

Agenda

**We welcome you to
Elmbridge Local Committee
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You**

Please note that due to the COVID-19 situation this meeting will take place remotely.

A link to view the live and recorded webcast of the remote meeting will be available on the [Elmbridge Local Committee](#) page on the council's website.



Discussion

Petition for pegasus crossing on A244 – *Nick Healey*

Highways Update – *Nick Healey*

Venue

Location: Virtual

Date: Monday, 8 March 2021

Time: 3.00 pm



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

You can get involved in the following ways

Ask a question

If there is something you wish to know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The Partnership Committee Officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

We will, where possible, endeavour to provide a written response to your question in advance of the meeting.

When you submit your question you will be sent an email invitation with a link to join the remote meeting, which will be held on Microsoft Teams.

This will enable you to listen to the Written Questions item and to then ask a further question based on the response provided if you wish, when invited to do so by the Chairman.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the Partnership Committee Officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting remotely via MS Teams. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Attending the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership Committee Officer is here to help.

Email: nicola.morris@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 07968 832 177 (text or phone)

Website: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/elmbridge>



Follow @ElmbridgeLC on Twitter

This is a meeting in public.

Please contact **Nicola Morris, Partnership Committee Officer** using the above contact details:

- If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language. In view of the current Covid situation it may not be possible to supply this in advance of the meeting.
 - If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern.
-

Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Dr Peter Szanto, East Molesey & Esher (Chairman)
Rachael I. Lake, Walton (Vice-Chairman)
Mr Mike Bennison, Hinchley Wood, Claygate & Oxshott
Mr Nick Darby, The Dittons
Mrs Mary Lewis, Cobham
Mr Tim Oliver, Weybridge
Mr John O'Reilly, Hersham
Mr Ernest Mallett MBE, West Molesey
Mr Tony Samuels, Walton South and Oatlands

Borough Council Appointed Members

Cllr David J Archer, Esher
Cllr Steve Bax, Molesey East
Cllr Barry Fairbank, Long Ditton
Cllr Peter Harman, St George's Hill
Cllr Caroline James, Thames Ditton
Cllr Mary Marshall, Claygate
Cllr Christine Richardson, Walton Central
Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon, Hersham Village
Cllr Graham Woolgar, Walton Central

Chief Executive
Joanna Killian

Borough Council Substitute Members

Cllr Andrew P Burley, Oxshott & Stoke D'Abernon
Cllr Christine Elmer, Walton South
Cllr Neil Houston, Long Ditton
Cllr Alan Kopitko, Walton North
Cllr Dorothy Mitchell, Cobham and Downside
Cllr Chris Sadler, Walton Central
Cllr Stuart Selleck, Molesey East
Cllr Janet Turner, Hinchley Wood and Weston Green
Cllr Simon Waugh, Esher

PART 1 – IN PUBLIC

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

To receive any apologies for absence and notices of substitutions from Borough members under Standing Order 39.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

3 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive any Chairman's announcements.

4 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

(Pages 1 - 4)

To answer any questions or receive a statement from any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Elmbridge Borough area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Partnership Committee Officer at least by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

5 PETITIONS

(Pages 5 - 6)

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 68. Notice should be given in writing or by e-mail to the Partnership Committee Officer at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures (30) has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

One petition has been received:

**Provide Pegasus Crossing- Arbrook to Esher Common
(across the A244)**

Lead petitioner: Nicola Foster

Signatures: 1616

6 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 7 - 20)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

7 MEMBER QUESTION TIME

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice should be given in writing to the Partnership Committee Officer by 12.00 noon four working days before the meeting.

8 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE ITEM - FOR DECISION]

(Pages 21 - 30)

On 5th February 2021 the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport announced an additional £12M capital funding over the next three financial years to invest in Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes) and confirmed £3M capital funding for maintenance schemes in 2021-22. These sums are to be shared between the eleven Local and Joint Committees.

Public consultations have been completed in relation to proposed Active Travel schemes in Baker Street in Weybridge, Bridge Road in East Molesey, and Thames Ditton High Street.

There is an ongoing problem with fly tipping in Pointers Road, Cobham.

9 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION]

(Pages 31 - 34)

This item provides an update on previous decisions and actions agreed by the Committee. The Committee is asked to agree that the items marked as complete are removed from the tracker.

10 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 35 - 36)

The Committee is asked to note the forward plan for the Committee and propose any items which they would like to see added.

11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [FOR INFORMATION]

Monday 7 June 2021 at 4pm tbc

This page is intentionally left blank



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 8 MARCH 2021

AGENDA ITEM 05

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Peter Barnes

Re: Lay-by on Ashley Road, Walton-on-Thames

Background

There is currently a lay-by on Ashley Road which was created for a beauty salon on the opposite side as compensation for increased parking restrictions in some local roads over 20 years ago. The shop has since been formally changed to a residential unit by planning request and has operated as a residential address for over 10 years. The layby now serves no purpose, all surrounding houses have substantial off street parking, the time constraints on parking are very short (2hours), there are only between 3-4 real parking spaces available (due to the road configuration) and the road itself barely accommodates any safe parking as it is so narrow. It isn't suitable for parking for either the high street (900mt) nor the train station (1000mts), both of which have substantial designated parking. It is in a state of disrepair, requires resurfacing and it is unsightly to the street scene.

Proposal

As the resident directly facing this lay-by we are willing to fund the conversion of this lay-by to a green area with trees and planting, replacing the tarmac currently there.

The benefits to the community would be as follows;

1. The street scene would be improved.
2. Recently lost green areas (nearby Stompond Lane development for example) would be partially offset, between 15-20 trees planted.
3. Money would be saved on resurfacing and the ongoing maintenance that is currently required and will be required in the future.
4. There would be no loss of access to services nor access for pedestrians (pavements would remain untouched).

Local residents, Surrey Highways, and the local Councillor are supportive of the proposition. I include supportive correspondence, a diagram of the proposed change and a current picture.

This I believe would be a rare occurrence of real green development in the area, this could be used as an example of such to other similar situations and would be done with a net saving to Surrey Council.

In terms of cost, a structure needs to be agreed, however my proposal would be to fund the conversion bar some minor kerb changes which could be done by Surrey highways. I would investigate the possibility of grants for the trees and I hope this could be part of Surrey' commitment to plant 1.2m trees by 2030. We realise the

ITEM 4

conversion of the road would be substantial but we are willing to fund this under the right conditions, we would also be willing to maintain the area going forward, something that isn't happening to the adjacent small green area. In order to protect against any reversal in the future (after funding the conversion) we would like to have a long lease to the land or actual ownership, whichever is deemed legally appropriate/acceptable.

Please may we have your approval on the proposal?

Supporting information



Correspondence with Surrey Highways

Dear Peter Barnes

Thank you for your enquiry reported on 03 Dec 2020 14:20 which has been logged as follows:

Reference number: 1735769

Location: ASHLEY ROAD, WALTON-ON-THAMES

Details: Carriageway and Footway - Carriageway enquiry

Cllr Samuels has contacted us yesterday to ask that we respond to you. I have looked up records of previous correspondence and can see you have had a response from Nick Healy in February. Please see below.
Changing the parking bay into a tree planted verge area would need to be funded and approved by the local committee to include on their list for prioritisation. That said, if external funding were available, then it may influence committee's decision but would still have to fit within their highways programme.
I can see you have already contacted Cllr Samuels which is a good start .

Dear Mr Barnes,

Reference number: 1459451

Location: ASHLEY ROAD, WALTON-ON-THAMES

Your argument is very logical and (for me at least) quite persuasive. Ultimately any decision to alter the subject layby would be made by Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Elmbridge. All the County Councillors in the Elmbridge area sit on this Committee, together with an equal number of Borough Councillors. This Committee has delegated authority to change parking arrangements, and also has access to funding that could be used to make minor changes to road layouts.

I would suggest approaching your County Councillor to explore whether or not your suggestion is likely to be received favourably by this Committee.

Kind regards,
Nick Healey
Area Highways Manager
Surrey Highways

Officer response:

Mr Barnes has raised this question and suggestion to Surrey Highways and was advised of the processes required, i.e. "Changing the parking bay into a tree planted verge area would need to be funded and approved by the local committee to include on their list for prioritisation. That said, if external funding were available, then it may influence committee's decision but would still have to fit within their highways programme." Hence, Mr Barnes has raised the question to the committee.

The layby is subject to parking controls; stay is limited to three hours, Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm, with no return within two hours.

We do not hold data on usage of the layby but photographic images* suggest the layby is regularly used, with space for approximately six vehicles. Should parking restrictions be removed we would anticipate usage of the layby would increase. SCC's Parking Team has requested that Elmbridge Borough Council monitor the location to ascertain occupation and usage. However, the ongoing restrictions due to the Covid pandemic may not allow for an accurate representation at the current time.

In terms of amenity it is approximately 500 metres from the layby to the southern end of the High Street and 650 metres to the High Street access to The Heart shopping centre. This equates to a walk of approximately 8 minutes*. The layby is approximately 900 metres from Walton Railway Station, via Ashley Park Road, a walk of approximately 11 minutes*.

[* Source: Google Streetview; Google Maps]

As highlighted in the question, the costs to convert the layby could be substantial. Further investigation would be required to determine the construction costs. These works would need to consider:

- Most suitable treatment for the area, e.g. existing make-up of the ground below surface level and depth available for proposed tree planting.
- Impact on the road drainage system – there are existing drainage gullies in the layby as well as the Ashley Road main carriageway.
- Impact on underground utilities – there is a service cover within the layby carriageway surface.

ITEM 4

- Provision of access for utility maintenance – there are utility boxes situated to the back of the footway adjacent to the layby. Maintenance vehicles are currently likely to use the layby when accessing the boxes.
- Suitable planting

These issues could be investigated, and potential costs determined, in the context of a feasibility study. A study could also establish the usage or demand for parking in the layby and provide commentary as to the effect of a net reduction in on-street parking.

Future maintenance, such as cutting of grass or planting of bulbs and shrubs, can be carried out by residents under a cultivation licence.

As well as construction and ongoing maintenance costs, a scheme to convert the layby would require a legal traffic order to prohibit vehicles from the area, which would remain public highway. Should a scheme be developed, statutory consultation would be required to implement. There is no guarantee of an outcome favourable to a scheme to convert the layby.

Should external funding be available, as suggested by Mr Barnes, development of the scheme would be subject to resources. Committee agreed its highways programme for 2021-22 in November 2020. New works would usually be promoted and included in the next available programme, which would likely be 2022-23, with consideration of other priorities. To be able to move ahead with the requested scheme before 2022-23 another scheme, which is already in Committee's programme, would need to be deferred.

It is recommended that Committee decides whether to add the proposed scheme to its prioritisation list of Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS Schemes) for consideration in a future programme.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

DATE: 8 March 2021

SUBJECT: Petition to: Provide Pegasus Crossing- Arbrook to Esher Common (across the A244)

DIVISION: East Molesey and Esher

PETITION DETAILS:

Petition to: Provide Pegasus Crossing – Arbrook to Esher Common (across A244)

Lead petitioner: Nicola Foster No. signatures: 1,615

“Arbrook and Esher Common are heavily utilised green spaces providing a natural sanctuary for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Given the pandemic this area has been used to a greater extent with local residents appreciating the benefits it provides for physical activity and mental well-being.

“However there is currently no safe crossing over the A244 from Arbrook to Esher Common. This is an exceptionally busy road with traffic coming in both directions. There is low visibility for vehicles seeing pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders to cross the road and poses a danger to the safety of everyone involved. The proposal is to have a Pegasus Crossing erected which will be well-utilised by the diverse groups using this green space.”

Representations of support have been received from:

- The British Horse Society
- Chessington Equestrian Centre
- Claygate Parish Council
- Cycling UK
- Esher Residents' Association
- Kingston Ramblers
- Kingston Riding Centre
- Slough Farm Livery, Claygate
- Surrey Countryside Access Forum
- Local residents

RESPONSE:

Surrey Police records incidents of collisions resulting in injury; these are shared with the council and form a basis for road safety discussions. In the last three year period, which is a standard length of time used to monitor collisions and identify patterns, there has been one recorded collision at this location which resulted in slight injury (i.e. no hospital admission). This was in May 2020, where a goods vehicle collided with a lamp post. The police recorded a likely contributory factor of 'Defective steering or suspension'. There was a further recorded incident in April 2016 which resulted in slight injury, where a vehicle involved in a police pursuit collided with traffic. The police recorded likely contributory factors of 'Stolen vehicle', 'Vehicle in course of crime', 'Travelling too fast for conditions', and 'Poor turn or manoeuvre'. The police do not record 'damage-only' incidents.

ITEM 5

A traffic signal controlled crossing at this location has been suggested in the past and preliminary design work was completed in 2008. To progress a scheme now, the earlier design work would need to be reviewed and revised as necessary, for example to consider any changes in design standards as well as changes in conditions at the site such as traffic volumes and speeds. Design work would also need to consider impact on the common land which bounds the A244 to both the east and west.

From a financial point of view, a Pegasus crossing is likely to cost in the region of £125k to £150k. Committee's established model for promoting this kind of scheme is for Committee to pay for the feasibility / design work using monies from the parking surplus, and then apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for implementation. At the present time the local CIL board for Esher could not afford this scheme. Separately on Committee's agenda for this afternoon's meeting it is reported that Committee will be allocated new capital funding for this kind of scheme for the next three Financial Years 2021-22 to 2023-24, which could be used to top up any CIL funding that were to be available.

From a resource point of view, Committee agreed its highways programme for 2021-22 in November 2020. New works would usually be promoted and included in the next available programme, which would likely be 2022-23. To be able to move ahead with the requested Pegasus crossing scheme before 2022-23 another scheme, which is already in Committee's programme, would need to be deferred.

The recommendations below are intended to invite Committee to decide whether to promote the requested Pegasus crossing scheme, and if so the level of priority that this scheme should be afforded in the context of Committees existing programme of work.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to:

- (i) Add the requested Pegasus crossing scheme to Committee's prioritisation list of Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS Schemes);
[If Committee approved only this recommendation, the requested crossing would be considered annually by Committee for inclusion in the following Financial Year's programme of work.]

- (ii) Promote the requested Pegasus crossing scheme as part of Committee's 2021-22 programme of feasibility / design work;

AND

Delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and affected Divisional Members to defer a scheme that is already part of Committee's 2021-22 programme of work;

AND

Agree that an application for CIL be made to Elmbridge Borough Council's Local CIL Board for Esher for £40k in the 2021 application round.

AND

Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the requested scheme.

Contact Officer:
Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 2.00 pm on 16 November 2020
 at Virtual meeting.

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

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Dr Peter Szanto (Chairman)
- * Rachael I. Lake (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- * Mr Nick Darby
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- * Mr Tim Oliver
- * Mr John O'Reilly
- * Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- * Mr Tony Samuels

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr David J Archer
- * Cllr Steve Bax
- * Cllr Barry Fairbank
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Caroline James
- * Cllr Mary Marshall
- * Cllr Christine Richardson
- * Cllr Mrs Mary Sheldon
- * Cllr Graham Woolgar

* In attendance

17/20 CHANGE IN BOROUGH COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE PARKING TASK GROUP [FOR DECISION] [Item 1]

Resolved that:

Councillor Graham Woolgar replace Councillor Roy Green on the Elmbridge Local Committee's Parking Task Group for the 2020/21 municipal year.

18/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 2]

There were no apologies.

19/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Cllr Mary Sheldon declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 petition 4 as a local resident.

Cllr Mary Lewis declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 as the local councillor and resident.

20/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman reminded county members that the deadline for applications for their £5,000 community allocation fund is 29 January.

He reported that the first of what we hope will be a series of events for residents will take place at 7pm on Monday 30 November. This will be an interactive Funding Workshop with presentations on various funding opportunities available to local organisations and a panel of experts to answer questions. The event will be live streamed to Facebook. Help in promoting this event would be appreciated and more details will be available shortly.

21/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS [Item 5]

Six public questions were received. The questions and officers responses are published in the supplementary agenda for the meeting. The following follow up questions were asked:

Question 2: What will be the focus of any feasibility study and what are the timescales? The Area Highways Manager replied that if Committee agrees the study will be added to the potential list of schemes for future years. The earliest a study could start would be April 2021 and it would include an evaluation of possible options based on the issues highlighted.

Question 3: What is a point closure, is it a road closure or expanding footways, what happens to any traffic diverted to other local roads? The Area Highways Manager responded that a point closure is a road closure although access is maintained for residents. Traffic will inevitably move to other routes. He offered to continue a conversation outside the meeting to see if there was any consensus which could lead to a possible scheme being added to the work programme.

Question 5: If the landowner is Surrey County Council or the Borough Council who carries out enforcement? The Countryside Access Officer responded that any issues on designated rights of way on land owned by the local authority should be reported to the rights of way team so they can look at individual cases.

22/20 ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN LITTLEHEATH LANE AND WATER LANE, COBHAM, ESHER [FOR DECISION - OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL FUNCTIONS] [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: Mary Lewis declared a non-pecuniary interest as a local resident and local member. She declared that she has also used the path and that her evidence is mentioned in the report. As a result she would not vote on the matter but was permitted to speak.

Officers attending: Catherine Valiant, Countryside Access Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

Alice Pearson-Thorne spoke in support of the application and made the following points:

- Alice spoke on behalf of her mother who is resident at 30 Water Lane which backs on to the footpath and is the only rear access to the property. It has been the Pearson family home since 1962.
- Her mother Marion has walked the path complete path twice a day most days until it was blocked in 2015 a total of 53 years.
- The full family walked the path in the 60s, 70s and 80s for a variety of reasons and was never made aware that they could not use the path until it was blocked in 2015.

Joanna Rutherford spoke in support of the application and made the following points:

- She has used the path since 1994 and was not challenged until December 2014.
- The claimed path is shown on many early historic maps with a designation of path indicating use by the public.

Jeremy Taylor spoke in support of the application and made the following points:

- A resident of Mill House Close where he has lived for around 25 years. He and his wife were also a resident of the area before that time and have walked the path in the 70s and 80s for recreation to visit friends and local shops as well as more recently. He has never been challenged.

Kathryn Ross spoke in objection to the application and made the following points:

- Her husband and herself have lived at Hazel Glen, 24 Water Lane since 1995, points F, G and H shown on the plans are within their land.
- She is confident that there is key evidence of a lack of intention to dedicate. There is evidence that landowners have erected gates and private signs along the route
- She agrees with the evidence of Mrs Turk given long after she left the area.
- The user evidence of users is less consistent, ignoring a sign or climbing over a gate does not evidence permission to use the route.
- She was clear that she had approached anyone she saw crossing her land from 1995 to make it clear that it was private property.

The applicant Patrina Hutchings took the opportunity to respond to the objections raised. She made the following points:

- She has been a resident of the area for 30 years and a user of the path.
- It was unclear why the original recommendation to approve the route was changed in the subsequent reports without further evidence.
- It is clear from user evidence that this path has been used regularly and that the signs were introduced after 2015 and there had been no challenge before this time.

The Countryside Access Officer presented the report, including the following points

- The land A-B is registered as common land and cannot be designated as a right of way and therefore the route under consideration is between B and L.
- She outlined the evidence outlined in the report and the basis on which the recommendation is based.

ITEM 6

- If the evidence of the placing of signs on the route is accepted as demonstrating a lack of intention to dedicate then a 20 year period of unchallenged use cannot be established.
- This is a finely balanced case with differences in the views of users and between users and landowners, although this is often the case and it is a matter for the Committee to weigh up the evidence. She asked the Committee to accept her recommendation.

Member discussion –key points

The divisional member stated that as shown on the map this is a network of historic paths giving access to Littleheath which is common land. She has lived in the area for 32 years and has regularly used the path and was never aware of any restrictions.

The Chairman asked for further information on why the recommendation of the Countryside Access Officer had changed since the report was first presented to Committee. She responded that she had re-read the case law following the deferment of the report and felt this caused her to change her view of the evidence.

The diggers who had previously been based on the common were referred to as an indication that the path had been used for open access in the past.

The path is shown on historic maps back to the late eighteen hundreds. The Countryside Access Officer explained that a path showing on a map does not provide proof of a public right of way as they just provide evidence of a route on the ground as they may still cross private land.

The point of challenge was deemed to be at 2013 as that was the time at which a gate and sign were installed. Officers had not been able to determine a 20 year period prior to that time when there was no restriction as the date when the signs at D and E were installed could not be established.

The definitive map was first established in Surrey in 1958.

Members felt that there was not sufficient clear evidence that the signs referred to had been present and visible within a 20 year period between 1958 and 2013.

Resolved that (by 13 votes AGAINST and 2 ABSTENTIONS):

The recommendation of the officer, that no public footpath should be recorded over the claimed route, should be rejected on the grounds that the notices at D and E were not sufficient to demonstrate a lack of intention to dedicate on the part of the landowner.

It was therefore **Resolved** by (14 votes FOR and 1 ABSTENTION) that:

It is reasonable to allege that by virtue of the use by the public on foot, public footpath rights have been acquired over part of the claimed route under section 31 of the Highways Act 1990. A Definitive Map Modification Order should, therefore, be made to record the route between B and L as shown on the plan, in Annex A of the report, on the Definitive Map and Statement for Surrey as Public Footpath No.96 Esher.

Reasons: The Committee considered that the evidence submitted in support of the application is sufficient to reasonably allege that public footpath rights subsist over the claimed route, having been acquired by virtue of use by the public on foot under statutory deemed dedication (under s.31(6) of the Highways Act 1980)."

23/20 PETITIONS [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: Mary Sheldon declared a non-pecuniary interest as a local resident in petition 4.

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:

Petition 1: Mrs Emma Purdy presented the petition on behalf of the lead petitioner. She outlined that she had lived in Langton Road for 18 years and the dangers of leaving the road at the junction with the Walton Road. There are lots of delivery vans parking on the double yellow line around the corner obscuring sight lines. There has been a recent accident and the car was severely damaged. Cars travel quite fast in this vicinity and there are many other vehicle manoeuvres in this area. Residents would like safety to be improved perhaps with the installation of an island to prevent parking near the junction.

Petition 2: Peter O'Donnell presented the petition on behalf of the lead petitioners. He made the following points: he has been a resident for 37 years; the road is narrow and serves a number of homes and other facilities such as sports grounds and small industrial units. There are three sites in the vicinity which are due for possible redevelopment and residents would like a co-ordinated master plan approach to be employed. Residents would not support a ban on right turns from the road and would like signage improved. The suggestion of a roundabout has many positives for debate and residents would have liked a more positive response from officers to this suggestion.

Petition 3: Jim Davidson presented his petition requesting a new pedestrian crossing. The four way junction outside the school is dangerous during school drop off and pick up times with high footfall with no natural location to cross, stop lines at the junction are confusing and there is a blind corner with cars driving fast. There have been four accidents since 2017 where emergency services have been called. There have been many near misses. Any reasonably placed crossing would attract users. He would like to see the speed limit in the area reduced to 20mph.

Petition 4: David Moore presented the petition on behalf of the lead petitioner. He commented that the scheme has caused significant congestion in the area and does not address the issue of providing a safe pedestrian crossing as previously requested. Undertaking has become an issue and vehicles waiting to turn right are held further back in the queue. There are other viable alternatives which should be investigated before the scheme is implemented in full.

Petition 5: Eleanor presented the petition on behalf of the lead petitioner and spoke on behalf of the residents and businesses on Queens Road. The

loading bay is in constant use and causes a huge disruption to businesses and blocks the view when leaving South Road. Lorries park on the pavement and is dangerous to the public. Trolleys fall into the road and onto the pavement and have damaged shop. Action needs to be taken to relocate it. South Road would be a preferable location nearer to the Tesco or further down Queens Road.

Petition 6: Ian Dilks presented the petition. A previous petition had resulted in very little action and the response to the current petition is disappointing. The Committee should ask officers to draw up a constructive report working with FEDORA and other agencies. Speeding issues are not being addressed and a 20mph zone should be considered. There is no acknowledgement of the issue of HGVs, traffic should remain on the M25 and not use Oxshott as a rat run. The weight limit of the Oxshott rail bridge has been requested from network Rail together with the results of the last safety assessment, but they have requested more time to provide that information. This raises concerns on potential safety implications.

Member discussion –key points

Petition 1: The Area Highways Manager responded that as outlined in his report there is already a feasibility study which has started to look at the safety on Walton Road. Members will be steering the direction of the study. He highlighted that it may take some time to evaluate options and find the best solution.

Members commented that there are many blind junctions around the County and that vehicles can park on yellow lines to load and unload. It was suggested that enforcement of these should be raised with the Borough Council as the enforcement authority if vehicles are parking illegally. The installation of a mirror opposite has also been suggested. The Area Highways Manager commented that the installation of a mirror on the public highway would not be supported and that anyone doing so on private land should consider taking out public liability insurance. It was also suggested that a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph on some stretches of the road could be considered. The issue of the speed limit further on the Walton Road which is still at the national speed limit was raised and it was asked if this could be considered in the feasibility study. It is understood that the issue of the national speed limit is being addressed as part of the development of schools in the area. Members would need to consider which issues are of the highest priority for consideration in a feasibility study.

Petition 2: The Area Highways Manager responded that this petition cuts across planning and highways and that any planning matters are outside the merit of the Committee. The County Council is a statutory consultee on any planning applications passed to them by the Borough Council as planning authority. It is not possible to comment on applications which have not been received, only the Borough Council can co-ordinate development with infrastructure to feed into the planning process. A roundabout would require the acquisition of private land and would probably need to be much larger than the size suggested, it may also make it easier to take a short cut through Thames Ditton. A roundabout or traffic light junction of sufficient size would likely to be too costly to be justified in relation to the size of possible developments. If banned right turns could be enforced by CCTV as they are in London these could be prevented. However this is not currently possible

and to make any significant improvements in safety at the junction closing of the gap would be the only solution. However this is not currently being considered. There are some signing improvements being implemented and if members had any further suggestions for improvements they could raise these with officers. Members are supportive of a master plan approach if Elmbridge Borough Council wished to consider this. There is a crossing point for pedestrians at this junction and small cars are using this for manoeuvres. It was suggested that a bollard could prevent this, officers agreed to look at this further outside of the meeting. Adding this to the prioritisation list will allow a proper study to take place as and when appropriate but conversations will continue in the meantime.

Petition 3: The Area Highways Manager commented that the issues raised by the petitioner could be considered as part of the road safety outside school assessment. A suitable location for a crossing is not easy to define, but there are a number of possible options which could be considered. Members supported the comments made and looked forward to the results of the investigation.

Petition 4: The Area Highways Manager commented that pedestrian refuges are appropriate to assist all road users although they may not be the perfect solution for all. A traffic light crossing would still require a pedestrian refuge and the requirement to close a lane in each direction as it would not be possible to cross four lanes in one crossing without causing further congestion. The divisional member thanked the petitioners for their contribution to the debate. He emphasised that it the Committee agrees to move to the next stage of the trial that is not the end of the story and nothing will be made permanent until extensive consultation takes place and the Committee makes the final decision. This scheme would have been recommended by the feasibility study which was in progress and addresses the safety issues raised in the March 2019 petition following a fatality in the area. The 2019 petition organisers support the proposed scheme as do the family of the person tragically killed. The scheme has already had a positive impact on reducing speeding along the road and if the Committee does not agree to the next stage of the trial it is unlikely that any improvements in this area will be possible.

Members commented that they could understand the initial misgivings of the petitioners, but having looked further at the proposals they could see the benefits of the proposed changes. Speeds on this stretch of road were excessive and have been reduced by the implementation of phase one and made the road safer and more enjoyable to use for pedestrians and cyclists. If ultimately the Committee decides that the scheme should be removed the cost will be covered by the active travel funding. Members asked if the crossing of the cycle way to enter side roads could be looked at as well as any other impacts which may have developed. It was agreed that these issues would be taken into account as the trial continues. Before the scheme is made permanent the traffic impact needs to be understood in the context of 'normal' traffic volumes post Covid. The Chairman commented that he had been involved in monitoring the scheme and it is unquestionably a safety scheme. It is the scheme which would have been recommended by officers who were carrying out a feasibility study following the March 2019 petition presented to this Committee. Active travel funding has helped to implement it over a year sooner. He acknowledged that the traffic management during the initial implementation of the scheme had caused congestion and 96% of the

ITEM 6

signatures on the petition were made during this time. Since the traffic calming cones put in place during the works were removed on 29 August only 4% (around 100 signatures) have been added as the traffic is now moving more smoothly on the road.

Petition 5: Members commented that many of the issues seem to have arisen as a result of Tesco not taking their responsibility for their actions and agreements made when planning was granted. The Borough Council should be approached to consider better enforcement and it was agreed that the information would be passed to them. However Tesco are now using smaller lorries and it would be difficult for them to park on the pavement where there are street signs on the kerb. The local member reported that there is a review planned for the whole of Weybridge as a result of planned redevelopments and this could be included in that review. The Area Highways Manager commented that he is in agreement that there is no obvious alternative space and it may have wider implications which would need to be taken into account.

Petition 6: The Area Highways Manager commented that a number of improvements have been made in the area, including hardstanding for enforcement by the police and an extension of the 30mph limit either side of the village. There have also been pavement improvements and extensions. Further improvements are being planned. The centre of the village and the possibility of a speed management scheme are suggested for a feasibility study later in the agenda. The A244 is a major route within Surrey's network and is key to the movement of goods and services and it would not be appropriate to restrict HGVs.

Members were sympathetic to the issues raised and apologised if residents did not feel that the report addressed these. They would be supportive of a number of proposed measures including a table in the centre of the village and speed roundels at either end together with pavement widening. The Committee agreed to officers and local members working with FEDORA to look at options and that if there are reasons things can't be done they are clearly articulated.

Resolved to:

Petition 1:

- (i) Consider measures at the junction of Langton Road within the Walton Road scheme, to inform a future application for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding
- (ii) Note that the subject(s) of an application will be proposed by the Area Highways Manager, in consultation with the divisional members and the Chairman/Vice-Chairman of the Elmbridge Local Committee
- (iii) Note that parking measures at the junction will be considered within the next Elmbridge Parking Review, which is currently due to begin in December 2020.

Reasons: To respond to the issues raised in the petition.

Petition 2:

- (iv) Include a scheme at the Summer Road/ Hampton Court Way junction on the prioritisation list for consideration in a future highway programme.

Reasons: To respond to the issues raised in the petition.

Petition 3:

- (v) Undertake an officer assessment of the road safety concerns on the roads in the vicinity of the St Lawrence School with reference to the county council's Road Safety Outside School's policy and will report the findings (including any recommendations for highway measures) to a future meeting of the Local Committee.
- (vi) This process also includes an assessment of the status of the school's travel plan. If required assistance will be provided to the school to ensure their travel plan is up to date and ideally registered on the national online school travel plan portal Modeshift STARS.

Reasons: To respond to the issues raised in the petition.

Petition 4:

- (vii) Approve the construction of the three pedestrian crossings that were originally intended as part of the Esher Road Active Travel scheme;
- (xiii) Approve that following the construction of the three pedestrian crossings, and after a period of bedding in, officers should undertake public consultation with the local community, and that the results of this consultation should be reported back to Committee for a final decision on whether to make this scheme permanent;
- (ix) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to implement the three pedestrian crossings and undertake public consultation for this scheme at the appropriate time.

Reasons:

Observations during the trial period by both local members and Surrey County Council Highways Service officers suggest that the scheme has no significant adverse impact in terms of congestion compared to the previous layout of the A244 Esher Road. The primary objective of this scheme was to provide three new pedestrian crossing facilities. However these have not yet been constructed. This means that the local community has not yet been able to utilise the main intended benefit of the scheme. There is no compelling reason to abandon the scheme at this stage. The alternative scheme suggested in the petition is unfeasible and has significant disadvantages compared to the proposed scheme. If the pedestrian crossings were to be implemented, as per the recommendations, the local community would be able to experience the scheme in full, and then provide feedback to enable Committee to decide whether to make the scheme permanent.

ITEM 6

Petition 5:

- (x) Include a scheme on the prioritisation list for consideration in a future highway programme to consider the issues with the loading bay in Queen's Road as part of a wider assessment of possible improvements in the Weybridge area.

Reasons: To respond to the issues raised in the petition.

Petition 6:

- (xi) request that local members and officers meet within 14 days to determine what improvements in the vicinity of the A244 in Oxshott are feasible and should be developed and agree timescales for these and engagement with third parties.

Reasons: To respond to the issues raised in the petition.

24/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 8]

Confirmed as a correct record.

25/20 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 9]

No questions were received.

26/20 BROOKLANDS BUSINESS PARK ACCESSIBILITY PROJECT: IMPROVEMENTS FOR SAFER CYCLING BETWEEN HEATH ROAD /BROOKLAND LANE JUNCTION AND WEYBRIDGE TOWN CENTRE [EXECUTIVE ITEM - FOR DECISION] [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Tim Vickers, Transport Planner

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: See item 5

Member discussion –key points

The officer introduced the report. Members were supportive of the proposals which would provide a welcome addition to the area when completed.

Resolved:

- (i) To approve the advertisement of a notice under Section 90 of the Highways Act 1980 for the construction of a road table on Heath Road around the junction with Brooklands Lane, as detailed in the drawing shown in Annex A of the report.
- (ii) To agree that the County Council's intentions to introduce double yellow line extensions on Brooklands Lane as shown in Annex A should be formally advertised and subject to statutory consultation. Also to agree that if objections are received, the Area Highways Manager and Project Sponsor are authorised to try and resolve them. If any objections cannot

be resolved, the Area Highways Manager and Project Sponsor, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the Divisional Member, decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.

- (iii) To agree that the County Council's intentions to introduce double yellow line extensions on Waverley Road as shown in Annex A should be formally advertised and subject to statutory consultation. Also to agree that if objections are received, the Area Highways Manager and Project Sponsor are authorised to try and resolve them. If any objections cannot be resolved, the Area Highways Manager and Project Sponsor, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the Divisional Member, decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications.
- (iv) To authorise the making of the Cycle Track Order. Also to authorise the Project Sponsor, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman and Divisional Member to resolve any objections to the Cycle Track Order if possible. Objections should be considered as resolved if they are contradicted by the reasoning provided in section 2 of this Report. Also, if necessary, to authorise the Project Sponsor to submit any unresolved objections to the Secretary of State for determining whether the Order can be confirmed, or whether a Local Inquiry is required.

Reasons:

To provide a safer route for cyclists from the completed shared cyclist/pedestrian facility along Heath Road into Weybridge town centre, to complete the route between Brooklands and Weybridge town centre. Completing this key missing link in the route would help to meet the project's strategic aims to encourage sustainable, safe and healthy forms of travel. The proposed road table will also provide an improved environment for pedestrians.

The Cycle Track Order specifically would formalise the town paths adjacent to Chuchfields Recreation Ground as cycle route options. Count data evidences that these paths are already very well used by cyclists, particularly younger users attending Heathside School and Brooklands College. Accident data shows that the route using these paths offers a safer cycling route to Weybridge town centre. There are plans to undertake improvements to these paths.

Full details of the reasoning are provided in Section 2 of the report.

27/20 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [EXECUTIVE ITEM - FOR DECISION] [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion –key points

ITEM 6

Members commented that they would like to look further at the recommended feasibility studies before they are confirmed. The Area Highways manager commented that there had been little progress on any scheme for an alternative bridge on Blundell Lane when there is little likelihood of appropriate funding. The number of feasibility studies which can be taken forward is limited by the capacity of the design team and not a lack of funding.

Resolved to:

- (i) Approve the proposed allocation of the 2021-22 Highways budgets as set out in table 3 of the report;
- (ii) Approve the commissioning of nine new feasibility studies in April 2021, as set out in table 4, to be funded from the parking surplus, subject to further discussions with divisional members to agree those of highest priority;
- (iii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons:

Each Financial Year the Local Committee is allocated budgets for Highway maintenance and improvement schemes – these budgets must be spent within their respective Financial Years. It takes a number of months to work with Committee as a whole and individual members to prioritise individual schemes, and then to make arrangements for schemes to be delivered as part of a countywide programme of work. Therefore it is necessary for Committee to decide high level allocations of its budgets well ahead of the start of the following Financial Year, to enable programmes of work to be developed in good time.

Committee has established a funding model whereby feasibility studies for road improvement schemes are funded from the parking surplus, and then those schemes that Committee approves are submitted to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding. It is anticipated that there will be capacity to commission new feasibility studies from April 2021. Therefore Committee is asked to approve the next round of prioritised schemes for feasibility studies.

Committee is asked to provide the necessary authorisation to deliver its programmes of work in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member without the need to revert to the Committee as a whole.

28/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER [FOR DECISION] [Item 12]

The Committee agreed to remove closed actions with the exception of those which are not yet complete which should be retained as a reminder.

29/20 FORWARD PLAN [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 13]

Noted the forward plan.

30/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 14]

Monday 15 March 2021 at 4pm tbc.

Meeting ended at: 5.50 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)**DATE: 8TH MARCH 2021****LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER****SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE****DIVISION: ALL****SUMMARY OF ISSUE(S):**

On 5th February 2021 the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport announced an additional £12M capital funding over the next three financial years to invest in Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes) and confirmed £3M capital funding for maintenance schemes in 2021-22. These sums are to be shared between the eleven Local and Joint Committees.

Public consultations have been completed in relation to proposed Active Travel schemes in Baker Street in Weybridge, Bridge Road in East Molesey, and Thames Ditton High Street.

There is an ongoing problem with fly tipping in Pointers Road, Cobham.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to:

- (i) Delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Members to decide a programme of schemes for next Financial Year 2021-22 in which to invest the additional ITS funding (paragraphs 2.1.1 to 2.1.8 refer);
- (ii) Authorise the advertisement of a permanent traffic regulation order to convert the temporary Active Travel scheme currently deployed in Baker Street, Weybridge, into a permanent scheme, and to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member (paragraphs 2.2.1 to 2.2.5 refer);
- (iii) Agree to consulting the business community in Bridge Road, East Molesey, with a proposal for trial a specific weekend only pedestrian zone, and to agree to fund the trial in summer 2021 should the business community be supportive and should COVID-19 restrictions allow (paragraphs 2.3.1 to 2.3.4 refer);
- (iv) Agree to consulting the business community in Thames Ditton High Street, with a proposal for a trial of a new pedestrian area at the Lime Tree on weekends during summer 2021, and to agree to fund the trial should the business community be supportive and should COVID-19 restrictions allow (paragraphs 2.4.1 to 2.4.5 refer);
- (v) Authorise the advertisement of an amendment to the prohibition of traffic order that is currently in force in Pointers Road, Cobham, to move the starting point of the order approximately 90m to the southeast to a point just northwest of the entrance to Chatley Farm, to authorise the installation of a new gate at this location to prevent unauthorised access, and to delegate authority to the Area

www.surreycc.gov.uk/elmbridge

ITEM 8

Highway Manager to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member (paragraphs 2.5.1 to 2.5.2 refer).

- (vi) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

A programme of schemes needs to be developed to invest Committee's share of the new allocation for ITS schemes in the next Financial Year 2021-22.

Committee is asked to agree next steps for the proposed Active Travel schemes in Baker Street, Bridge Road and Thames Ditton High Street.

An amendment to the prohibition of traffic order in Pointers Road, Cobham, would be beneficial to mitigate the problem with fly tipping in this location.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) aims to improve the highway network for all users. In general terms it aims to reduce congestion, improve accessibility, reduce the frequency and severity of road casualties, improve the environment, and maintain the network so that it is safe for public use.
- 1.2 The Local Committee in Elmbridge has been delegated Highways budgets to be able to contribute to the objectives set out in Surrey County Council's LTP, according to local priorities.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Local Committee finance

2.1.1 At the time of Committee's previous meeting in November 2020, it was anticipated that the Highways budgets available to the Local Committee next Financial Year 2021-22 would be in line with the council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), as follows:

- Committee revenue: £0
- Member revenue: £67,500 (£7,500 per Division)
- Committee capital: £200,000
- **Total: £267,500**

2.1.2 At the time it was recommended to allocate these budgets for 2021-22 as set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Previously agreed allocation of 2021-22 budgets

Allocation	Amount
Local Structural Repair (LSR – large scale patching) of carriageways and / or footways	£200,000 capital (approx. £22,000 per Division)
Member Highways allocations (revenue)	
• Contributions to Street Smart:	£20,000 revenue (£2,222.22 per Division)
• Revenue for Members to allocate:	£47,500 revenue (£5,277.77 per Division)
Total	£267,500

2.1.3 On 5th February 2021 the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport announced an additional £12M capital funding over the next three financial years to invest in Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes) and confirmed £3M capital funding for maintenance schemes in 2021-22. These sums are to be shared between the eleven Local and Joint Committee. This means that the budgets available to the Elmbridge Local Committee for next Financial Year 2021-22 are now as follows:

- Committee revenue: £0 (unchanged)
- Member revenue: £67,500 (£7,500 per Division – unchanged)
- Capital maintenance: £311,000 (increase of £111,000 from MTFS)
- Capital ITS: £444,000 (new funding)
- **Total: £822,500** (increase of £555,000 from MTFS)

2.1.4 This in turn means that Committee's budget allocations for 2021-22 are updated as follows in Table 2 below:

Table 2 Updated allocations of 2021-22 budgets

Allocation	Amount
Capital maintenance. For example Local Structural Repair (LSR – large scale patching) of carriageways and / or footways.	£311,000 capital (approx. £34,500 per Division – priorities to be agreed with Divisional Members)
Capital ITS. For implementation of Highway improvement schemes.	£444,000 capital (to be invested in individual schemes – see below)
Member Highways allocations (revenue)	
• Contributions to Street Smart:	£20,000 revenue (£2,222.22 per Division)
• Revenue for Members to allocate:	£47,500 revenue (£5,277.77 per Division)
Total	£822,500

2.1.5 Committee has a well-established funding model for development and delivery of its annual ITS programme. Committee uses Parking Surplus funding to undertake feasibility studies, and then applies to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for implementation of schemes. This has been very successful and

www.surreycc.gov.uk/elmbridge

ITEM 8

to date has resulted in £1.275M CIL being awarded for Highway improvement schemes across Elmbridge. Committee's prioritisation list of ITS schemes is presented in Annex A. Members will see that a good number of these schemes are progressing through feasibility, with others in the pipeline to follow.

2.1.6 The additional capital ITS funding enables Committee to implement Highway improvement schemes for which there the available CIL funding is not sufficient to cover the full cost. For example if Committee has developed a scheme through feasibility as a local priority, but the local CIL board cannot afford to implement the scheme, the additional capital ITS funding could be used to top up the available CIL funding, and enable schemes to be implemented that otherwise could not progress.

2.1.7 The additional ITS funding is intended to be for the next three financial years. In 2021-22 this funding will need to be allocated to schemes that are well advanced in terms of feasibility / design. For 2022-23 and 2023-24 there would be time to develop a scheme from Committee's prioritisation list that has not yet started its journey through feasibility. If a scheme were to require extensive public consultation, it may not be feasible to deliver within the three year timescale unless it is already well advanced.

2.1.8 It is recommended Committee delegates authority to the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member to decide the programme of ITS schemes for next Financial Year 2021-22 to be funded with the additional funding. These schemes would be selected from the programme of feasibility / design work that Committee has been developing – as shown in Annex A – focussing on those that are furthest advanced. The Area Highway Manager would take into account availability of CIL contributions to assist in the delivery of selected schemes with the objective of maximising the total investment value for Elmbridge.

2.2 Baker Street, Weybridge, Active Travel Scheme

2.2.1 A temporary Active Travel scheme was deployed in Baker Street, Weybridge, in October 2020. The scheme comprises of a road closure to motor vehicles between Springfield Meadows and the entrance to Elmbridge Borough Council's car park. Pedestrian and cycle access has been maintained throughout. The scheme was suggested by Elmbridge Borough Council, and implemented as a trial as part of the Government's nationwide Active Travel programme.

2.2.2 The effect of the scheme has been to reduce substantially the volume of traffic using Baker Street as a through route. This in turn means the environment in Baker Street for pedestrians and cyclists has been much improved. There have been persistent calls from the local community to reduce the volume of through traffic in Baker Street over a number of years.

2.2.2 Since the scheme was first deployed we have received feedback suggesting that some in the local community have enjoyed the reduction in noise and traffic. Others in the local community have expressed concerns about aspects of the scheme. We received messages of support for the scheme from the late Cllr Andrew Davies, the Chairman of the Weybridge Business Group, and two members of the Weybridge Society committee.

2.2.4 In February 2021 a public consultation was arranged to give the community the opportunity to comment on whether to make the scheme permanent or not. The

results of the consultation should be available to the Committee before the meeting and will be published in a supplementary agenda

2.2.5 It is recommended to authorise the advertisement of a permanent traffic regulation order to convert the scheme currently deployed in Baker Street into a permanent scheme, and to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager to consider any objections in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member. If Committee were to approve the conversion of this scheme to a permanent scheme, funding would be provided under the auspices of the Active Travel programme.

2.3 Bridge Road, East Molesey, Active Travel Scheme

2.3.1 As part of the Government's Active Travel programme Elmbridge Borough Council suggested that Bridge Road, East Molesey, would be a good location for an Active Travel scheme. Following discussions with local Divisional and Ward members, it was agreed to consult the local community to establish whether there would be support for a new pedestrian zone that could operate on weekends and bank holidays. This consultation took place in October 2020.

2.3.2 A total of 922 letters were sent out to the agreed consultee area, including 884 residential addresses, and 38 business addresses. 130 responses were received including 108 from residents and 18 from businesses. 76% of respondents were supportive of a pedestrian zone. Opinion was divided on the extent of the pedestrian zone and its times of operation. Further details of the consultation results have been shared with local Divisional and Ward members and are available on request.

2.3.3 The results and comments suggest a number of important factors to consider:

- There is an appetite for some form of weekend and / or bank holiday pedestrian zone on Bridge Road.
- There is no clear consensus among the local community on either the extent or operating times for a pedestrian zone.
- There is a significant split in views between the residents and businesses.
- Just under half of the businesses engaged with the consultation, so it is difficult to be confident of the business community's views on the proposal.

2.3.4 Officers reviewed the consultation results with local Divisional and Ward Members. It was agreed that there was merit in evaluating a pedestrian zone further, but it was felt that it would be imprudent to go ahead with the scheme without a clear understanding of the views of the business community. By the time the consultation was completed the funding available for Active Travel schemes was fully committed – meaning that if the scheme is to progress further, it would need to be funded by the Local Committee. It was agreed to put a proposal to the Local Committee to agree to consult the business community on a specific proposal for a trial weekend pedestrian zone, which could be tested in the summer of 2021, COVID-19 restrictions permitting, and also to agree to provide funding , in the event that the business community were to be supportive.

2.4 Thames Ditton High Street, Active Travel Scheme

2.4.1 As part of the Government's Active Travel programme Elmbridge Borough Council suggested that Thames Ditton High Street, would be a good location for an Active Travel scheme. A number of options were discussed with local Divisional and Ward members and it was agreed to consult the local community to establish whether there would be support for a trial of one of these options, on a full or part time basis. The option that was put to consultation would involve the temporary conversion of part of the carriageway near the Lime Tree to create a pedestrian area.

2.4.2 At the outset of the public consultation, officers arranged a virtual public forum to enable the local community to ask questions and raise concerns. The public consultation was then publicised via social media, and with posters in the shops in the High Street.

2.4.3 A total of 392 responses were received from the local community, including 350 residents, 14 local business owners and 9 employees of local businesses. 49% of respondents were supportive of the proposed pedestrian area on a full-time basis. A further 13% of respondents were supportive of the scheme to be implemented on a part-time basis. 38% of respondents were opposed to the scheme. There was no consensus on the days or times of operation of the scheme.

2.4.4 The results and comments suggested a number of important factors to consider:

- There is an appetite to try something new or different in Thames Ditton High Street, but there is no clear consensus as to what should be tried.
- There are concerns that a scheme might have a negative impact for on-street parking provision, which is currently free of charge, with some areas time limited to increase turnover.
- Elmbridge Borough Council have indicated that they would not consider providing free of charge parking in the Ashley Road car park, which some respondents felt would support the proposed Active Travel scheme.
- In the context of a potential impact on on-street parking there were concerns that passing trade for businesses would be inhibited, and also concerns that residents would find it more difficult to park near their homes.

2.4.5 Officers reviewed the consultation results with local Divisional and Ward Members. The appetite within the local community to try something new or different was acknowledged. It was also agreed that it was important to achieve consensus within the local community before any permanent change could be promoted. By the time the consultation was completed the funding available for Active Travel schemes was fully committed – meaning that if the scheme is to progress further, it would need to be funded by the Local Committee. It was agreed to put a proposal to the Local Committee to agree to consult the business community on a specific proposal for a trial weekend only scheme, which could be tested in the summer of 2021, COVID-19 restrictions permitting, and also to agree to provide funding , in the event that the business community were to be supportive.

2.5 Pointers Road, Cobham

2.5.1 Over the years there have been problems with fly tipping and antisocial behaviour at the north-western end of Pointers Road, Cobham. In 2003 in response to these issues Committee agreed to implement a prohibition of traffic order to make it unlawful for motor vehicles to proceed beyond a point 90m northwest of the entrance to Chatley Farm. At the time a gate was installed at this point, and a prohibition of traffic sign installed by the entrance to Chatley Farm.

2.5.2 Unfortunately the problem with fly tipping re-emerged – with perpetrators tipping waste in the 90m section between Chatley Farm and the gate that was installed in 2003. It is therefore proposed to amend the prohibition of traffic order to make it unlawful for motor vehicles to proceed beyond the entrance to Chatley Farm, and to install a gate at this location to prevent unauthorised access. Access for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists would be maintained. It is proposed to pay for the amendment to the traffic order and the new gate from the parking surplus.

3. OPTIONS:

3.1 As described above.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 As described above.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 As described above.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to take account of the needs of all users of the public highway.

7. LOCALISM:

7.1 The Local Committee prioritises its expenditure according to local priorities.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	A well-managed highway network can contribute to reduction in crime and disorder as well as improve peoples' perception of crime.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	A number of schemes being promoted by the Local Committee are intended to promote sustainable transport.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.

Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	A number of schemes being promoted by the Local Committee are intended to promote active travel.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 Recommendations have been made to facilitate the development and delivery of the 2021-22 ITS programme, the next steps with three Active Travel schemes in Weybridge, East Molesey and Thames Ditton, and an amendment to the prohibition of traffic order in Pointers Road, Cobham.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The Area Team Manager will work with Divisional Members, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to deliver this Financial Year's Divisional Programmes, and to develop next Financial Year's programme of investment.

Contact Officer: Nick Healey

Consulted: See above.

Annexes: One.

Sources/background papers: None

ELMBRIDGE LTP SCHEMES RANKING - 2020				Congestion					Accessibility					Safety					Environment			Economy			FINAL SCORE	Cost	Benefit/ Cost													
Rank	Factors should be assessed considering whether the proposed scheme will have a positive or negative effect, using the range of (-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5), with negative figures being a negative effect, and positive ones beneficial. The score given should reflect factors such as the type of road, traffic volumes, likely impact of scheme etc. For KSI and accident statistics, the number of accidents over the preceding three year period should be entered, but only if these are directly relevant to the purpose of the scheme. Scheme / Title	County Division		15%		Con. Score	Wgt. Adj.	15%		Acc. Score	Wgt. adj.	35%			Safety Score	Wgt. Adj.	15%	Env. Score	Wgt. Adj.	20%	Econ. Score	Wgt. Adj.	20%	£(k)																
				Vehicle delay impact	Traffic growth impact	Support travel plan	Technological congestion management	Parking management	15%	Improve mobility for impaired	Promote public transport	Encourage walking	Reduce community severance	Encourage cycling	15%	Reduce KSI	Reduce child KSI	Reduce slight casualties	Reduce vehicle speeds	Support safe routes to school	Improve street lighting	Reduce fear of crime	35%	Improve streetscene inc. reducing tipping	Reduce vehicle CO2 emissions	Reduce traffic noise	Reduce HGV impact	15%	Aligns with planned maintenance	Supports local economy	20%									
1	Boroughwide new crossings - mobility improvements across Borough, e.g. Dropped kerbs and ramps (scheme scoring for a typical site)	Various		0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	5	0	3	2	0	10.00	150.00	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	5.00	175.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	325.00	5	65000.000
2	Bridge strike sites - warning and route sign improvements. Sites identified (scheme scoring for a typical site): Hersham Road, Walton on Thames (some treatment undertaken) Molesey Road, Hersham Portsmouth Road, Esher (east of Scilly Isles) Station Road, Esher Mill Road/More Lane, Esher Hare Lane, Claygate Lower Green Road, Esher Weston Green Road/Embercourt Road, Thames Ditton	Various		2	0	1	1	0	4.00	60.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	70.00	0	1	0	2	3.00	45.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	175.00	5	35000.000
3	Walton High Street - new (or replacement) Zebra Crossing between the Heart and Boots	Walton South and Oatlands; Walton		0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	15.00	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	7.00	245.00	1	0	0	0	1.00	15.00	0	1	1.00	20.00	295.00	50	5900.000	
4	Blundel Lane, Stoke D'Abernon - Junction Improvement <i>On hold pending outcome of speed limit assessment.</i>	Cobham		-3	0	2	0	0	-1.00	-15.00	5	0	5	0	5	15.00	225.00	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	35.00	0	-1	0	0	-1.00	-15.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	230.00	115	2000.000	
5	Blundel Lane pedestrian / cycle accessibility improvements <i>Would cost approx £100k for the feasibility study.</i>	Cobham, Oxshott, Claygate and Hinchley Wood		1	2	1	0	0	4.00	60.00	3	0	5	4	5	17.00	255.00	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	5.00	175.00	-2	0	0	0	-2.00	-30.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	460.00	3,000	153.333	
6	Hampton Court junction(s) to the south of the bridge (casualty reduction, congestion, etc) <i>On hold pending Jolly Boatman development.</i>	East Molesey and Esher		2	1	1	0	2	6.00	90.00	2	2	2	2	2	10.00	150.00	2	0	4	1	1	0	0	8.00	280.00	0	1	1	0	2.00	30.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	550.00	4000	137.500	

Awaiting ranking	County Division
Esher Transport Study Major scheme with a number of different elements, including: - Junction capacity improvements at Copsem Lane junction with Milbourne Lane, Esher Town Centre, Cafe Rouge and the Scilly Isles - Pedestrian crossing facilities in Esher Town Centre and at Copsem Lane junction with Milbourne Lane. - Traffic signal technology upgrade. - Review of format of Esher High Street. - Casualty reduction at Esher Green.	East Molesey and Esher
Esher Road pedestrian crossing (near Mole Bridge) - suggested by Stuart Selleck <i>On hold pending bridge replacement.</i>	East Molesey and Esher
Weybridge Station Accessibility - feasibility complete. Discussions ongoing re Heath Road (common land issues, etc) <i>Improvements to be made as part of LEP funded scheme.</i>	Weybridge
A245 Byfleet Road Pedestrian / Cycle improvements - part of cycling strategy - and speed limit review for possible reduction to 40mph	Weybridge
Seven Hills Road Cycle Route - part of cycling strategy	Hersham, Weybridge
West Molesey traffic order - tidy up and clarify existing restriction for HGVs	West Molesey
Walton Road between Esher Road and Avern Road Casualty reduction / 20mph / pedestrian improvements.	West Molesey, East Molesey and Esher
Woodstock Lane South - suggestions for new footway, speed management, safety improvements, etc	Oxshott, Hinchley Wood and Claygate
A309 off-carriageway cycle route between Woodstock Lane and the Scilly Isles - suggested by Janet Turner - part of cycling strategy	Oxshott, Hinchley Wood and Claygate (mostly)
Weybridge High Street - review pedestrian crossings to alleviate congestion	Weybridge
Grotto Road junction with Thames Street, Weybridge - pedestrian improvements	Weybridge
Grotto Road - between Oatlands Drive and Marlborough Drive	Weybridge
Hurst Park School - Road Safety Outside Schools assessment <i>Need to wait until everything has bedded in and then use this scheme to pick up any loose ends</i>	East Molesey and Esher
New cycle route connecting Weybridge and Hersham (possibly along Queens Road and St George's Avenue) - suggested by Ian Donaldson <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	Weybridge and Hersham

Key
Yellow
White
Green

These are schemes that are already being progressed through feasibility / detailed design / implementation

These are schemes that are either on hold for some reason, or that will be taken into account as part of another ongoing scheme.

These are schemes available for recommendation to be added to the programme of schemes.

Church Road and Kent Road, East Molesey, especially at the junction with Vine Road and Kent Road Casualties at the junction, pedestrian crossing opportunities for children en route to school. <i>Awaiting outcome of new RSOS Audit - then feasibility study to commence in 2021-22.</i>	East Molesey and Esher
Lammas Lane - improvements to pedestrian facilities on the approaches to the roundabout and measures to encourage lower approach speeds.	East Molesey and Esher
Oxshott - further pedestrian improvements to the south of Danes Hill - Widen footway south of The Bear - New footway between Danes Hill and village centre on west side of road.	Oxshott, Hinchley Wood and Claygate
Ember Lane S-bends	The Dittons
Portsmouth Road, Long Ditton/Surbiton. Cycle route improvements. <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	The Dittons
Portsmouth Road, just west of Ditton Reach - new pedestrian crossing Suggested in discussion with Cllr Nick Darby	The Dittons
Monument Hill, between its junctions with Baker Street and Oatlands Drive, Queens Road, and Hangar Hill Casualty reduction and improved pedestrian facilities <i>Need to coordinate with proposal to move the War Memorial</i>	Weybridge
Ditton Hill Road junction with St Mary's Road and Church Road - casualty reduction	The Dittons
Oxshott Village Centre - speed management scheme to consider a new 20mph Zone for the A244 section between Birds Hill Rise and Danes Hill - at the very least measures to encourage lower speeds through the centre of the village. Scheme to include consideration of overnight weight restriction. Scheme to include consideration of speed management measures and consideration of new 20mph zone in Steels Lane / Blundel Lane area, as requested by petition. <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	Oxshott, Hinchley Wood and Claygate
Mill Road / More Lane by the railway bridge - pedestrian improvements - problem with visibility between pedestrians and vehicles approaching under the bridge Suggested by residents, with support from Cllr Peter Szanto. <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	East Molesey and Esher
Queens Road - new pedestrian crossing outside Manby Lodge School Suggested by school community, with support from Cllr Tim Oliver	Weybridge
Church Street on bend near Bridge Street - new pedestrian crossing (refuge island?) Suggested by Cllr Tim Oliver. <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	Weybridge
Crossing of Hampton Court Way near allotments north of Embercourt Rd Suggested by Cllr Szanto. <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	East Molesey and Esher/ The Dittons
A244 Esher Road - pedestrian improvements <i>Active Travel Scheme</i>	Hersham, East Molesey and Esher
Baker Street, Weybridge <i>Active Travel scheme</i>	Weybridge
Thames Ditton High Street <i>Active Travel Scheme</i>	The Dittons
Bridge Road, East Molesey <i>Active Travel Scheme</i>	East Molesey and Esher
Hersham Road, outside Westward School <i>Westward School have offered 25% contribution.</i> <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	Walton South and Oatlands
Queens Road, new cycle link between Seven Hills Road and Ashley Road <i>Arising out of discussion between Walton Charities and John O'Reilly.</i> <i>Feasibility study due to start in 2021-22.</i>	Hersham
Hawkshill Way, Esher - 20mph limit <i>Suggested by Cllr Peter Szanto</i>	East Molesey and Esher
Queens Road - re-location of loading bay near South Road <i>Petition to Elmbridge Local Committee, Nov 2020</i>	Weybridge
Cavendish Road jw Egerton Road and also Old Avenue and Gower Road - scheme(s) to address persistent reports of damage only incidents - could consider junction road tables. <i>Suggested by Cllr Peter Harman</i>	Weybridge
Hampton Court Way / Summer Road junction review <i>Added to the list following petition in November 2020</i>	East Molesey and Esher, and The Dittons

Local Committee Decision and Action Tracker

This tracker monitors progress against the decisions and actions that the Local Committee has made. It is updated before each committee meeting. (Update provided on 25/02/2021).

- Decisions and actions will be marked as '**open**', where work to implement the decision is ongoing by the Local/Joint Committee.
- When decisions are reported to the committee as '**complete**', they will also be marked as '**closed**'. The Committee will then be asked to agree to remove these items from the tracker. For some decisions the Committee and public will be able to monitor the progress through Surrey County Council website. A link to the webpage will be included on the item when marked as complete.
- Decisions may also be '**closed**' if further progress is not possible at this time, even though the action is not yet complete. An explanation will be included in the comment section. In this case, the action can remain on the tracker should the Committee request.

Ref No	Meeting Date	Decision	Status (Open/Closed)	Officer	Comment or update
1	4 December 2017	Petition 4 – speed assessment to be carried out in Hare Lane	Closed	Area Highways Officer (Nick Healey)	Action now with Claygate Parish Council to decide whether or not to allocate CIL funding to implement this scheme.
2	11 June 2018	Committee to be provided with information on the basis of the feasibility study and a follow up report to be brought to the Committee when the pedestrian refuge in Portsmouth Road has been installed and the safety audit completed to identify if further measures are required.	Closed	Area Highways Officer	The 12 month review period ended in the middle of the lockdown period and was therefore deferred as traffic levels and pedestrian movements were not representative.
3	5 December 2019	Agreed proposals in 2019/20 Parking Review to be advertised, comments considered and agreed changes implemented.	Closed	Parking Engineer	Final decisions have been made following advertisement of the proposals. Detailed design is currently under way with implementation of agreed schemes expected to begin in the spring. Complete
4	5 December 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding to construct a new cycle route along 	Closed	Area Highways Manager	Bids for CIL funding will open in February 2021

ITEM 9

Ref No	Meeting Date	Decision	Status (Open/Closed)	Officer	Comment or update
		<p>Grotto Road between Oatlands Drive and Marlborough Drive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding to construct a new road safety scheme in Ember Lane, Esher / Thames Ditton 	Closed	Area Highways Manager	Bids for CIL funding will open in February 2021
5	17 March 2020 (delegated officer decisions)	<p>(i) Construct the Stoke Road speed management scheme;</p> <p>(ii) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for the Seven Hills Road cycle route scheme, subject to the necessary consultation;</p> <p>(iii) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for improvements including new pedestrian crossing facilities in Walton High Street, subject to the necessary consultation;</p> <p>(iv) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for improvements to the junctions at either end of Baker Street, Weybridge, subject to the necessary consultation;</p> <p>(v) Convene a meeting with the relevant Divisional and Ward Members to review the Walton Road between Esher Road and Avern Road scheme;</p> <p>(vi) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding to improve pedestrian facilities at the junction of Grotto Road with Thames Street, Weybridge, subject to the necessary consultation;</p> <p>(vii) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding for capacity improvements between Station Road and the Scilly Isles, Esher, subject to the necessary consultation;</p>	<p>Open</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>Closed</p>	<p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p> <p>Area Highways Manager</p>	<p>Phase 1 complete. Detailed design in progress for next phases.</p> <p>This application was submitted in October 2020 and was declined. EBC are waiting for the LCWIP to be completed before allocating strategic CIL for cycling or walking schemes.</p> <p>CIL application to be submitted in current funding round.</p> <p>CIL application to be submitted in current funding round.</p> <p>Officers have met with members and prioritised a number of locations for further development. Complete</p> <p>CIL application to be submitted in current funding round.</p> <p>CIL application to be submitted in current funding round.</p>

Ref No	Meeting Date	Decision	Status (Open/ Closed)	Officer	Comment or update
		(ix) Apply to Elmbridge Borough Council for CIL funding to implement a quick win scheme in Copsem Lane, Esher, subject to the necessary consultations.	Closed	Area Highways Manager	CIL funding awarded following interim CIL funding round in October 2020.
6	15 June 2020	Changes to parking restrictions in Wey Road and Round Oak Road to be advertised, comments considered and if approved, implemented.	Closed	Parking Engineer	Following analysis of the feedback to the proposals advertised as part of the parking review, it has been decided not to proceed with any new parking controls in these roads at the current time. Complete
7	16 November 2020	Consider measures at the junction of Langton Road within the Walton Road scheme for a possible future application for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding	Closed	Area Highways Manager	To be considered as part of the Walton Road between Esher Road and Avern Road scheme.
Page 8	16 November 2020	Include a scheme at the Summer Road/ Hampton Court Way junction on the prioritisation list for consideration in a future highway programme.	Closed	Area Highways Manager	Complete – scheme now added to prioritisation list for future consideration.
9	16 November 2020	Undertake an officer assessment of the road safety concerns on the roads in the vicinity of the St Lawrence School and report the findings to a future meeting of the Local Committee.	Open	Active Travel Team Manager	Delayed as school currently shut
10	16 November 2020	Construct three pedestrian crossings as part of the Esher Road Active Travel scheme; Following the construction public consultation to take place with the local community and the results reported back to Committee.	Closed Open	Area Highways Manager	Pedestrian crossings complete. (Minor amendments to the scheme still to do.) To follow completion scheme.
11	16 November 2020	Include a scheme on the prioritisation list for consideration consider the issues with the loading bay in Queen's Road as part of a wider assessment of possible improvements in the Weybridge area.	Closed	Area Highways Manager	Complete – scheme now added to prioritisation list for future consideration.

Ref No	Meeting Date	Decision	Status (Open/Closed)	Officer	Comment or update
12	16 November 2020	Local members and officers to meet within 14 days to determine what improvements in the vicinity of the A244 in Oxshott are feasible and should be developed and agree timescales for these and engagement with third parties.	Closed	Area Highways Manager	A number of meetings have now taken place; dialogue established with local community and actions documented. Complete
13	16 November 2020	<p>Advertise a notice under Section 90 of the Highways Act 1980 for the construction of a road table on Heath Road around the junction with Brooklands Lane</p> <p>Advertise the intention to introduce double yellow line extensions on Brooklands Lane and subject to feedback decide whether to implement.</p> <p>Advertise the intention to introduce double yellow line extensions on Waverley Road and subject to feedback decide whether to implement.</p> <p>Make a Cycle Track Order, consider any objections and if necessary, submit to the Secretary of State for determination.</p>	Closed	Transport Planning Officer	<p>Following advertisement of the road table and feedback received, the decision has been made to construct the road table.</p> <p>Following advertisement of the double yellow lines extensions on Brooklands Lane and feedback received, the decision has been made to proceed with the extensions.</p> <p>Following advertisement of the double yellow lines extensions on Waverley Road and feedback received, the decision has been made to only proceed with the extensions on the southern side, not the northern side of Waverley Road.</p> <p>The Cycle Track Order made received maintained objections and will be submitted to the Secretary of State for determination. Complete</p>
14	16 November 2020	Commission nine new feasibility studies in April 2021, to be funded from the parking surplus, subject to further discussions with divisional members to agree those of highest priority;	Open	Area Highways Manager	Design briefs being prepared.

Local Committee (Elmbridge) - Forward Programme 2021/22

Details of future meetings			
<p>Dates for the Elmbridge Local Committee 2021: 7 June 2021 at 4pm tbc</p> <p>The Committee meeting commences at 4pm. This forward plan sets out the anticipated reports for future meetings. The forward plan will be used in preparation for the next committee meeting. However, this is a flexible forward plan and all items are subject to change. The Local Committee is asked to note and comment on the forward plan outlined in this report.</p>			
Topic	Purpose	Contact Officer	Proposed date
Decision Tracker	For information	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Forward Programme	Review the Forward Programme and consider further themes for Member briefings	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Parking Review	To receive the recommendations of the annual review of on street parking restrictions in the Borough	Parking Engineer	7 June 2021
Henrietta Parker Trust	To update the Committee on the Men's Shed Project (?committee item or display)	HP Trust	TBC

This page is intentionally left blank