

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
 held at 6.00 pm on 25 June 2014
 at Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking GU21
 6YL.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Liz Bowes (Chairman)
- Mr Ben Carasco
- * Mr Will Forster
- * Mrs Linda Kemeny
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mr Colin Kemp
- * Mr Richard Wilson

Borough / District Members:

- Cllr Graham Chrystie
- * Cllr Gary Elson
- * Cllr Beryl Hunwicks
- * Cllr Tina Liddington
- * Cllr Liam Lyons
- * Cllr John Kingsbury (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr Mazaffar Ali

* In attendance

15/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Graham Chrystie and Mr Ben Carasco.

16/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the Woking Local Committee meeting held on 5 March 2014 were agreed and signed.

17/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Richard Wilson declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 16.

18/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]**Petition A: Pathway from Horsell Park to Brewery Road**

In accordance with Standing Order 14.1, Mr Colin Kemp presented this petition on behalf of local residents. The petition contained 225 signatures, and was worded as follows:

ITEM 2

We petition the SCC local committee to take action to repair and make safe the top of the pathway leading from Horsell Park to Brewery Road.

In particular we want:

- Resurfacing including both the potholed path and the unmade-up muddy section.
- Lighting to provide safety at night.

Mr Kemp showed some photographs of the pathway. It was noted that this path is very well used with over 1,000 people and 100 wheeled vehicles using it each day. The last section of the path is narrow, lined with white posts and unlit, and many people in Horsell would like this addressed.

As local Member, Mr Kemp noted that the path in some areas is less than the 5 foot stated in the response. He has instigated an investigation into ownership of the land and will work with local residents to take this forward.

Members noted that the footpath was a key arterial route into Woking, and is key to helping to promote the health and wellbeing by encouraging people to walk and cycle into the town.

Petition B: Speeding on Arnold Road

In accordance with Standing Order 14.1, Mr Osborne presented this petition on behalf of local residents. The petition contained 83 signatures, and was worded as follows:

I want the Council to consult with residents to address speeding issues on Arnold Road which have developed as a result of Sheerwater Access Road works.

Possible solutions proposed by residents include:

- Installation of speed humps on Arnold Road
- The installation of a no left turn for all traffic approaching from Sheerwater
- Closure of Arnold Road to through traffic
- 20MPH speed sign on approach to Arnold Road

Petitioners acknowledged the improvements that the Sheerwater Access Road had given to Arnold Road, but it had caused local speeding. The road is now being used as a cut through to avoid the traffic lights, and residents fear that this will increase once the new ASDA is opened, and the Sheerwater proposals are implemented. The speed survey that was commissioned was carried out at the wrong location and during half term. Residents would like something to be done to address the issue.

Mr Fishwick responded to the petition and it was agreed that officers would carry out a further speed survey in the New Year once ASDA has opened, and would liaise with residents over the positioning of the speeding loops and the timing of the survey. A report would be brought back to a future meeting of the Joint Committee with appropriate recommendations.

Petition C: 20MPH Speed Limit on White Rose Lane

In accordance with Standing Order 14.1, Mr Kelly presented this petition on behalf of local residents. The petition contained 41 signatures, and was worded as follows:

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to urgently implement a 20mph speed limit on the most dangerous section of White Rose Lane.

Mr Kelly explained that residents are concerned about White Rose Lane being dangerous as there is no pavement at the end. They recognise that it would be too expensive to put one in, but would like the Committee to consider implementing a 20MPH speed limit along the road.

Mr Milne introduced the response and explained the process for prioritising requests. The first step would be to carry out a speed assessment. Mrs Bowes agreed to use some of her Community Enhancement monies to expedite the survey. The survey would be completed, with residents involved in agreeing the locations, and then a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the committee on the findings, and any recommended next steps.

19/14 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Two 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 1: Mr Simmons questioned paragraph 2 of the response and asked for it to be amended as there is an overhanging branch from a private property which affects the light distribution. The Chairman asked for further details to be sent to officers regarding the correspondence Mr Simmons has had with Skanska. Cllr Hunwicks and Mr Kemp agreed to work with Mr Simmons to establish ownership of the relevant tree and seek to resolve the issue.

Question 2: Mrs Barker asked for further details about compensation. Mr Kemp explained that this was an ongoing issue that he was involved with so could not provide an answer at the moment, but he was trying to look after the interests of the residents in any outcome.

20/14 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No written Member questions were received.

21/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 7]

Andrew Milne introduced the Highways Update report.

Member comments:

- Mr Milne explained that the intention is to tie resurfacing and ITS works up where possible, including Pembroke Road and Blackhorse Road, but noted that this is not always possible if timing does not allow.
- Mr Milne noted that to try to keep works disruption to a minimum, the timing of works takes into account local residents, commuters etc. Works

ITEM 2

are published in advance, letters sent to local residents, website is updated and advance warning signs are put out. Other communication streams including social media, are also being looked at. Need to make sure they are all giving a consistent message. Councillors commented that they were happy to help get the message to those that are harder to reach.

- Mr Milne explained the permit system for streetworks, whereby anyone carrying works out on the highway needs to apply for a permit and book space. Notice is then given to utilities for them to carry out any works before resurfacing takes place, following which they are not allowed to do any planned works for the next two years.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

22/14 WOKING TOWN CENTRE MANAGEMENT [Item 8]

Geoff McManus introduced the report which updated the committee on the Woking Town Centre Management Agreement.

Public comments:

- Regarding signage for the Town Centre cycling prohibition it was noted that DfT agreement is being sought for the signage, and enforcement along Commercial Way would not take place until the works have been completed. To date there have been no accidents reported. A further update will be brought to the March 2015 committee.

Member comments:

- Mr McManus noted that an update on the A Boards would be included within the report due to come to committee in March 2015. It was agreed that the Public Realm Usage Policy would be circulated to Members for comment.
- Mr McManus explained that the Town Centre had a deep cleansing regime, as well as Serco dealing with the litter. Any queries regarding this should be directed to Mr McManus.

The recommendations in the report confirm the priorities and work programme to enhance the Town Centre street scene with a review scheduled for the beginning of the new financial year.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (iv) the proposed timeline of actions within this report are endorsed.
- (v) a further update at the end of the financial year 2014/15 be received.

23/14 AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA - ANCHOR HILL, WOKING [Item 9]

Geoff McManus introduced the report on air quality in Knaphill. Minor works to the junction will be undertaken with a view to reducing the emissions of NO₂ to below the national standards. When this is achieved, the AQMA would be able to be revoked.

Public comments:

Mr McManus apologised if there had been a lack of public consultation. When an Air Quality Management Area is identified, local residents are written too. Mr McManus is happy to meet with Knaphill Residents Association if it would be helpful.

Member comments:

The Chairman proposed an additional recommendation (ii), which was seconded by Cllr Kingsbury and agreed by the committee. The further assessment will look at the change in levels once the work has been carried out.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- i) Minor works to the Anchor Hill road junction are to be undertaken (Option 1) with the aim of improving air quality
- ii) A further assessment of nitrogen dioxide levels to take place 6 months after option 1 has been introduced is required and will be reported back to this Joint Committee

24/14 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND [Item 10]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report which updated members on the Local Sustainable Transport Fund.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee is agreed to:

- (i) Note the Annual Report for the 2013/14 financial year.
- (ii) Note the draft programme for the 2014/15 financial year.
- (iii) Note the Sheerwater and Maybury community funding update

**25/14 YOUTH PROVISION IN WOKING - ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
2013/14 AND FUTURE JOINT WORKING [Item 11]**

Jeremy Crouch, Sue Barham and Jeff Papworth introduced the report which set out the annual performance review of youth provision in Woking and future joint working.

On Page 75 it was noted that there is no Skills Centre in Woking as one is not required due to the good work that is already being done.

It was proposed that the draft Integrated Youth Strategy would be presented to Members in September, before going out to consultation, with the final strategy being agreed by the Joint Committee in December, which is in line with the timetable for recommissioning.

Member comments:

- The Chairman proposed an additional recommendation (iv), which was seconded by Mr Kemp and agreed by the committee, to help ensure that the youth centres are fit for purpose.
- All three centres are delivering well, and as expected, there is regional variation. Match provision has been a challenge, but work is ongoing to improve this.
- The Cabin is going well and they are due to expand to a third evening. There could be an opportunity for additional provision at Trinity Studios targeting a different group with Surrey Youth Focus.
- Work is ongoing in Sheerwater to further engage with the community and get them more involved. Work is also being done with the school.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed:

- (i) To note the Annual Performance Reports for Services for Young People, as well as WBC activity taking place during 2013/14
- (ii) To note planned activity by all partners for 2014/15
- (iii) To endorse the approach being taken to the development of an Integrated Youth Strategy, with the cost of any required consultancy support (up to the value of £5k) being met from WBC's youth service budget.
- (iv) To request that Property Services comment on the repair status and how fit for purpose the premises of Lakers, Sheerwater and Woking Youth Centre are and report back to the Youth Task Group as soon as possible.

26/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL RE-COMMISSIONING FOR 2015 - 2020 [Item 12]

Jeremy Crouch introduced the report. The paper outlined plans to build on the successes of Services for Young People and proposed greater integration and working together for the commissioning of the Local Prevention Framework, Centre Based Youth Work alongside the contracts for youth work in youth centres currently let by Woking Borough Council, and potentially other more integrated commissioning with partners such as Public Health, Surrey Police and Active Surrey.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework.
- (ii) Agree that local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Woking Joint Committee informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group.

27/14 JOINT COMMITTEE SUB-COMMITTEES AND TASK GROUPS [Item 13]

Sarah Goodman introduced the report which set out the terms of reference and membership of the Sub-Committees and Task Groups of the Joint Committee. An amendment was made to the terms of reference of the Community Safety Sub-Committee - the membership was changed to: Four members including at least one County Councillor and one Borough Councillor.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed:

- (i) The terms of reference for the following (as set out in Annex 1):
 - a. Health and Wellbeing Sub Committee
 - b. Community Safety Sub Committee (as amended)
 - c. Parking Task Group
 - d. Youth Task Group
 - e. LSTF and Future Transport Planning Task Group
- (ii) The County Councillor and Borough Councillor appointments to the following:
 - a. Health and Wellbeing Sub Committee (2 County and 2 Borough)
 - Liz Bowes (C)
 - Colin Kemp (C)
 - Beryl Hunwicks (B)
 - Tina Liddington (B)

ITEM 2

- b. Community Safety Sub Committee (4 members including at least one Borough Councillor and one County Councillor)
 - Beryl Hunwicks (B)
 - Liam Lyons (B)
 - John Kingsbury (B)
 - Will Forster (C)
- c. Parking Task Group (2 County and 2 Borough plus Chairman and Vice Chairman)
 - Richard Wilson (C)
 - Colin Kemp (C)
 - Gary Elson (B)
 - Liam Lyons (B)
 - Liz Bowes
 - John Kingsbury
- d. Youth Task Group (2 County and 2 Borough)
 - Linda Kemeny (C)
 - Colin Kemp (C)
 - Derek McCrum (B)
 - Graham Chrystie (B)
- e. LSTF and Future Transport Planning Task Group (2 County and 2 Borough plus Chairman and Leader of Borough Council)
 - Richard Wilson (C)
 - Saj Hussain (C)
 - Mazaffar Ali (B)
 - Will Forster (B)
 - Liz Bowes
 - John Kingsbury

28/14 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 14]

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee:

- (i) Noted and commented on the forward programme contained in this report, with the addition of the following items:
 - September – Draft Integrated Youth Strategy
Update on Operation Horizon
 - December – Review of Ride 100
Approval of Integrated Youth Strategy

29/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 15]

RESOLVED that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the

following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

PART TWO – IN PRIVATE

The following items of business were considered in private by the Joint Committee. Set out below is a public summary of the decisions taken.

30/14 SCHOOL PLACES IN WOKING (1) [Item 16]

Mr Wilson, Mr Kemp, Mr Forster and Mr Hussain all declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item

Kieran Holliday and Ray Morgan introduced the report which looked to agree an approach to securing school places.

RESOLVED (by a vote of 11 in favour and 1 abstention)

Woking Joint Committee agreed the recommendations as set out in the Part 2 report.

31/14 SCHOOL PLACES IN WOKING (2) [Item 17]

Mr Wilson, Mr Kemp, Mr Forster, Mr Hussain and Mr Spinks all declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item

Kieran Holliday and Ray Morgan introduced the report which looked to agree an approach to securing school places.

RESOLVED (by a vote of 8 in favour and 4 abstentions)

Woking Joint Committee agreed the recommendations as set out in the Part 2 report.

32/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 18]

The information considered in Part 2 of the meeting should not be made available to the press and public.

Meeting ended at: 9.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Notes from open public questions**Question 1: Mr Alan Grant, West Byfleet**

The residents and rate payers of Woodlands Road and Berkeley Gardens, West Byfleet want to be included in the 2014 Surrey County Council CPZ review, for implementation in 2015 to the West Byfleet CPZ scheme.

Richard Wilson advised that he had a site meeting on 22 May where it was agreed that a proposal to introduce double yellow lines on the junction of Woodlands Road and Old Woking Road would be put to the Joint Committee. It was further agreed that the request to extend the West Byfleet CPZ to include Woodlands Road and Berkeley Gardens would not be progressed at this time.

Question 2: Mr Ian Makowski

When the same question on parking in West Byfleet was asked in October 2013, it was noted that yellow lines would be done by end of financial year. This has not been done.

Liz Bowes asked for the minutes of the appropriate meeting be sent to Mr Makowski, and said that we would honour what was agreed at the meeting.

Question 3: Mr Stubbs, Knaphill Resident's Association

Woking Central Bus Station is no longer fit for purpose – what action will be taken to get one that is fit for purpose?

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

Question 4: Mr Tony Metcalf

There are no signs for the parking restrictions in Onslow Crescent, but good signage in Park Road. Please could you clarify why?

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

Question 5: Mrs Anne-Marie Barker

Would like an update on the 'Horsell splash' outside Brewery Road car park – both the drainage and the dip in the road.

Mr Kemp noted that CCTV was carried out and a blockage was found. Thames Water is looking into it. A written response would be given to the second part of the question.

ITEM 2

Question 6: Mrs Marshall

Will any parts of the A322 in Woking be resurfaced?

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

Question 7: Mrs Farrant

Following a petition signed by Byfleet residents last month requesting the re-establishment of medical facilities in Byfleet, would the Chairman of the Joint Committee please write to both the Chairman of Surrey County Council's Health & Wellbeing Board and the Chairman of the NW Surrey Clinical Commissioning Group, asking that urgent consideration be given to this request and that a Health Centre and/or a GP practice be established in Byfleet at the earliest opportunity.

Cllr Kingsbury agreed to channel the request to the SCC Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing.



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 25 JUNE 2014

SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: WOKING

1. Question from Mr Simmons

Please advise progress on the subject raised on the last "Local Committee (Woking)" on the 5th of March 2014 "Item 5 Section 3 on the first new lamp post in Wheatsheaf Close from the Chobham Road regarding shading due to tree foliage.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Following this matter being raised in the Woking Local Committee meeting held in March 2014, a review of vegetation in the vicinity of lamp columns was carried out by the Community Highways Officer. As a result of this, some trimming of vegetation has been arranged around column No.3.

However, as column No. 1 was clear of vegetation at the time of this inspection, no works are proposed in this vicinity.

As was explained in the previous response, it is not possible to secure perfect lighting distribution from every lamp column on the public highway, and a balance must be struck between providing adequate lighting levels and maintaining the character of the area.

2. Question from Mrs Ann-Marie Barker

Much disturbance and inconvenience has been caused to residents of Well Lane, Horsell and neighbouring roads by recent resurfacing works (still to be completed). Can Surrey County Council tell me:

i) Why it considered an experimental method of dealing with the old road surface, whereby it was to be recycled on site requiring heavy machinery and noise, suitable for a key road in a heavily populated residential area.

ii) What controls are in place to ensure that contracted out highways work and the myriad of sub-contractors that involves, work within licenced conditions (I had to phone highways out of hours service on 2 occasions to get late night work stopped - the second time after officers had told the contractor there was to be no night

working).

ii) What redress is there to be for residents and businesses who suffered over many weeks. The trade of businesses in the road, particularly the fish and chip shop has suffered.

ii) Residents will not have the same dreadful experience when other Horsell roads including Arthur's Bridge Road, Church Hill, High Street and Thornash Road are resurfaced.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

- i. The recycling design choice for Well Lane was necessary due to the structure of the road, predominantly consisting of coal tar, (a product used historically, that has to be treated/ disposed of differently to normal road construction material). Disposing of this material is particularly cost prohibitive, and as such is one of the main reasons why resurfacing roads constructed with this material have had to be deferred over the past decade. Surrey County Council are looking at innovative solutions to reduce these costs and deliver major resurfacing (not just pot hole repairs), that will provide long lasting benefit to the area.

In situ recycling is an industry proven method that has been used successfully on many schemes outside of the county for many years, and is the best value engineering solution for treating this material. It provides excellent savings and environmental benefits (reducing waste to landfill) for these sites.

There were unique local ground conditions that presented themselves on Well Lane that did cause issues. Such issues/ risks occur so rarely that the level of resources necessary to undertake the site testing, to pre-empt a possible problem, would not be viable for every scheme. It would add months onto the design process on something that may only happen in 1 in 100 or more. This would in turn reduce the amount of schemes we complete county wide considerably.

There were two main issues at Well Lane. The first was a weak cast water main that is at a depth of approximately 1m, and fractured in several places when the existing surface course was removed. The largest delay on the site has been associated with a sewer failure/ collapse, which was 3m deep and not identified until the existing surface layers had been removed. Thames Water have since been working on site for several weeks to rectify an historical issue and have now completed works.

The recycling works were suspended during these Thames Water works, but the final surfacing is due to take place on the evening of Friday 27th June (Weather permitting).

- ii. In regards to the start of the works on Well Lane there were definite teething issues with the contractor on the first 2 days and these were immediately rectified, however the longer lasting disruption is due to site conditions not contractor quality.

The night works described was the lowering of man hole covers, this operation needed to be carried out as close to the main works as possible,

and was delayed due to works elsewhere. Consequently the sub contractors operatives carrying out the work decided to work on to catch up without approval, and as soon as this was discovered the situation was resolved. We must apologise for this, even though it was carried out with the best intention of those involved.

- iii. We have been in discussion with the local councillor and Woking Borough Council in regards to an appropriate compensation process for this scheme, and we will action as necessary.
- iv. As a Highway Authority we are continually seeking to improve our service for both value for money and public service. This scheme has highlighted areas where we will seek to improve, including how we deliver local communications and programme our works to deliver the least amount of disruption to residents.

We again apologise to both residents and business for any disruption this scheme construction has caused. However, hopefully the £300,000 investment in Well Lane to improve not just the road surface, but underlying drainage system, replacing leaking water pipes and delivery of an updated traffic calming scheme which will provide lasting benefit to the wider community.

This page is intentionally left blank