officers to look at this and try to make the approach consistent
- The scheme (if it goes ahead) need not be the same as area 2 but could be a separate scheme
- Double yellow lines could be removed as part of the scheme, but would need to be advertised and promoted as part of the scheme so residents would need to advise on this.

Members also noted that the roads were narrow with cars parked on both sides. Most of the businesses in the area were in adjoining roads but customers parked on Eve Road/Arnold Road. Pavement parking was also mentioned but this was a separate issue to the parking review.

Residents were happy with business permits but felt they should be limited to each business to minimise parking problems.

Unfortunately, although Cllr Mohammed Ali was in attendance, he was not able to speak as the time ran out. He was thanked for his interest in the meeting and his support to residents.



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 11 NOV 2020
SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS
DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1: Claire Johnston, local resident

2 years on from the initial petition, Sopwith Drive still needs a safer pedestrian crossing for access to Brooklands Community Park and Cherrylands Nursery.

What action will this committee take in 2020 to make the crossing safer for the children and people of our communities?

Answer from Highways Office

This petition was presented to the Elmbridge Local Committee at its meeting on 26 November 2018 and although the petition was never formally presented to the Woking Joint Committee, a question was asked about this matter at the Joint Committee meeting on 13 March 2019.

An item to consider the introduction of a controlled pedestrian crossing on Sopwith Drive had been included within our overall work programme for a number of years prior to the petition and question; it remains on our programme and is currently ranked 18th out of 70 or so potential schemes on our list.

All the schemes on this list are point scored against the same criteria to allow us to prioritise them as best as we can and whilst the petition and question have highlighted to the members of the Elmbridge and Woking Committees it does not alter the way in which the schemes are ranked. Whilst officers will make recommendations about which schemes should be promoted in any given year, the Members of the Woking Joint Committee are at liberty to promote schemes out of priority order or to add extra items to our list of schemes. As Members will know, it is sometimes necessary to promote the schemes that are on our list out of priority order to make best use of the available budgets.

This length of road has a relatively good collision history compared with many locations although it is acknowledged that the only collision along the length of Sopwith Drive in the last 5 year period, between the Parvis Road and Barnes Wallis Drive roundabouts (but not including the roundabouts themselves) did involve a young male cyclist who was crossing the road. However, Members will remember that one of this year's ITS schemes was to improve the existing uncontrolled crossing point to the north of Viscount Gardens and this work was completed by the end of June 2020. Visibility along Sopwith Drive from this existing crossing point is very good and the double yellow lines that were applied over the summer appear to have removed the obstructive goods vehicle parking that had become particularly bad during the first national Coronavirus lockdown.

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

It is also acknowledged that there could be a certain amount of suppressed demand due to the absence of a controlled pedestrian crossing but it is also clear that the work that would be required to provide such a crossing would exceed the Joint Committee's annual budget, based on current and recent funding levels. Although the Elmbridge Local Committee has indicated that there may be scope for some CIL funding from the Weybridge / Brooklands area

Supplementary question from Claire Johnston

I wanted to follow up the response and I thank you for answering this, but I interpret from this that no action will be taken. I understand that money is tight, but I wanted to know what could be done to try to progress this.

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager

It is a sad fact that we have a long list of requests for Woking (reflected across the County) and that although this is an item that is of interest to Members and has been so for 2 years, the list of other outstanding improvements includes schemes that have been outstanding for a lot longer.

We use a prioritisation system for schemes and constantly review this, but this scheme is not at the top. We are always looking at other funding sources and try to work with developer funding and CIL funding too. We continue to actively search for ways of delivering schemes on the list at all times.

MP Jonathan Lord, Woking

I am sympathetic to this, but I also do understand the financial constraints and difficult decisions for the Committee. I do understand that this scheme is on the cusp between Woking and Elmbridge and I wondered if there were scope to combine funds and use CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) funds from both sides of the boundary. I am happy to liaise with the neighbouring MP if this would help.

It was therefore agreed that further attempts would be made to try to secure cross boundary funding for this scheme.

TO BE ADDED TO THE DECISION TRACKER

Question 2: Trevor Caldwell, Sally Cormac and Andrew Murrin, Woodham Road residents

SPEEDING AND DANGEROUS DRIVING ON WOODHAM ROAD

Residents are seriously concerned about speeding and dangerous driving on Woodham Road, with over 200 hundred residents having signed a petition (<http://chnq.it/WR8d7B9h>) seeking action to tackle the problem. This concern has been echoed by Halstead School and parents. The petition was sparked by the horrific fatal crash that occurred on Woodham Road on Sunday 30th August. One young man is dead, and the accident could have been much worse with two pedestrians close enough to witness the flying motorcycle.

Residents have previously raised the issue of speeding on Woodham Road and two small roundel flashing 30's have been erected. These are unfortunately frequently ignored with vehicles failing to brake when the sign illuminates. Recent speed monitoring using a 7-day automatic traffic count has confirmed both the level of traffic on Woodham Road and the excessive speed of users, where between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm, 50% of the traffic exceeds the 30 mph limit and a vehicle exceeds 40mph every 5 minutes or so.

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

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

Speeding is clearly a problem on this road. This is compounded by the quantity of traffic, with 3 vehicles a minute during the rush hour as Woodham Road becomes increasingly a rat run into Horsell and a bypass of the traffic queues both going west on Shore's Road and going east on Chertsey Road.

More obviously needs to be done to lower speeds and hence reduce the likelihood and severity of collisions and make our community a more pleasant place to live. Whilst we understand that the accident investigation has not yet been completed, and officials are restricted in what they can say, we do believe that further action will be required and we request the JC to ;

- 1. Immediately undertake a comprehensive assessment of speed levels along Woodham Road. We would propose monitoring at least at either end and in the middle to both determine speed limits and to understand traffic flows.**
- 2. Confirm that funds will be made available in the 2021-22 budget to implement whatever measures are required both to address this serious problem and to prevent further tragedy.**
- 3. Add speeding and dangerous driving on Woodham Road to the March 2021 agenda of the JCC to allow the results of the monitoring and of the accident investigation to be considered and appropriate measures planned for the 2020-21 budget year.**

Answer from Highways Office

We are aware of residents' concerns about vehicle speeds on Woodham Road, which, along with a many other roads in the Borough, is recorded on our Speed Management Plan.

The Speed Management Plan (SMP) is a prioritised list of roads where concerns have been raised about vehicle speeds. This is periodically reviewed in conjunction with colleagues in our Road Safety Team and Surrey Police Officers. All the roads on the list have speed surveys undertaken to determine the extent of any speeding issues and these results, combined with the personal injury collision history for each road, allow the police to prioritise their enforcement resources. Any roads where it is determined that there is no issue with excessive speeds will generally remain on the Speed Management Plan, but would not be an active site in terms of police enforcement or routine speed monitoring.

Speeds do appear to have increased on Woodham Road since it was first included on the SMP, and as a result of correspondence that we had with several other residents of the road in 2018 and 2019, the road was elevated to the "high" category within the SMP. Also as a result of that correspondence, an item was added (in May 2019) to our overall work programme for "speed reducing measures" to be considered along the road. This item was added before the fatal collision took place, and at that time, the only personal injury collisions along the road had taken place at the Woodham Rise junction. The main contributory factor in these collisions was a failure of vehicles on Woodham Rise to give way at the junction with Woodham Road, despite the presence of give way and advanced give way signs. These signs

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

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

have subsequently been replaced with yellow backed versions of the same signs to make them more prominent (it should be noted that the provision of a yellow backing board is not a legal requirement).

As a result of the personal injury collision history along the road at that time, and given that physical traffic calming tends to be used as a casualty reduction measure rather than solely to reduce vehicle speeds, it was not possible to confirm to residents when any scheme may be promoted at this location. All highway improvement schemes within Woking are prioritised, and proposed to the Woking Joint Committee for funding in priority order.

It was also suggested to a couple of residents, including one of the petitioners, that consideration might be given to submitting a petition to the Woking Joint Committee to show the level of residents' concern. One other suggestion that was made was to consider an approach that was taken in Park Road, Maybury whereby the on-street parking places were "de-regulated" and rather than being subject to any time limits or permit only use, they could allow all day parking. We have had complaints about the parking that takes place in the 50mph section of Woodham Road and so it seems reasonable to assume that some of this might transfer to the bays in the 30mph section, which are very often unoccupied, and this would provide a degree of natural traffic calming, similar to the effect of chicanes. We would still urge residents to consider this as an option.

The average speeds that were recently recorded by the resident funded speed survey were 29.9mph eastbound (ie towards Six Crossroads) and 30.9mph westbound, with corresponding 85th percentile speeds on 35.6mph and 36.7mph. The 85th percentile speed is the speed at which or below, 85% of vehicles are travelling. These figures are slightly lower than those that we have recorded, using a different monitoring device, a little further along the road.

The Department for Transport's document, "Circular 01/2013 – Setting Local Speed Limits", on which SCC's own speed limit is based, states, "Mean speed and 85th percentile speed (the speed at or below which 85% of vehicles are travelling) are the most commonly used measures of actual traffic speed. Traffic authorities should continue to routinely collect and assess both, but mean speeds should be used as the basis for determining local speed limits."

Based on the mean speeds, the officers who are involved in the SMP would consider the recently recorded speeds to indicate relatively good compliance with the speed limit compared to some other roads. However, the disparity between the mean and 85th percentile speeds is greater than we would hope to see, and this is another reason why an item was added to our work programme.

In a road such as Woodham Road, we would tend to promote speed cushions as the form of traffic calming. These are raised areas in each running lane with a gap between them and at each side, between the cushion and the adjacent kerb. These do not impede drainage in the same way as full width traffic calming. They are preferred by the emergency services because they do not impede wider vehicles so much and the impact of noise and possible vibration from any lorries that might pass over them is also lessened. However, they do not have a significant effect on motorbikes, which can pass between or to one side of them.

The item on our work programme is currently ranked 32nd out of about 70 schemes on the list. The Members of the Joint Committee will therefore need to decide if they wish to promote the scheme during the 2021/22 financial year. However, it is

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

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

recommended that the results of the police investigation into the recent fatal collision are known before such a decision is made. It should also be noted, that at this point in the financial year we do not have any funding for additional speed surveys along the road, but it should be possible to undertake these quite early in the new financial year.

Supplementary question from Trevor Caldwell

Although average speeds were close to half an hour, half of the cars were going faster than that and even going 40mph. Traffic has increased, which reduces the average but not the speeds.

We would be interested in reducing parking restrictions and allowing further parking in order to decrease speeds.

Cllr Beryl Hunwicks stated that she was appreciative of all that Trevor Caldwell and the residents have done since the fatal accident in the area. She was interested in the de-restriction of parking and appreciated the efforts of the Police and the Area Highways Manager in looking at the issue and what could be done.

Cllr Ben Carasco thanked the Highways Officer Kevin Patching for his work, and noted that speed humps were not appropriate for the area, but was pleased that Officers were working hard to look at this.

It was not known when the Police investigation would be completed but Members would be kept informed on this.

Supplementary question from Andy Murrin

Andy asked whether speed limits could be changed (lowered) whilst the outcome of the investigation was awaited?

The Area Highways Manager answered that in short, no this could not happen, as it would not fit with the SCC speed policy. He stated that Officers were keen to work with residents to try to resolve issues and that they would look at this again once the outcome of the investigation was known.

TO BE ADDED TO THE DECISION TRACKER

Question 3 – Adam Kirby, Claire Draper and Neil McPherson, Horsell Moor residents

What is possible in terms of protecting green spaces against illegal traveller incursions? (such as that currently taking place on Horsell Moor) and what is WBC currently planning to do to address this and/or provide alternative provision for travellers?

There is currently an ongoing problem with a traveller incursion on Horsell Moor. This has happened three times in the last six months, involving the same group, but it seems that the dispersal order can't be enforced. **Can posts or some similar barrier (perhaps similar to the ones on Wheatsheaf Common) be installed around the green space at Horsell Moor to prevent future illegal incursions?**

Answer from Woking Borough Council

To date council officers have worked successfully with police colleagues to deal with unauthorised encampments in the Borough.

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

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

In every case there are clear guidelines to follow which can involve court action which is the case for Horsell Moor. However, continued attention from council and police officers encouraged the group to move on and this has proven to be a robust and effective method to prevent unauthorised encampments remaining in one location for extended periods.

Practically, it is rarely possible to completely secure all our green spaces and even on sites which are gated and fenced it is often the case that locks are broken to enable entry. For Horsell Moor we will assess whether any further measures are practical and we will continue to work with police colleagues to review our working arrangements.

Finally, we do have static traveller sites in the Borough, but Surrey do not have a transit site although we are in discussions with other Surrey Districts and Boroughs regarding this type of provision to use in the future”.

Supplementary question from Adam Kirby

As this is the same group using the same spot each time, would this help speed up the legal position? What are the costs of the clear up each time – this might help to resolve the issue and push the debate forward?

Answer from Geoff McManus, Woking Borough Council

Traveller incursions are difficult. We do try to avoid going to Court (this can result in longer stays) but we try to work with travellers to move them on.

In terms of costs of the contract with SERCO, there is no additional cost involved. We do have the cost of disposing of the waste, but we are quite lucky in Woking that this type of incursion is limited.

Question 4 – Maddie Key, Pyrford Resident

I would like to draw attention to the issues around Marshall Parade, Pyrford. I have been a resident at Onslow way for 30 years and I am concerned for road safety in this area. The shops and flats in this already busy area are to be extended by the removal of the garages, and I am concerned about the impact of this development. Cars park on the corner of Lovelace drive, blocking sight lines and the area gets very busy at school drop off and pick up times.

Can anything be done to improve road safety here?

Answer

This area was looked at under the 2020 parking review and there is a proposal under item 11 to extend double yellow lines in Lovelace drive with no waiting at any time restrictions.

The road safety outside schools team recently reviewed the area and the personal injury collision database indicates that there have been no such incidents in the area around the shops since at least 2012.

The Woking parking enforcement team could be asked to undertake some visits to the site, but would only be able to enforce existing parking restrictions.

ANNEX B TO THE MINUTES

Time restrictions on parking bays around the shopping parade could be considered as part of the next parking review.

Work will be undertaken with Cllr Graham Chrystie to look at this issue.

Councillor Discussion

Cllr Liz Bowes welcomed the proposal under the parking review and felt that this might help. Cllr Chrystie felt that the new premises would make things much worse and that we needed to keep the area under review.

This page is intentionally left blank

**WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE**

DATE: 11 NOV 2020
SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS
DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1: Will Forster, Surrey County Councillor

Following a discussion with the Principle of Woking College, please would the County Council to consider consulting on returning the area outside the college on Rydens Way to a one-way system?

Answer from Highways Office

As Councillor Forster will be aware, the changes to the road layout outside the entrance to Woking College were made as part of the nearby housing development, with the changes having been proposed by the developer and approved by SCC's Transport Development Planning and Woking Borough Council in its capacity as the Planning Authority.

It is not clear why the road layout should be returned to a one-way system and although the development has only been completed for about a year, our personal injury collision database, which now contains details of incidents as recent as September 2020, does not show any such incidents in this vicinity or any justification revert back to a one-way system.

We do not propose to consult on returning the layout to a one-way system but should the residents wish to submit a petition, it could be added to our overall scheme list for consideration in a future year's work programme.

Question 2: Will Forster, Surrey County Councillor

Surrey County Council was due to resurface Granville Road in Westfield on 27th October, however this was postponed due to covid.

Please can the County Council confirm when this resurfacing will be reorganised?

Answer from Highways Office

Our colleagues in our Network & Asset Management Group, who oversee this resurfacing programme have advised that the new programme date is Wednesday 6th January 2021. The works are expected to last for one day. As always, these works will be weather dependent to a large degree and so could be subject to further postponement.

Question 3 – Ann-Marie Barker, Woking Borough Councillor

Please can an update be provided on the current state of, and future plans for the Lakers building and site, specifically:

- i) Was the whole building destroyed beyond repair as a result of the fire in January 2018?
- ii) Is the building now beyond repair?
- iii) Has a final decision been made to demolish the existing building?
- iv) Has any interest been expressed in running a youth facility at the Lakers site as a result of the recent youth centre consultation?
- v) What are the county council's alternative plans for the site?

Answer from Nigel Denning, Early Help Transformation Lead

The Lakers Youth Centre was destroyed by fire in early 2018. SCC has subsequently undertaken a public consultation regarding the future of all the SCC Youth Centres and the provision of open access universal youth work across the County.

The consultation has informed the strategy decisions that were published at the beginning of September:

1. Surrey County Council enables the community, voluntary and faith sector (CVFS) to use the youth centres for the benefit of young people at little or no cost.
2. Surrey County Council (SCC) acts as an enabler and facilitator of open access universal youth work rather than providing the service directly. The SCC expertise that is valued by residents and in particular young people can then be remodelled to continue to support specific vulnerable groups. The learning from Covid-19 should be used to inform the service design to ensure SCC is able to respond to the needs of young people who would otherwise be vulnerable to poor outcomes.

During the consultation, expressions of interest were invited and received from a wide range of organisations seeking to take on the running of services at youth centres. Whilst there are viable arrangements being progressed for other youth centres in Woking at Sheerwater and the Woking Youth Arts Centre there has not been any expression of interest for the Lakers Youth Centre that would warrant it being rebuilt as a youth centre.

As part of the Council's Asset & Place Strategy and the Corporate Landlord model the site is now being reviewed for alternative service use. This process will determine whether the asset has an identified use which enables service delivery in line with corporate and service strategies. If no alternative service use is identified Land & Property will then undertake an options appraisal to identify 'best value'; this will include disposal of for a capital receipt; redevelopment for revenue generation or a strategic hold.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Ann-Marie Barker

It is unclear whether the damage to the building occurred was from the fire or the failure to protect the building from the elements after the incident. It is also unclear whether the Centre was included in the County's consultation.

Answer

SCC Councillors confirmed that that this was included in the consultation - but it was clear that County was looking for a provider to take over and run the facility and none were forthcoming for this.

It was also confirmed that Woking Borough Council had no plans to develop the site as this belonged to Surrey County Council.

This page is intentionally left blank