## CABINET MEMBER DECISION

#### Item:

Members' Questions

# (i) Details:

A question was received from Cllr George Potter. The question and response were published within a supplementary agenda.

Cllr Potter thanked the Leader for his response and asked for detail on the timeline for the further design review for Section 1. The Leader stated that he expected a decision to be made before the summer 2024.

#### Item:

**Public Questions** 

## (i) Details:

A question was received from Mr Howard Smith. The question and response were published within a supplementary agenda.

Mr Smith asked whether the Leader, when considering a controversial decision, had ever moved forward with the decision as the benefits outweighed the disbenefits. The Leader said that the council needed to take many difficult decisions and that it was important to consider and balance the evidence available.

A question was received from Mr Doug Clare. The question and response were published within a supplementary agenda.

Mr Clare asked whether the council would follow up on correspondence made in 2020 related to gaining access to the land opposite Guildford High School to allow for additional space for Section 3. The Leader said that he would ask the Land and Property Team to engage with the owners of the land.

#### Decision:

LONDON ROAD GUILDFORD ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR SCHEME

# (i) Details of decision

The Leader of the Council:

- Noted the efforts that have gone into extending the engagement with the local community and stakeholders for the London Road active travel corridor in Guildford and acknowledge the feedback provided on the scheme proposals.
- 2. Proceeded with the construction of Section 2 Boxgrove Roundabout based on the strength of support from the local community, with the detailed design incorporating comments from the community engagement to deliver a scheme that prioritises pedestrians and cyclists.

- 3. Deferred a decision on Section 1 subject to further design review informed by comments received through the engagement to ensure that the scheme considers the needs of all road users, with further consideration to be given by the Leader at a future date.
- 4. In the interim, committed to progressing with the delivery of a controlled crossing near Winterhill Way to assist with safer routes to school, following strong representation from local stakeholders.
- 5. Did not proceed with Section 3 Boxgrove Roundabout to York Road, as there were legitimate concerns raised about the design of this section and there is an existing alternative route through Stoke Park, but instead to progress with the delivery of a more targeted improvement in the form of a zebra crossing on the junction of Nightingale Road and London Road

# (ii) Reasons for decision

- 1. When the engagement exercise for this scheme was launched, there was a commitment to only proceed where there is not substantial opposition to the scheme. After careful consideration of the community feedback on the proposed scheme following a 12-week extensive community engagement, the results indicate that on balance, there was overall support for progressing with section 2 (Boxgrove Roundabout), more mixed views on Section 1 (New Inn Lane to Boxgrove Roundabout), and less overall support to proceed with section 3 (Boxgrove Roundabout to York Road).
- 2. Proceeding with the delivery of the Boxgrove roundabout improvements and considering the improvements to the stretch of road from New Inn Lane to Boxgrove Roundabout will enable key links to be made with existing walking and cycling routes and key local destinations. Enhancing the infrastructure at this location also contributes to the delivery of important policy priorities for the County Council, including the ambitions of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and achieving the county's net zero carbon target by 2050.
- 3. Progressing with the zebra crossing at Nightingale Road reflects that whilst there was less overall support for Section 3 of the proposed corridor, the feedback received during the engagement exercise highlighted the need for improved infrastructure at this location which would further contribute to the provision of safer walking and cycling facilities. There was also positive feedback for a new controlled crossing on London Road, near to the junction with Winterhill Way which again will contribute to safer walking.

#### (iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

None.

# (iv) Details of any consultation and representations received not included in the published report

Cllr Fiona Davidson made a statement at the meeting which included the following points:

- 1. That she was speaking on behalf of the many residents that contacted her.
- 2. Endorsed the recommendation not to proceed with the plans for section 3 of the London Road Boxgrove Roundabout to York Road

- 3. That residents believed that a loss of a lane on York Road would increase existing congestion and queried why no evaluation of the impact on air pollution was undertaken.
- 4. That residents were unsure why 14 road tables were necessary in a section of road 0.8 miles long.
- 5. With 32% of the footway as a shared pedestrian cyclist footway, may people believed that pedestrians would be deterred.
- 6. The loss of parking on Stoke Park was also seen as a negative by those that use the park for sport and leisure.
- 7. That many residents believed that the disadvantages outweighed the active travel advantages
- 8. Many residents were in favour of a 20 mile per hour zone.
- That some residents recognised that making Boxgrove Roundabout easier for pedestrians and cyclists to navigate safely would be beneficial. Many however believe that implementing a Dutch Roundabout would reduce safety.

# **Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted**

(Any conflict of interest declared by any other Cabinet Member consulted in relation to the decision to be recorded and any dispensations granted by the Audit and Governance Committee)

None.

### **Decision taken by:**

(i) Name: Tim Oliver

(ii) Portfolio: Leader Decisions

**Date of Decision**: 27 February 2024

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 28 February 2024

<u>Date decision effective</u> (i.e. 5 working days after date of publication of record of decision unless subject to call-in by the relevant Scrutiny Committee): 7 March 2024