



Minutes of the Local Committee (Woking)
Meeting held at 6.00pm on 26 September 2012
at
Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square,
Woking GU21 6YL

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mrs Liz Bowes (Pyrford) - Chairman

Mr Will Forster (Woking South)

Mrs Linda Kemeny (St Johns and Brookwood)

Mr Geoff Marlow (The Byfleets)

Mrs Diana Smith (Knaphill)

Woking Borough Council

Cllr John Kingsbury (St Johns and Hook Heath) – Vice Chairman

Cllr Mazaffar Ali (Maybury and Sheerwater)

Cllr Bryan Cross (Goldsworth East)

Cllr Kevin Davis (Brookwood)

Cllr Tina Liddington (Hermitage and Knaphill South)

Cllr Derek McCrum (Kingfield and Westfield)

Cllr Richard Wilson (West Byfleet)

The meeting was preceded by a public engagement session. The notes of this session are set out in Annex 1 of these minutes.

Part One – In Public

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

37/12 Apologies for absence [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Mohammed Amin, Mr Ben Carasco and Cllr Tony Branagan. Cllr Mazaffar Ali substituted for Cllr Branagan.

38/12 Minutes of the last meeting held on 6 September 2012 [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting of the local committee (Woking) held on 6 September 2012 were agreed and signed.

39/12 Declarations of interests [Item 3]

No disclosable pecuniary interests were declared..

40/12 Petitions [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mr Tony Noel presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. This petition received 56 signatures:

“There are two major issues:

1. Car parking on the junction of Morton Road, Meadway Drive and The Ridgeway, and along the corner of Morton Road at the Junction with Morton Close.

2. Speeding along Morton Road and Meadway Drive.

The corner between Meadway Drive and Morton Road at the junction with The Ridgeway is the major danger zone. It is a 90 degree turn with limited visibility. The advisory road sign ‘School’ is sited 30m from the junction in Meadway Drive. However, cars are regularly parked during school hours along that stretch of road forcing single line traffic around the blind corner. The inevitable accident occurred on 11 June when two cars collided head-on, on the single carriageway open to traffic. Visibility was the major factor, coupled with the shock of meeting another car head on with no room to manoeuvre.

In the short term it is imperative that arrangements are put in place to allow the passage of two lines of traffic around that corner at all times.

One possible cheap easy solution would be to ban parking by placing double yellow lines along both sides of Meadway Drive from the traffic sign to the junction, 30 meters approx, and to extend the yellow hatching to the end of Morton Road North side. This simple measure would keep the junction clear of parked cars.

Although it always used to be part of the Road Traffic Act that parking on a corner was an offence it has never been enforced in this locality, and yellow paint would serve to focus attention.

The impact of this restriction would be to reduce parking by 5/7 places, which in the absence of any additional parking spaces being provided would displace this need elsewhere. Possibly there is ground in the School premises which could be used.

Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

An aggravating factor with safety implications is the loose gravel which frequently covers the road surface on the corner; it is washed down from The Ridgeway. The Highways Authority should consider some means of ameliorating this nuisance, which also causes drain blockages in Morton Road.

The second dangerous area of limited visibility is on the corner of Morton Road and Morton Close where parking is frequently on both sides of the road creating again a single carriageway. No accident has occurred here to our knowledge yet, but head-on meetings are commonplace.

Speed

There is a long history of high speed in both roads, with four wheel drifts as cars take the corner as fast as possible. The fence opposite has been damaged four times by cars losing control, in one instance four panels were destroyed as a guy was on his way home from The Plough; possibly speed was not the only factor! In another instance the guy made the corner but ploughed into a heap of ballast on the road near No 65 which stopped him.

We, the local residents Neighbourhood Watch group, and other locals, would ask the Committee to consider a 20 mph speed limit for Morton Road and Meadway Drive, and if possible for The Ridgeway (a private road). Although the road is private the adjoining footpath is maintain by SCC and work to replace the post protecting pedestrians has recently been completed.

There are three schools in the immediate vicinity; Woking High School, Horsell C of E Middle School and St Andrews; in excess of 2000 children with parents, many of whom walk or cycle to or from school. The safety implications are obvious.

There are doubtless other issues the Highways Authority might consider but the priority is to make the corner safe for vehicles and pedestrians, especially school children.

In summary the residents would like the Committee to demand action by the Highways Authority to improving safety in the environment of Woking High School, and to consider the imposition of a 20mph speed limit on Morton Road and Meadway Drive.”

Mr Noel introduced the petition and explained that approximately 2000 children use this junction. Cars park on both sides of the road, which effectively makes it a single lane road with limited visibility. Woking High school has responded positively to the petition and has asked parents not to park on the junction. Parents responded for the first couple of weeks, but parking issues have started to return. The Ridgeway is an un adopted road and debris from this road can cause localised flooding.

Members were supportive of the petition and would like to see a travel plan for the school when considering the petition.

Andrew Milne welcomed the petition and agreed to investigate it and bring a full response to the next meeting.

Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

Mr Forster requested a parking review within the next six months.

41/12 Written Public Questions [Item 5]

Will Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item based on the fact that he is a member of Woking Borough Council.

Five written public questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 2 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

Question 2: Mrs Marshall asked a supplementary question about the highways licence, and the fact that the public don't know what will be done and cannot do anything about it. Cllr Kingsbury agreed to raise the issue about the process within the Borough Council.

Question 3: Mr Hipkins asked why after two and a half years and £220k the crossing was broadly the same as it was previously. Andrew Milne explained that the signals had been replaced, the crossing had been made wider and there was new ducting under the road. It is recognised that it did take a long time – part of the reason for this was that the aspiration for the crossing proved impossible to deliver. The question would be forwarded to the relevant officer outside the meeting to see if there was anything further to add.

Question 4: Mr Thomas asked a supplementary question - when the original planning application was made SCC had an objection on highways grounds which was removed by limiting the numbers. Why now are there no objections? It was agreed to respond to this outside the meeting.

Question 5: Cllr Barker asked whether there are lessons to be learnt about frequency and scale of maintenance and chippings. In response Andrew Milne explained that after resurfacing, loose stone is swept, but some can go down the gullies. The service work with Woking Borough Council to keep the highways gullies running freely.

42/12 Written Members' Questions [Item 6]

Three member questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 3 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

Question 1: Diana Smith asked whether the expected levels of activity have been met. In response Jeremy Crouch explained that the contract performance is judged at the end of the year. The team have monthly meetings with the providers to discuss performance and the provider has good plans in place and will be on target for the end of the year.

Executive Items

43/12 Local Prevention Commissioning 2012/13 [Item 7]

Michelle Collins advised the committee on procurement standing orders and conflicts of interest in relation to this item.

Jeremy Crouch introduced the report and explained the reasons for the recommendation to extend the contract and explained that the provider had good plans in place to achieve its targets.

Officers have a monthly meeting with the provider, and the minutes of these meetings will be sent to Youth Task Group members. Task Group members requested a meeting with the provider to enable them to get a better feel of what is happening, and Jeremy agreed to facilitate this. An update on skill centres was also requested – this would be provided outside the meeting.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- a) Extend the Local Prevention contract for five months to 31 August 2013
- b) Extend the remit of the Youth Task Group to constitute up until the first Local Committee of the municipal year
- c) Delegate the ability to appoint Members to the Task Group to the Assistant Director for Young People in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee to replace any members who are no longer Councillors as a result of the elections.

44/12 Traffic Regulation Orders Amendments for Development-related highway works associated with Barratt Development on land at Guildford Road, Woking [Item 8]

This item was withdrawn because owing to advances in technology the car club bay can now be located within the site of the development, as originally planned, and therefore does not need to be on street. The county council was only made aware of this after the report had been written.

45/12 St John's Hill Road Bridge Update [Item 9]

Zena Curry introduced the report and noted that the committee first received a report on the bridge in October 2005. She went on to explain the reasons behind the proposed permanent scheme set out in the report as a result of reviewing the risk scoring at this site with Network Rail. This suggested removing long term temporary traffic signals and barriers and installing new bollards and reverting to the un-signalled priority system that was at this site before the temporary traffic lights were installed. This was brought as an item to note to the Committee.

Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

Cllr Kingsbury did not agree with the scheme set out in the report. This site was one of the earliest to have Rail Vehicle Incursion scoring following from the Selby Rail Disaster. At this time, the bridge was ranked as the third highest risk of vehicle incursion in Surrey and members were told that traffic lights must be installed, against public opinion. Now the public are expected to accept that there has been a change and the traffic lights are no longer required as a result of this recent review. It was suggested that the committee might like to refer the matter to the Cabinet member to look at the scheme.

Mrs Kemeny was also disappointed with the report. Bollards and permanent traffic lights have always been promised at the site, and she considers that these are still required due to the visibility around the bend and the speed of the vehicles. Cllr Liddington agreed with this.

Members did not agree with the proposals in the report. However, as the report was for information, as the decision was under the remit of the officers and not the Local Committee, the Chairman agreed to write to the Cabinet Member to see what could be done. Officers agreed to take comments back and work with members, and bring a further report to a future local committee meeting.

RESOLVED:

Did not agree to note the report. Agreed that the Chairman write to the Cabinet Member asking him to look into the scheme, and requested a further officer report at the next meeting.

46/12 Highways Update [Item 10]

Andrew Milne introduced the report and explained the contingency plans for any 2012/13 ITS underspend.

Members raised the following questions, which will be responded to outside the meeting:

- Members would like an update on the resurfacing of Lockfield Drive.
- When the pavement opposite Sythwood School was widened, no markings were put down?
- What is the alternative funding source for on street parking?
- Mrs Kemeny would like an update on a meeting held back in June with Knaphill Residents Association and councillors on the A322.

RESOLVED:

The local committee:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;

Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

- (ii) Note that a further Highways update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iii) Agree the proposed contingency plans for ITS capital funding, and authorise the NW Area Team Manager together with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee to agree any additional actions that may be required to ensure this budget is fully utilised.

47/12 Egley Road – Speed Limit Assessment [Item 11]

The specifics of the speed limit change were added to recommendation ii for clarification.

Andrew Milne introduced the report and explained that the physical measures required to help reduce speed would be depend on driver behaviour after the crossing has been installed.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessments
- (ii) Agree that based upon the evidence the speed limit along Egley Road between Wych Hill Lane and just south of the laybys south of Almond Avenue should be changed to 30mph, where necessary, to meet the current policy, and give authority to advertise a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes subject to no objections being maintained the Order be made
- (iii) Agree that the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals

48/12 Blackhorse Road – Speed Limit Assessment [Item 12]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which recommended that the speed limit should remain unchanged. It was explained that this is a rural road, and people will not abide to a 30mph speed limit unless physical measures are put in place. The report explained that speed has not been a factor in the accidents at the junction.

The Chairman drew members attention to paragraph 7.2 and proposed to refer the decision to the Cabinet member.

The Local Committee did not agree with the recommendations that the speed limit should remain unchanged, but thought that it should be changed to 30mph. The reasons for this are as follows:

- Members believe that there have been a number of serious accidents, and may have been more fatalities than set out in the report.

Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

- A petition was presented to this committee a few years ago signed by nearly 1000 people, and residents views need to be taken into account.
- Speeding is an issue along sections of the road and Members believe more could be done to address this.

As this was against officer recommendations, the decision will be referred to the Cabinet Member for decision.

Mr Forster proposed an additional recommendation (iii), which was seconded by Cllr Kingsbury and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessments undertaken.
- (ii) Did not agree with officer recommendation (ii) and agreed to refer the decision to the Cabinet Member for reconsideration.
- (iii) In future, consider the Blackhorse Road, Heath House Road and Saunders Lane crossroads for safety improvements under its Integrated Transport Scheme programme.

49/12 Lower Guildford Road/Hermitage Road – Speed Limit Assessment [Item 13]

The specifics of the speed limit change were added to recommendation ii for clarification.

Andrew Milne introduced the report which recommended a reduction in the speed limit along sections of this road to 30mph.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessments undertaken.
- (ii) To agree that based upon the evidence the speed limits along the D3605 Lower Guildford Road (between Northwood Avenue to Hermitage Road) and the A324 Hermitage Road (between Elmgrove Close to Blackhorse Road) should be changed to 30mph, where necessary, to meet the current policy, and gives authority to advertise a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes subject to no objections being maintained the Order be made
- (iii) The Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

50/12 Martyr's Lane Junction with Woodham Lane – 7.5T Weight Limit and Prohibition of Right Turn [Item 14]

Andrew Milne introduced this report which recommended a scheme to prevent the through movement of HGVs and prohibiting the right hand turn to help eliminate hazardous movements at the Martyrs Lane junction with Woodham Lane.

Andrew Milne had met Mr Carasco on site, and he was supportive of the scheme.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which will be to implement the proposed 7.5 Tonne weight limit over Martyr's Lane, between the Household Recycling Centre and its junction with A245 Woodham Lane and also to prohibit the right turn from Martyr's Lane into Woodham Lane, and subject to no objections being upheld, the Order be made.
- (ii) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local Divisional Member, to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

51/12 Woking Town Centre Management Agreement [Item 15]

Will Forster declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item based on the fact that he is a member of Woking Borough Council.

Geoff McManus from Woking Borough Council introduced the report and explained that the target start date was April 2013 with a phased approach. It was noted that the final design for Commercial Way was still to be agreed.

The detail of the Steering Group is still being worked up, and would be put in place once the report has been agreed by the Woking Borough Council Executive. It was suggested that the Commercial Way Task Group could be used as a starting point.

Mr Forster proposed an addition to the end of recommendation (iii) – 'whilst Woking Borough Council continue to ring fence its future on street parking account surplus'. This was seconded by Mrs Smith.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) Support continued joint working between the SCC and WBC
- (ii) Endorse the principal of a "Town Centre Management Agreement (TCMA)" between WBC and SCC
- (iii) Agree that 40% of any future on-street parking account surplus devolved to this committee, is ring fenced to support the agreement whilst Woking Borough Council continue to ring fence its future on street parking account surplus.
- (iv) Endorse Woking Borough Council's public realm improvements and support Officers from the County and Borough in working together to ensure all necessary procedures are put in place to enable construction of the Commercial Way improvements from early 2013.

52/12 Members Allocations [Item 16]

Michelle Collins introduced the report, and noted one amendment to Annex 1 where Liz Bowes and Wills Forster's names had been transposed. Members were encouraged to get bid forms completed in time for the December Local Committee meeting.

RESOLVED:

The local committee agreed to:

- (i) The items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue and capital funding as set out in paragraph 2 of this report as set out below:
 - 1) Display screen for Woking Library - £4000
 - 2) Dads Dancing - £350
 - 3) Knaphill Christmas Lights - £1100
 - 4) Woking Community Action Fund - £5000
- (ii) Note the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in paragraph 3.

53/12 Forward Programme [Item 17]

Noted as in the report with the addition of pupil premium and review of secondary school places, as well as St John's Hill Road Bridge, and Woking Surface Water Management Plan.

Chairman

[The meeting ended at 9.25pm]

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

1. Open Public Question Session [Public Engagement Item 1]

Question 1: Mr Thomas

What action has been taken on Lock Lane following previous questions to Local Committee?

Andrew Milne agreed to ask Chris Higgs to contact Mr Thomas directly outside of the meeting. The Chairman also asked Andrew to speak with the Legal Department over this issue.

Question 2: Cllr Lyons

Would like an update on CPZ review changes agreed a year ago, particularly Lampeter Close.

Geoff McManus advised that the Borough is discussing a number of works with Surrey, and the Lampeter Close bay is part of the programme which will be put forward. A possible solution, which Cllr Lyons welcomed, was the suspension of the parking bay, but this would only be effective during CPZ hours. A full answer would be provided as part of the full programme shortly.

Question 3: Anthony Saunders

What quality checking does SCC do after utilities works?

Andrew Milne explained that standards are set in national guidelines. SCC has a Streetworks Team that spot audit works undertaken. If works are substandard, then it will be addressed by the utility company. Work is guaranteed for a two year period.

Question 4: Mr Chapples

There was planning consideration on an application on Parvis Road 10-15 years ago for a bench to be provided. Is that still the situation, if so, when will the bench be erected?

Andrew Milne explained that the matter rests with the planning authority, and will give Mr Chapples contact details to follow this up outside the meeting.

Question 5: Cllr Morales

The road layout at Rydens Way is being reviewed and a safety audit is being carried out on the new road. Will the proposed changes take into account the issues raised in the safety audit last July and the legally binding statement of common ground that the running lane would be 5.5m along its length, and can assurance be given that these will be kept in the new s278 when it is agreed?

The Chairman said that a written response would be provided outside the meeting.

2. Report on Surrey County Council Trading Standards Service
[Public Engagement Item 3]

Tanya Griffiths introduced the report and explained current local initiatives. It was agreed that the contact details for Consumer Direct would be circulated to members by email outside of the meeting.

Members welcomed the comprehensive report and thanked officers for attending.

3. Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy [Public Engagement Item 2]

Deborah Fox introduced the report and promoted the start of the consultation on the strategy.

The following responses were given to questions raised:

- There are various provisions in the new legislation but the sewage authorities cannot be forced to do anything.
- There is no extra funding for retrofitting, but there are simple measures that house owners could take.
- The Surface Water Management Plan will be brought back to members at an appropriate time.
- Deborah will circulate a list of local contacts to councillors on the committee so they can update them for the consultation.
- Deborah to look in to flood risk associated with the Basingstoke Canal.
- Deborah to check with officers that the non-return valve in the River Wey by Sopworth Drive is still working.

The Chairman thanked officers for the report and looked forward to welcoming them to a private meeting in the future.

4. Response Update on the Delivery of the Olympic Programme in Surrey [Public Engagement Item 4]

Surriya introduced the report and explained that the team are still going through the debrief. Surriya thanked partners, including officers and members at Woking Borough Council for their help and support during the Games.

Members are keen for the cycle marathon on 4 August 2013 to come through Woking, and also the Tour of Britain. Surriya agreed to take this away and report back to members at a future date.

The Chairman and members of the committee expressed their thanks to Surriya and the rest of the 2012 Team for a wonderful success this summer.

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**26 SEPTEMBER 2012****1. Question from Mrs Skinner**

I have been a resident of Dean Close, Pyrford since 1978 and I am aware that there has been a serious deterioration in the quality of the road surface over the years. I cannot remember that it has ever been re-surfaced although occasionally attempts have been made to remedy some pot holes, resulting in a most unsatisfactory patch-work effect.

I would be most grateful if you would consider making a personal inspection and backing my request that this road is added to the County Council's list of roads that need urgent attention – preferably near the top. I realise that unless residents inform the relevant body of such matters, it will be oblivious to the problem and its urgency.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Dean Close is not presently listed on our main resurfacing programme. However, the Maintenance Engineer, Christopher Higgs, has inspected Dean Close, and agrees that although there are no safety defects present, the surface has deteriorated and would benefit from resurfacing work. It is proposed that this site is added to the localised structural repair contingency list shown as Annex 1 to the Highways Update report.

It must be emphasised that there is no guarantee that this site will be resurfaced this financial year, and that the resurfacing of Dean Close may be dependant upon decisions taken by Woking Local Committee for the 2013-14 financial year.

2. Question from Mrs Marshall

Why don't applicants for planning permission whose development would affect the highway pavement and road (including crossings etc.) have to include with the application an up to date detailed plan of the area affected, and also an up to date report on the implications of what they are proposing. The application should not be granted unless this is done, so the safety of the general public can be considered. A condition that a highways licence is required is too vague and people commenting on the application are not able to make constructive comments or put in information that the Councils do not have to hand (with another department perhaps). If another planning application comes up in the vicinity of the application site, how could you comment unless the plans are available?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The question should be asked of the local planning authority for the following reasons. The local planning authority for Woking borough for all developments - excluding minerals, waste and county development such as to state-run schools - is Woking Borough Council. The county council in its role as the local highway authority is a statutory consultee to the planning process, not the planning authority itself.

Consequently, the county council typically has no direct involvement over the information, which is or is not included in submissions by developer and that the local planning authority registers as planning applications. When consulted by the local planning authority on a particular planning application, the county council will decide as part of its assessment of transport matters whether the information provided - be that drawings, forms, reports, etc - is sufficient. If insufficient for the county council to make a reasonable assessment of transport matters, including highway safety, the transport response made back to the local planning authority will indicate the deficiency and usually a suggestion about how to correct the problem.

Similarly, county council typically has no direct involvement over what information the local planning authority publicises, stores or makes available to the public.

The county council's transport response to the local planning authority on a particular planning application will often suggest planning conditions and informatives, be included on any planning permission granted and suggest the wording of them. However, conditions and informatives are not the same things. Planning conditions are part of the permission, which regulate specific aspects of the development and can be enforceable by the local planning authority. Informatives are listed on planning permission just to give developers information and consequently are not things that can be enforced by the local planning authority. The county council's transport response to the local planning authority will often include a planning informative that a highway licence is necessary post-planning to enable construction of the works on the public highway, such as building a vehicular access over a footway. The local planning authority should be contacted for further information about the difference between conditions and informatives.

The majority of the question is for the attention of the local planning authority. I have however fully set out the county council's statutory consultee role in the planning process.

3. Question from Mr Hipkins

Regarding the pedestrian and cycle crossing on Victoria Way:

1. Why was there a delay of two-and-a-half years between starting the feasibility study and completion of the project?
2. Why did the feasibility study not show that the proposed separate cycle crossing was unsuitable? From my observation of the works, that seems to have become evident only after the construction had begun.

3. What proportion of the cost was wasted?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

One of the aspirations of the Cycle Woking project was to improve the crossing facilities for both pedestrians and cyclists (including disabled people) over the A320 Victoria Way.

One new toucan crossing and one converted pelican crossing were installed to the south of the Victoria Arch under a section 278 agreement with developers.

The original crossing from Market Square to Goldsworth Road was converted to a toucan crossing and so was the facility in Cawsey Way.

The crossing near the Civic Offices and Lightbox provided a different challenge, as the carriageway width was considerably wider than at the other locations around the A320 Victoria Way. The original intention was to provide a separate crossing for cyclists and keep the original pelican crossing (with upgrades) for pedestrians, but even this would be 'pushing' the boundaries of design. However, similar treatments with separate pedestrian and cycle crossings had been installed at a few sites across the country.

Feasibility work commenced in August 2009 and from this work, it indicated that the scheme would work. However, signal equipment must go through rigorous testing in the factory and at this stage, it was realised that the scheme could not work as a separate facility and the decision was made to widen the crossing and convert to a toucan, together with upgrading the original equipment.

The scheme was completed on the ground in March 2012 at a total cost of £219,787, including upgraded signal equipment, cabling, controller equipment, resurfacing, improved drainage and new ducting.

Other than small schemes, it is generally normal practice, for financial reasons, to carry out feasibility study work in one financial year and construction in another financial year.

The estimated difference in costs between the original planned scheme and what was constructed was about 10%.

The crossing provides connectivity between the Basingstoke Canal towpath and the Horsell area of Woking with the town centre and railway station. From surveys undertaken number of pedestrians' have increased by 89% (based on counts on the towpath at the town centre site) and between 75 and 213% for cyclists (based on various points along the towpath). The majority of these trips use the crossing located on Victoria Way near the Civic Offices, together with additional trips created by the improvements made under the Cycle Woking project.

In summary

The original crossing was considered unsuitable for these or future increased movements and was not legal for cycles. It was the intention to create a segregated cycle crossing adjacent to the original crossing. However, the technical aspects of the traffic signal systems would not allow pedestrian and cycle crossings to run across such a wide road as we had intended. Therefore, a widened crossing and converted to a toucan from a pelican was the most appropriate solution to accommodate the increasing pedestrians and cyclists using this facility.

The facility was Safety Audited during April 2012 and was fully functional before the bridge closure works commenced.

4. Question from Mr Thomas

When the Marist school applied re the redevelopment of the schools highways had major concerns which were withdrawn when the developer agreed to highways suggestion that the site should be limited to 330 pupils , this was agreed

The developer has asked for this limitation to be increased to 420 30% increase, SCC highways were consulted and raised no concerns, WHY?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The county council has reviewed the responses it made on transport matters to planning application reference PLAN/2003/1070, for the full redevelopment of the Marist School, which was then built. The 2003 application was for a replacement school to cater for the existing student roll. Consequently, it is unlikely that there would have been any major or in-principle highways concerns about the redevelopment.

The documents available for PLAN/2003/1070 indicate that a county council application response questioned whether it was possible to limit pupil numbers, which prior to the 2003 application do not appear to have been restricted. We cannot trace further how this question resulted in planning condition 20 being applied to the planning permission, which capped pupil numbers to 330. Nonetheless, the inclusion of the condition has provided the useful opportunity to review the school's transport situation, as the circumstances have changed from what was intended in 2003.

In deciding about the acceptability of the changed school roll, the county council has considered the transport consequences against current planning and transport policies. The outcome is set out in the county council's response to the recent planning application reference PLAN/2012/0406, which requests that the school travel plan be reviewed and updated for the expanded school roll.

Further information can be found in the documents available via the local planning authority for planning applications PLAN/2003/1070 and PLAN/2012/0406.

5. Question from Cllr Ann-Marie Barker

There are a number of roads in my area that suffer from notable flooding after heavy rain. This can be caused by drains blocking but in recent times seems to be an after effect of resurfacing works. I have raised this issue with officers and I believe some investigative work has been done but I would like an update on:

- when flooding on Brewery Road and Arthur's Bridge Road is expected to be remedied

- whether there are issues with the contractor resurfacing roads and flooding after resurfacing has been noted in other areas

- if so what is being done to put this right in future

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Surrey Highways are aware that there have been past issues with flooding in both Brewery Road and Arthurs Bridge Road. However, routine maintenance has since been carried out, and observations at both these locations following the recent heavy rains did not show any evidence of an existing flooding issue. The Community Highway Officer will continue to monitor these sites and will arrange further routine maintenance as appropriate should this become necessary.

**MEMBER QUESTIONS
26 SEPTEMBER 2012**

1. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

i) To what extent have levels of activity in Lakers Youth Centre, Sheerwater Youth Centre, and Woking Youth Centre:

a) been those expected following the contract with the Surrey Youth Consortium to supply services since the 1st of April 2012?

b) been complemented by other uses of these centres to the benefit of young people?

ii) What is the current situation with regard to the Woking Youth Arts Centre in Knaphill?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

i) The level of activity in all centres has increased in the last month and there are plans in place to increase this further across all three centres. This includes both youth work delivered through the contract and other users of the centre. There have been a number of different issues associated with each of the centres since the beginning of the contracts. These have been acknowledged, plans have been drawn and are now in place which will resolve these issues.

ii) Negotiations are taking place regarding the use of Woking Youth Arts Centre. Due to commercial sensitivity, these negotiations are not able to be discussed in a public forum.

2. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

When will further details of the pilot 'bus hub' at the Vyne in Knaphill approved in the Local Committee meeting of 6th September be made available to myself and 'key stakeholders', and what form will consultation take?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Key point to make is that our original concept ideas of a 'bus stop hub' have now been scaled back from the LSTF bid document, and what has previously and recently been communicated. This has partly been necessary due to planning and delivery timescales, but also due to our intention to trial the idea of dedicated bus/cycle interchange and understand usage/demand before progressing anything larger. The term 'bus stop hub' is therefore now slightly misleading, as the key objective of our current plans are to provide bus/cycle interchange facilities at bus stops in the bid towns. This will include cycle parking facilities at bus shelters in

Annex 3 Draft to be agreed on 5 December 2012

suitable locations. The specification and facilities (such as additional CCTV, enhanced information and accessibility improvements) at the bus stops are currently being considered, along with survey and design work to identify suitable locations. The existing stops at/nearby The Vyne Health centre are included as possible sites to progress this, along with other suitable stops along key Woking (and Guildford) corridors. This is work in progress. With the emphasis on bus/cycle interchange, we intend to work with local cycle groups, and bus operators (already in progress) to assist with identifying suitable sites and facilities. However, local members will be informed about these locations when they are identified and agreed with the above groups.

Regarding further consultation - it seems the 'hub' idea has generated a lot of interest (and possible concern). And as the original 'hub' concept is now scaled back to a more simple 'larger bus stop shelter/cycle interchange facility' I'm not sure any additional formal consultation is necessary, as this has already been covered through earlier LSTF consultation exercises. We are though of course expecting to engage further with relevant stakeholders as plans are progressed, and specific locations are identified.

3 Question from Cllr Derek McCrum, Woking Borough Council

Why is the Woking Youth Centre in Walton Road only open one evening a week?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

In order to run youth provision that is well resourced, attractive to young people and well supervised within the current constraints, it has been necessary to focus provision on one night. There is a forward plan in place to open a second night of youth work within the next month. The process for recruiting more staff is underway which will enable Woking YMCA to open further youth work sessions as and when suitable staff can be recruited.