

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Guildford JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 2.00 pm on 1 July 2020  
Meeting held remotely using MS Teams

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

**Committee Members:**

- \* Borough Cllr John Rigg (Chairman)
- \* County Cllr Keith Taylor (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Borough Cllr Joss Bigmore (
- \* County Councillor Mark Brett Warburton
- \* County Cllr Graham Ellwood
- \* County Cllr Matt Furniss
- \* County Cllr Angela Goodwin
- \* County Cllr David Goodwin
- \* County Cllr Julie Iles
- \* Borough Cllr Julia McShane
- \* Borough Cllr Bob McShee
- \* County Cllr Marsha Moseley
- \* Borough Cllr Susan Parker
- \* Borough Cllr George Potter
- \* Borough Cllr Jo Randall
- \* Borough Cllr Caroline Reeves
- \* Borough Cllr Pauline Searle
- \* Borough Cllr Paul Spooner
- \* County Cllr Fiona White
- County Cllr Keith Witham

\* In attendance

---

**1/20 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE FOR 2020/21 [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 1]**

The Committee Partnership Officer advised that Guildford Borough Council was providing the chairman for the Joint Committee for 2020/21 and 2021/22. Cllr John Rigg had been appointed for this role by the Borough Council for 2020/21, at the end of which period his tenure would be reviewed. The vice-chairman for 20/21 is Cllr Keith Taylor.

The officer also welcomed Cllr Joss Bigmore as a new member of the committee.

**2/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]**

Apologies for absence were received from councillors Keith Witham.

**3/20 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> December 2019 were approved as a correct record.

**4/20 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 4]**

The Chairman informed the Committee that as the planned Joint Committee meeting on 18th March 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID 19 outbreak, a number of recommendations from the reports that had been prepared for the meeting were passed under the remote meetings protocol agreed by the County Council. These decisions were included on today's agenda and were noted by the committee members.

**5/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]**

There were no pecuniary interests.  
Four members declared non-pecuniary interests in relation to Item 10, and one in relation to Item 12 – these are shown under the Items below.

**6/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 6]**

The Chairman highlighted joint obligations across the County and Borough Councils, particularly recognising the impact of Covid19 and the pressures on resources as a result of growth and development outlined in the Local Plan. Each authority has its particular areas of responsibilities but a collaborative approach is the best way to tackle the work over the coming period and provide long-term solutions.

**7/20 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 7]**

No petitions were received.

**8/20 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 8]**

No questions were received.

**9/20 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 9]**

One question was received from Mr. Peter Watts, concerning cycling and pedestrian priorities along Alresford Road and Ridgemount in Guildford.

The full question and the response from the Area Highway Manager are included in the minutes as Annex 1.

**10/20 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Cllr George Potter declared a non-pecuniary interest as a zone B resident (albeit a non-car-owning one). Cllr Angela Goodwin and Cllr David Goodwin declared that they were both permit holders in zone B. Mr Matthew Furniss declared he also holds a permit for Zone A.

**Officer attending:** Andy Harkin, Guildford Borough Council

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** Mrs Natalie White, a resident in zone B, read out a statement expressing her concerns about the proposed changes.

**Member Discussion – key points:**

A number of members supported the statement from Mrs White, recognising the problems that she had highlighted. There were suggestions that the controlled parking zone scheme should undergo a full review to ensure that it matched the requirements of current parking pressures, including the advent of Sunday trading. It would also be good to encourage less car use and ownership, and these issues could be addressed by an overall review of the CPZ scheme. The process would require significant input from the Parking team and could draw resources away from other projects, but it could possibly be scoped for future consideration.

Some concern was expressed regarding the consideration given to objections received to proposals in the public consultation process, where some felt that negative responses were discounted if only a low number had been received. The consultation involved placing an advert in a newspaper and contacting 10,000 households by letter; perhaps this approach needed reviewing.

After a lengthy discussion during which the work of previews reviews and working groups over a number of years to arrive at the proposals presented today was highlighted, a vote was taken on Recommendation (ii) by putting it to each member in turn. The remaining Recommendations were considered together.

**Resolved**

The Guildford Joint Committee AGREED:

Town centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

- (i) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, the proposals for the north part of Area C are not progressed.
- (ii) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the amended controls as originally advertised, including an extension to the operational hours of the parking bays and single yellow lines in Areas A, B and D to Monday to Sunday 8.30am to 9pm.
- (iii) if (ii) is agreed, implementation takes place as and when parking behaviours return to a more normal state following the COVID 19 pandemic. If the order is to be made, this must be done within 2 years of the start of the original public consultation (20 September 2019). The need to introduce the proposals and implementation date to be determined by the Parking Manager in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and 2 delegate members.

Other Locations

- (iv) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant

- parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new and amended parking controls to the existing as shown in ANNEXE 1.
- (v) having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, those in 2.16 are not progressed at this time.

Result of vote on Recommendation (ii):  
For 11, Against 7, Abstention 1

**Reasons for recommendation**

To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to make local improvements.

**11/20 SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINT TRIALS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Cherrie Mendoza, Transport Strategy Project Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

**Member Discussion – key points:**

Guildford has 24 electric vehicles per charger, so there is a real demand for this infrastructure. There were requests to consider areas outside of Guildford town centre as locations for charging points, such as local shopping parades, with a balance needing to be struck between sites at 'destination' locations and those in more residential areas. Similarly, it was important to balance the provision of charging sites at on- and off-street parking locations to avoid an over-supply of charging bays. This particular report concerns the on-street trial organised by the County Council, using sites on its land so that aspects such as access, ownership and liability can be controlled. The Borough Council recognises Park & Ride locations as good places to install charging points and is considering these separately.

Charging locations farther out from Guildford town centre are being considered for Phase 2 of the trial, with possible match funding available for this. Conversion of Car Club parking bays to EV charging points in some of these sites was also put forward as something to be explored.

Members were invited to submit suggestions of potential new charging sites to the Project Manager; residents' requests have also been collected over the past few years.

Parking sensors will be installed to help with monitoring behaviour of users and enforcement.

**Resolved**

The Joint Committee (Guildford):

- (i) NOTED the overview of the plans and locations of bays to undertake the Electric Vehicle Charging Point trials funded by the Enterprise M3 (EM3) Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and led by Surrey County Council (SCC) in Guildford.
- (ii) AGREED that the project sponsor, in consultation with the parking strategy and implementation team manager, the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor can modify the layout and location of the bays prior to a traffic regulation order (TRO) being advertised.
- (iii) AUTHORISED advertisement of all necessary TROs across the selected sites in the Borough of Guildford, as and when required, in order to allow the bays to be introduced and agree that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iv) AGREED that 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 Divisional member, with the addition also of the SCC Transport Strategy Project Manager.

#### **Reason for recommendations**

The recommendations will enable the progression of the Electric Vehicle Charging Point Trials as per the business case that was approved and funded by the EM3 LEP.

#### **12/20 GUILDFORD COLLEGE LINK+ 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT SCHEME (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** Mr Matthew Furniss declared a non-pecuniary interest as a resident on one of the roads in question.

**Officer attending:** Duncan Knox, Surrey County Council, Road Safety and Active Travel Team Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

#### **Member Discussion – key points:**

Members were supportive of the introduction of the lower speed limit in the area described in the report, not just to bolster the College Link plan but to encourage an active travel neighbourhood and support the wider development of the permeability of Guildford town centre. Enforcement of revised speed limits is a key part of their introduction and police support for any changes is always sought.

There was discussion about the consistency of the County Council's approach to the introduction of 20mph limits; targeted plans are carefully considered and active travel schemes are being developed in a number of places around the county.

## **Resolved**

The Guildford Joint Committee;

- (i) AGREED a 20 mph speed limit is implemented on Gardner Road, Markenfield Road, Nettles Terrace, Dapdune Road, Park Road, Drummond Road, George Road, Artillery Terrace, Artillery Road, Stoke Fields, Stoke Grove and Church Road to support safer walking and cycling along the “Guildford College Link+” route and throughout the adjoining neighbourhood of residential roads.
- (ii) AGREED in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 an order will be advertised for the 20 mph speed limit, and the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member for Guildford Southwest will consider the responses before proceeding

## **Reason for recommendation**

The proposed lower 20 mph speed limit on Markenfield Road, Nettles Terrace and Dapdune Road will contribute to easier and safer walking, scooting and cycling on the new “Guildford College Link+” route between Guildford rail station and Guildford College. Providing a 20 mph speed limit on these roads and throughout the adjoining neighbourhood of residential roads will ensure consistency of speed limit and will contribute to easier and safer walking throughout the residential area.

## **13/20 BISHOPSMEAD PARADE ONE WAY SYSTEM (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Frank Apicella, Surrey County Council, Area Highways Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions, Statements:** None

### **Member Discussion – key points:**

The Divisional Member for the Horsleys welcomed the proposal, highlighting the support from the local Parish Council that was enabling its implementation.

## **Resolved**

The Guildford Joint Committee;

- (i) AGREED the introduction of a one-way system on the north section of Bishopsmead Parade, East Horsley, in a southerly direction.
- (ii) AGREED to promote a traffic regulation order for the introduction of a one-way system on the north section of Bishopsmead Parade, as shown on the plan below.

### **Reason for recommendation**

Drivers can access Bishopsmead Parade from the three existing entries and exits. Due to the slight bend in Ockham Road South and boundary vegetation, visibility is poor for motorists exiting Bishopsmead Parade at the north section. This creates a hazard for motorists at this location and may result in future incidents.

### **14/20 REPRESENTATION ON WORKING GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 14]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Gregory Yeoman, Partnership Community Officer, Surrey County Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

The following nominations were made:

Infrastructure Delivery and Transportation Working Group

County: Cllr Matt Furniss, Cllr David Goodwin, Cllr Julie Iles, Cllr Keith Taylor.  
Borough: Cllr Joss Bigmore, Cllr George Potter, Cllr John Rigg, Cllr Paul Spooner.

Parking and Air Quality Working Group

County: Cllr Matt Furniss, Cllr David Goodwin, Cllr Keith Taylor, Cllr Keith Witham.

Borough: Cllr Bob McShee, Cllr Susan Parker, Cllr John Rigg, Cllr Caroline Reeves.

Safer Guildford Partnership: Cllr Furniss

Guildford Health and Wellbeing Board: Cllr Fiona White.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Guildford)

- (i) AGREED the membership of the working groups and appointments to outside bodies, as detailed at paragraphs 2.1 to 2.8.

Reason for recommendation:

Good governance practice requires that the Committee reviews membership arrangements regularly to ensure that representation on the committee, task groups and partnerships is fair and provides the best outcomes for the interests of Guildford borough residents.

### **15/20 DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 15]**

The recommendations in the decision tracker were agreed as described.

### **16/20 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 16]**

The Chairman invited members to submit their suggestions for future agenda items to the Partnership Community Officer (PCO). The PCO stated that the

next Parking Review would be added to the Forward Plan for the next meeting, and discussion of a possible car-free day would be included on the list of items for informal meetings.

**17/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 17]**

The next formal meeting will take place on Wednesday 18th November 2020 at a time to be confirmed.

Meeting ended at: 4.05 pm

---

**Chairman**

**GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL and  
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**



**GUILDFORD  
BOROUGH**

**JOINT COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**DATE: 01 JULY 2020**

**LEAD OFFICERS: FRANK APICELLA, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER, JEFF WILSON, TRANSPORT PLANNER, SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**SUBJECT: PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS**

**DIVISION: GUILDFORD SOUTH-WEST**

The following question was received from Mr Peter Watts.

Would the Joint Committee agree to the introduction of pedestrian and cyclist prioritisation and the 'greening' of the streetscape along Ridgemount and Alresford Roads in Guildford (GU2) in order to:

1. Build on the momentum of pedestrian priorities being created in Guildford Town Centre.
2. Create a proper walking and cycling route from the back of Guildford Railway Station through to the University and Cathedral, and onwards to the Hospital, Surrey Research Park and Surrey Sports Park.
3. Create a cycling and walking route from the back of the station that links in a safe manner into the Christmas Pie Track via Stephenson Road in the Research Park.
4. Develop a proper C2 cycle route, building further on the infrastructure developments of recent months.
5. Develop and enhance the environmental credentials of the two roads, by improving and adding to the existing protected hedges, trees, green verges, and shrubs.
6. Address the runoff flooding that flows off Stag Hill into the road and driveways of the housing.
7. Begin to develop a coordinate plan that looks to increase the greening of the urban landscape in line with data (see addendum).
8. Fully develop a coordinated response to the #BuildBackBetter movement that takes advantage of the reduction in vehicle traffic due to the pandemic and builds neighbourhood focused environments where the car is not the centre of planning.
9. Create a vibrant example of street life that prioritises nature and people, utilising roads that in the case of Ridgemount and Alresford are already half-way there and therefore easy to convert.
10. Be part of the movement of similar progressive developments by Councils that are on the vanguard of sound environment and social thinking (see addendum below).

**Addendum**

**A. Hackney**

This is the main example, a couple more are also included for reference.

Article on Hackney's plan see: <https://www.hackneycitizen.co.uk/2020/02/12/public-realm-boss-reimagine-hackney-streets-climate-crisis/>

The Hackney Strategy Document:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1n8zbQY0bm7i3m8IBub1UFTlqeaPqnhfG/view>

Hackney have been developing a planned and coordinated approach to changing the priorities of many of their residential roads to enhance the pedestrian and cycle access and improve environmental features and landscaping.

Please see the below narrative from Hackney Council:

1/ One of many new rainwater gardens for Hackney. By systematically eliminating paving and replacing it with gardens and additional trees, we're helping to reduce summer temperatures in a warming city, increase biodiversity and manage high rainfall events.



2/ This #depave programme is part of a broader approach (including the largest urban tree scheme in Europe) to cooling the streets of Hackney, improving air quality, and contributing better mental health and wellbeing outcomes for our residents.

3/ But, this is just the beginning. The most radical #depave work we're undertaking is not through the delivery of rainwater gardens, but through our **21st Century Streets programme**. Neighbourhood parks eliminate cars, cool streets, and provide play space.

4/ In particular, Hackney been heavily influenced by this fantastic piece of work from Carly Ziter and others, which focuses on the relationship between canopy cover, depaving, and urban temperatures... see: <https://www.pnas.org/content/116/15/7575>

5/ So, rather than put an arbitrary number against the street trees we'll plant in Hackney, we're working towards a minimum of 40% canopy cover, beyond which we know we can significantly reduce temperatures and therefore pressure on medical services and energy demand for cooling.

6/ Once we knew what level of canopy cover we wanted to achieve on-street, we sat down and costed it. Mature trees - the kind we plant with care on-street - are expensive. There are labour costs, root directors, caging, staking, after-care...

7/ We realised that, to get to 40% canopy cover on-street, we'd need to invest circa £9m. When you consider that Hackney's annual Gov't grant has been cut by £140m since 2010, that's a big commitment; the kind of commitment made by people who take the **#climateemergency** seriously.

8/ Then we decided what we could afford to invest this term, which is why we've committed to deliver 30% ten year canopy cover by 2022, with 40% cover achieved by 2024. As we currently have 20% canopy cover from 10k street trees, we know we'll to deliver a further 5000 by 2022.

9/ This all sounds a bit tedious, I know, but it matters. Why?

- because it allows us to tell the public a credible story about where our numbers come from.
- because we know it will work to deliver what we want. Evidenced-based policy-making in action.

## B. Gateshead

A similar guide can be found from Gateshead: <https://www.gateshead.gov.uk/media/3798/Gateshead-Homezone-Guide/pdf/Gateshead-Homezone-Guide.pdf?m=636440102986370000>

## C. Freiburg, Germany

A team of architects reviewed what was happening in Freiburg: <https://emmettrussell.co.uk/news/study-trip-to-vauban-freiburg/>



## D. Enfield

See website: <http://betterstreets.co.uk/low-traffic-neighbourhoods/>

A local group that is campaigning to develop a better balance on Enfield's streets between cars, bikes, public transport and pedestrians.

Their main aims are:

- Street design takes into account the needs of those who walk, cycle and use public transport as well as those who drive
- Riding a bike is a safe, convenient travel option for all ages and abilities
- Children can walk or cycle to school, for better health, wellbeing and independence
- Fewer short journeys are made by car, reducing air pollution and leaving more space for those who need to drive

- Residents can lead a healthier, more active lifestyle, saving money for the NHS
- Residential streets are communities rather than conduits for traffic
- High streets are pleasant places to spend time and money.

The group works in partnership with the Council to coordinate and action developments.

#### **E. Oxfordshire Living Streets**

See: [www.oxlivsts.org.uk](http://www.oxlivsts.org.uk)

The OLS Plan is guided by five tenets:

- Roads are to move people
- Neighbourhoods are for living
- Cities are destinations
- Towns are for people
- Countryside connection

The aim is to work with the Council to address the challenge of vehicular excess, and thereby improve Oxfordshire and Oxford City liveability in a short space of time and for the long-term. By incentivising active travel (by foot or by bike), travel by car is made unappealing. This will increase physical activity, thus improving public health. This will decrease pollution and congestion, thus bringing down health costs and highway maintenance costs.

#### **Officer response**

The [Surrey Cycle Strategy](#) outlines the council's commitment to improve infrastructure for cycling, including the utilisation of quiet streets. Officers recognise a propensity for walking and cycling along the Alresford Road / Ridgemount corridor given the character of the roads and the connectivity they provide to local destinations.

Surrey County Council identified this as a 'suggested route' in the [Guildford cycling plan](#), indicating its desire for the route to be considered for the introduction of on-street measures to make it easier to travel by bike when suitable funding opportunities become available.

It should be noted that Guildford Borough Council (under licence from Surrey County Council) recently undertook work on this corridor as part of the Sustainable Movement Corridor West project. This involved widening the link path from The Chase to Alresford Road to allow its shared use by cyclists and pedestrians with the addition of markings on the carriageways of Alresford Road and Ridgemount to support cycling along this route. There are also already existing traffic calming measures (speed cushions) along Ridgemount.

The additional measures proposed in the question would require a level of funding that means that it could not be implemented in the short term. If the proposals are to be considered further, a scheme should be placed on the running list of the Joint Committee for prioritisation and for a thorough feasibility study which will likely include the requirement for public consultation with local residents.

#### **Recommendation**

The Joint Committee is asked to note the response.