

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 24 March 2021
at VIRTUAL.

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

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

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

* In attendance

22/20 PUBLIC FORUM [Item]

A public forum was held prior to the formal meeting.

6 questions were raised: –

1. Andy Grimshaw re blocked footpath in Pyrford
2. Andy Grimshaw re an unauthorised scrapyard
3. Andy Grimshaw re parking at Marshalls Parade
4. Andy Grimshaw re damage to grass verges
5. Carl Thomson re item 4 (petition) on the agenda – to be taken at that point
6. Cllr Will Forster on behalf of a resident re traffic using Witch Hill Lane

The notes of the full questions raised and the answers given are attached to these minutes as Annex A.

23/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Cllr Melanie Whitehand gave her apologies.

24/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting, held on 20 November 2020 were agreed. It was noted that Cllr Ashall was vice chair of that meeting (not Cllr Bittleston as listed).

25/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were none.

26/20 PETITIONS [Item 4]

ITEM 4A

Petition to 'review the traffic arrangements in Goldsworth Road at the junction with Poole Road, Woking, to prevent the access to McDonald's drive-through restaurant causing access problems to homes and businesses and gridlock to the traffic in that area at busy times.'

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: One petition as detailed.

The petitioner, Lance Spencer attended the meeting to present the petition, raising the inconvenience to residents, Morrisons shoppers and the blocking of emergency access by queueing traffic.

The Area Highways Manager assured the petitioner that this had been very carefully considered in detail with WBC Officers, Surrey Police, Fire service and Road Safety. Since the petition was raised, the traffic had alleviated. Traffic modelling would not be warranted for a temporary issue that only occurs infrequently.

Councillors noted that McDonalds had taken steps to assist by allowing drive through customers to park up and await their food. Lockdown was due to lift at the beginning of April which would also improve the situation. Councillors would continue to review the situation and to work with McDonalds to try to find alternative solutions as the situation evolved. Woking Borough Council had a travel plan attached to the planning application, but this covered staff travel and not customer traffic. The County Council had raised issues at the planning stage, but these were not reasons to reject the planning application.

The Joint Committee noted that:

- (i) Meetings were held prior to the reopening of the McDonald's Drive-thru to discuss possible measures to minimise the impact of queueing traffic.

- (ii) No options could be identified for segregating McDonald's traffic from traffic that was either passing along Goldworth Road or trying to access Morrison's.
- (iii) Another meeting will be held to review the situation and identify any possible alternative routes to McDonald's.
- (iv) The cost of any traffic management measures should not be borne by Surrey County Council

ITEM 4B

Petition to 'trial the reduction in speed limit to 20 mph in White Rose Lane, Mount Hermon Road, York Road and roads ancillary to those roads.'

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: One petition as detailed

Woking Borough Councillor Liam Lyons presented the petition which repeated a request from residents of White Rose Lane for speed reduction in that area. He outlined that other areas and London boroughs had different speed policies that allowed 20mph zones to be introduced. The road had no pavement and was used by school children.

Mr Carl Thomson, resident of the area and former Borough Councillor also spoke in support of the petition.

Members discussed at length the issues of the area and how to further gather residents views, noting that the introduction of speed limits or mitigation measures could impact negatively on surrounding roads, and the fact that there were similar issues in other parts of the Town. It was noted that the focus should be on White Rose Lane (and later Park Road) as the ancillary roads around there might be part of a HIF project for funding.

Members also discussed that, subject to agreement by the Mount Hermon Borough and County Councillors, the Joint Committee could explore the possibility of using Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy funds to design, consult upon and implement, if approved by consultation, speed restrictions (including a 20 mph zone) for Park Road and White Rose Lane. It was noted that these funds were for Mount Hermon ward and therefore the expenditure on

a small area would need to be considered as part of a whole package (including the HIF bid fund).

The Joint Committee were aware that this was contrary to the SCC speed limit policy, but did discuss whether an exception could be made, on the understanding that this did not set a precedent. Two county councillors (Will Forster and Liz Bowes) proposed resolutions for 20 MPH for Park Rd and White Rose Lane, the other councillors agreed and the chairman stated that there was cross party agreement for 20 MPH for both of these roads.

Although the discussion showed clear support for action, the way forward was dependent on a number of issues being clarified and worked through.

The Joint Committee noted that:

- (i) It would be impractical to trial a 20mph speed limit in a road, as opposed to permanently reducing the speed limit, because the amount of work required for assessment, advertising and implementation, as well as the associated cost, is similar in both instances.
- (ii) White Rose Lane, Mount Hermon Road and York Road are all included in the Woking speed management plan. Speed surveys previously undertaken in both roads indicate a relatively good level of compliance with the speed limit but with speeds too high to permit a 20mph speed limit in accordance with Surrey County Council's Speed Limit Policy.
- (iii) Residents' concerns will be discussed with officers of the Speed Management Plan review group and new speed surveys will be requested to include Park Road.**
- (iv) Vehicle speeds and road safety will continue to be monitored in White Rose Lane, Mount Hermon Road and York Road, as they are for all sites on the Woking speed management plan.
- (v) Petitions have previously been received for a 20mph speed limit along White Rose Lane in 2014 and 2017 and in both instances, the Woking Joint Committee agreed to take no further action.

However, the Joint Committee also agreed to:

Delegate to Officers to agree, in consultation with the Area Highways Manager, the way forward (including CIL bids for funds) in full consultation with Members.

This would need to be subject to call in with the Cabinet Member and, if agreed, a further report to the Committee at the next meeting, giving details of potential possible schemes for consultation, the costs involved and sources for funding and delivering these schemes. An update on the HIF bid progress for Mount Hermon Road and York Road would also need to be included.

27/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Five written public questions were received and the full questions and written answers given were included in the agenda pack and later on the supplementary agenda:-

1. Linda Murray re Mcdonalds traffic (in addition to petition 4a)
2. Phil Stubbs re Brookwood Country Park
3. Adam Kirby re footpaths – safety and lighting
4. Kate Wright re footpaths and lighting
5. Marian Malcher re climate change

The additional questions asked and discussion were:

Question 1 – Ms Murray did not attend the meeting but Cllr Aziz spoke on her behalf and highlighted the issue of queueing traffic as discussed under item 4a – the petition.

Question 2 – Mr Stubbs did not attend the meeting but Cllr Hussain asked whether Cala homes could be encouraged to undertake these works.

Question 3 – Mr Kirby highlighted the low level anxiety regarding safety of footpaths. The last train from London into Woking arrived at 1am and the footpaths into Horsell were not alight at this hour. He urged that further work be undertaken on the short stretches of routes identified as a small amount of work would really assist with feelings of safety.

It was noted that this issue was being raised in a number of ways, including on social media and was of concern to local residents. It was agreed that each area needed to be looked at individually to find suitable solutions.

28/20 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

8 Written member questions were received and the full questions and answers given can be found on the agenda and the supplementary papers:

1. Cllr Will Forster re roads in Kingsmoor Park
2. Cllr Will Forster re speed limit on A320 in Barnsbury and Mayford
3. Cllr Will Forster re roads / resurfacing
4. Cllr Will Forster re pavement at Bonsey Close
5. Cllr Ann-Marie Barker re Safer Streets fund
6. Cllr Ann-Marie Barker re Active Travel
7. Cllr Ann-Marie Barker re Bus services
8. Cllr Graham Chrystie re school places in Woking

The points discussed and additional questions raised were:-

Question 1 – A further update was given and it was noted that the development in question had a number of outstanding “snagging” items to be completed before the final inspection could be made – the roads therefore, at present, remain unadopted by SCC Highways.

Questions 3 – As Whitmore Lane is to be resurfaced, is this an opportunity to make improvements on the grounds of safety?

Question 5 – It was noted that the criteria for applications – including crime figures were set by central government and this was available on their website

Question 8 – The Officer was thanked for a very comprehensive response. Concerns were raised around schools having different policies for siblings. It was noted that Hoe Valley school was working above capacity and further clarification on this would be sought.

29/20 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 7]

The AHM highlighted the report and welcomed questions from Members. It was noted that the Horsell 20mph scheme was listed at £32,000 but it was believed that this was also subject to additional CIL funding. Councillors were keen that CIL money be used to benefit local communities and that this could include Highway improvements, if appropriate.

The Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- i) Note the progress with schemes and revenue funded works for the 2020/21 financial year.
- ii) Note the budgetary position.
- iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.
- iv) Agree the proposed capital works programme for 2020/21, shown in Table * and as agreed at the informal meeting of the Woking Joint Committee on 10 March 2021.
- v) Agree that authority is delegated to the Area Highways Manager to allocate the £100,000 capital maintenance budget to support the implementation of the capital maintenance programme for 2021/22.
- vi) Authorise the Area Highways Manager to undertake all necessary actions to deliver the capital works programme, consulting with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Divisional Members where necessary.

Reasons for decisions

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

30/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - UPDATE ON DECISIONS FROM THE SUB GROUP AND HOOK HEATH APPLICATION APPROVAL [Item 8]

Councillors noted the Hook Heath CIL application and thanked the residents involved in putting the bid together. It was noted that the process was working well for small applications and that County and Borough Councillors were working together to progress these. Cllr Chrystie stated that this had worked very well for Pryford Cricket club which was a very good example of a community project. Ernest Amaoko was thanked for his input to the sub group.

Working Joint Committee:

- (i) Noted the applications determined by the Sub Group and its decisions to date.
- (ii) Agreed the Hook Heath CIL application for £15,000.

Reasons for decisions:

To keep the Joint Committee informed of the decisions of the Sub Group and the applications to date and to agree the one application that was above the limit of the group.

31/20 DECISION AND ACTION TRACKER [Item 9]

The decision tracker was noted.

It was noted that the taxi rank bays in the town were still listed as outstanding and Councillor Kemp stated that he had been working with Borough Officers around the mix of disabled bays and taxi bays at the station. This would remain on the decision tracker until resolved.

32/20 FORWARD PLAN [Item 10]

The forward plan was noted. Cllrs were keen that the cycling item be discussed in due course.

Government guidance was that meetings should resume to in person meetings, so Officers were working on making this happen safely for the June meeting.

Meeting ended at: 9.00 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A**Woking Joint Committee**
24 March 2021
Open Public Question Time

3 Members of the public registered for the public forum and 6 questions were raised: –

Andy Grimshaw
Carl Thompson
Norman Johns

The members of the public joined the meeting for the first half hour and then left to watch the rest on the webcast.

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 : Andy Grimshaw, Pyrford resident

Footpath Blockage - Over the last year, many people have spent more time at home and walking locally. In Pryford, many landowners have allowed the right to roam, across golf courses etc, but one landowner, the owner of Twisted Stone has installed a fence and kissing gate across a right of way. I have raised this with the Countryside team at Surrey County Council, who have done a site visit, but I have not had a further response from them yet.

Scrap yard – there is a site close to the Twisted Stone, which is within the green belt, which now appears being used as a scrapyard. I have raised this with WBC as it looks like a business within a green site.

Marshall Parade – At this parade of shops there has been lots more parking and this has caused problems. Residents staying at home are using the bays. I have made parking review requests for additional Double Yellow Lines via the parking reviews but these have not been progressed and I wondered if they could they be reviewed again

Grass verges - Delivery lorries and home improvements in Pyrford have caused damage to grass verges within estates around Pryford and I wondered what SCC plans to do to repair and re-instate these.

The chair thanked the resident for raising these issues and highlighted that the Borough Councillor was involved in with the scrap yard issue.

Cllr Liz Bowes spoke about the verge issue – there was SCC Highways planned pavement work on the Lovelace estate and she would get Highways to look at verge repairs – possibly funded from her Councillors allocation.

Cllr Graham Chrystie urged residents to take up verge damage with any contractors that they use and Cllr Gary Elson had already spoken to some contractors / properties on this.

Cllr Liz Bowes referred to the Marshalls Parade issue and asked Mr Grimshaw to provide her with details that she could take this up with the Parking team.

Cllr Graham Chrystie also spoke about the scrapyard on the greenkeepers facility, which had taken WBC 2 years to get sorted, but assured the questioner that the items were due to be removed and they were continuing to monitor the site.

Cllr Gary Elson also assured Mr Grimshaw that the scrapyards usage had been taken up by WBC and was under investigation (with residents providing evidence to the Borough).

The issue of the footpath would be chased up outside the meeting

Question 5: Carl Thompson

I refer to Agenda item 4 and would like to speak on this matter on the agenda.

The Chair agreed to take this with the agenda item.

Question 6: Cllr Will Forster asked a question on behalf of a resident (Ian) of Witch Hill Lane

I would like to raise the issue of the level of traffic using Witch Hill Lane, particularly as a result of town centre developments and diversions. What impact assessments have been carried out as a result of the Victoria Square development?

I would particularly like to raise concerns about the pending Victoria Arch closure and what can be done about traffic diversions for this?

Answer from Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager

With any development there are always formally agreed diversion routes, but it is inevitable that people with local knowledge will diverge off this and they are legally entitled to do this.

We are working with the Borough on this, but I would need to consult with Borough colleagues over specific plans for any potential Victoria Arch closures.