

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking JOINT COMMITTEE
 held at 6.00 pm on 3 December 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

55/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mr Ben Carasco.

56/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2014 and the special meeting held on 22 October 2014 were agreed and signed.

57/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Cllr Tina Liddington declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 13.

58/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]

No petitions were received for this meeting.

59/14 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

One public question was received and tabled. A copy of the question and answer can be found in annex 1 of these minutes. The supplementary question and response is recorded below:

On behalf of the resident, Mr Hussain asked whether another survey could be carried out as a number of new businesses, including a nursery, have moved to the area since the last survey was undertaken.

In response it was noted that a survey could be carried out but it would not be recommended due to the low footfall and high cost of the scheme. Andrew Milne agreed to check whether there had been any personal injury accidents at the site and report to members outside the meeting.

60/14 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

One member question was received and tabled and is set out in annex 2 of these minutes. The supplementary question and response is set out below:

Mr Forster asked whether it would be possible to install a crash barrier under Victoria Arch to protect the bridge.

In response it was noted that it would be the responsibility of Network Rail to install a crash barrier, but the project team would also be made aware of the issue to see if any action could be taken.

61/14 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14 [Item 7]

Paul Kenny and Steve Dean introduced the report which updated the committee on the major strands of activity being taken within Woking by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service teams based at Woking Fire Station.

Paul Kenny highlighted the increase in safeguarding referrals, which had come about as a result of increased partnership working and training.

Member comments:

Members welcomed the report and made the following comments:

- Safe Drive Stay Alive has a profound impact on young people and is very much supported by members.
- Youth Groups are welcome to contact Woking Fire Station directly to see how Surrey Fire and Rescue Service could link in locally, for example through Life Cut events, visits to the Fire Station etc.
- In relation to the new Fire Station, it was noted that it will be future proofed to cope with potential future demand. The training area would be larger, and there would be capacity for additional vehicles to be stored there. However, it was noted that there are not currently any plans to increase the number of appliances based in Woking.
- Members noted that the fatality occurred just outside the Woking area in Surrey Heath. The report would be updated to reflect this.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Recognise the achievements of the borough teams within Woking Borough and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Woking Borough safer through the delivery of the borough/station plan
- (ii) Note the targets and initiatives set within the Woking Borough plan for 2014/15 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan

62/14 COMMON CLOSE PETITION RESPONSE [Item 8]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which set out the response to a petition received on 24 September 2014 asking for a reduction in the speed limit on the A3046 Chobham Road.

This length of road has been included in a package of speed limit assessments that will form part of the Joint Committee's ITS work programme during the 2015/16 financial year. The speed limit will be assessed with a view to reducing it if appropriate. A scheme for enhanced signing along this length of Chobham Road has been ordered and should be in place before the end of the calendar year.

Member comments:

Members asked for reassurance that the enhanced signage would be in place shortly.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to note the report.

63/14 WHITE ROSE LANE PETITION RESPONSE [Item 9]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which set out the response to a petition received on 25 June 2014 asking for a 20 mph speed limit to be introduced on White Rose Lane.

Speed surveys were carried out in White Rose Lane at locations agreed with the petitioners. The recorded speed data indicates that there is good compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit but that speeds are too high to allow a signed-only 20mph limit to be introduced. Committee noted that budgets would be identified in the next financial year to allow the reconstruction of the existing speed cushions and the provision of enhanced signing.

Public comments:

- Residents of White Rose Lane were disappointed with the response and requested a lower speed limit to protect pedestrians due to the lack of a footpath. The majority of people do not walk down the road due to the danger which would explain the lack of casualties.

ITEM 2

- Residents again requested a 20 mph speed limit and noted that the road is surrounded by three schools.

Officers had carried out a site visit. It was explained that 20 mph signage without additional traffic calming would not change driver behaviour, and could create the impression for pedestrians that it is safer than it actually is. The current traffic calming measures support a 30 mph speed limit, and would need to be redesigned and reconstructed if a 20 mph speed limit was to be implemented.

Member comments:

- Members noted the concerns of the residents. Officers noted that there was no space along the road for a footpath.
- The existing traffic calming features along the road have sunk, and are due to be renewed next financial year.
- Officers noted it would not be responsible to introduce an inappropriate speed limit as drivers would not respect it. As part of the policy, Surrey County Council has a duty to consult with the Police, and they would not support the introduction of an inappropriate speed limit.
- Members raised questions regarding the Surrey Policy for 20 mph speed limits. Countywide policies are put in place for consistency, but sites are visited so each site is assessed individually. Resources are limited so need to be allocated to areas with the most pressing need. When looking at sites, the needs of all highway users have to be considered not just those living there.
- Members would welcome further discussion around the 20 mph Speed Limit Policy and requested this to be added to the agenda for a future informal meeting of the Joint Committee.
- Liz Bowes agreed to look to use some of her Community Enhancement fund for 2015/16 to fund a Vehicle Activated Sign for White Rose Lane if this would be of benefit.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee noted the report.

64/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 10]

Andrew Milne introduced the report which updated the committee on highways schemes within the borough and set out for approval the highways programme for 2015/16.

Member comments:

- Clarification regarding when the work on Lych Way would be carried out, and from which budget was requested outside the meeting.
- Members requested that the measures set out as a result of the Horsell Junior School petition be added to the prioritised list. Officers suggested that it would be unlikely to score high enough on the list to be funded during 2015/16.
- Mr Hussain asked for confirmation outside the meeting as to when the jetter would be in his division.

- In response to comments, Andrew Milne noted that although the proposed works list was weighted on the east of the borough, this is where works are currently needed most and would balance out across the borough over the course of a few years.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2014/15 financial year
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure
- (iii) Agree the proposed capital works programme for 2015/16
- (iv) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

65/14 LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND (WOKING AREA) [Item 11]

Paul Fishwick introduced the report which set out an update on the LSTF capital programme as well as proposals for bus clearways and Business Travel Forum applications.

The following changes to annex A were noted:

- Audio on bus has been delayed until after April 2015.
- Real Time Passenger Information – the upgraded works to the core system have been completed. This will go live when all the schedule data files have been uploaded and checked.
- Mercia Place media screens – the four screens have been installed and are operational.
- A318 Barnes Wallis Drive/Oyster Lane and A3046 Chobham Road – works due to commence early January 2015

Member comments:

- Confirmation on the number of people included within the Business Travel survey in 2013 would be provided outside the meeting.
- Concerns were raised over the Business Travel Forum proposals for the pool bike scheme and the wet weather cycling and walking clothing due to concerns that funding these schemes was not good use of public money.
- In order to achieve a full spend on the Business Forum budget by end March 2015, it was proposed by Will Forster and seconded by Liz Bowes that approval for the remaining funding was delegated to the Area Highways Manager in consultation members on the LSTF Task Group. A proposal for new bike racks outside the Tesco on Guildford Road was put forward as a suggestion to be considered.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

ITEM 2

- (i) To note the LSTF (Woking) capital programme for the remainder of 2014/15 (annex A)
- (ii) Approve bus stop clearways for bus stops on two further LSTF quality bus corridors: the Mayford/Westfield and Sheerwater/Byfleet corridors as indicated in annexes B1, B2, B3 and B4
- (iii) Approve the following projects for 2014 from the existing LSTF Business Engagement budget (annex C) as set out below:
 - b. Cycle maintenance stations (£8,000)
 - c. Dr Bike and mobile maintenance classes (£3,000)

Woking Joint Committee did not agree to approve the following projects for 2014 from the existing LSTF Business Engagement budget (annex C) as set out below:

- a. Pool bike scheme (£12,000)
 - d. Wet weather cycle and walking clothing (£3,600)
- (iv) To delegate authority to the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Members of the LSTF Task Group and the Project Manager to approve remaining spend from the LSTF Business Engagement budget, and report this spend back to a future meeting of Woking Joint Committee.

66/14 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS [Item 12]

Jeni Jackson introduced the report which set out the governance arrangements for the Community Infrastructure Levy in Woking. It was noted that following the deferral of this item from the last meeting, the membership of the Infrastructure Working Group has been amended to include one county councillor and one borough councillor.

Member comments:

The Chairman requested a report on S106 at a future informal meeting of the Joint Committee.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed:

- (i) the terms of reference for the Member/Officer Infrastructure Working Group;
- (ii) to appoint Cllr John Kingsbury (Borough Councillor) and Mr Will Forster (County Councillor) (one councillor from each main political party) to the Infrastructure Working Group;
- (iii) that the Infrastructure Working Group will make recommendations to the Joint Committee in future about how monies collected using the Levy will be spent in accordance with the published Regulation 123 list;

- (iv) that the Infrastructure Working Group will utilise the infrastructure prioritisation criteria set out within the report; and
- (v) that the neighbourhood portion will be given further consideration post 2016 changes to the Ward boundaries.

67/14 INTEGRATED YOUTH STRATEGY [Item 13]

Jeremy Crouch and Sue Barham introduced the report which set out the priorities of the Integrated Youth Strategy for approval. The priorities have been developed, taking into account local data and after consultation with practitioners and young people.

Member comments:

- Members welcomed the report and thanked officers for the work on the strategy.
- In order to enable young people to attend any future discussions at the Joint Committee, members requested that the youth item is considered early on in the agenda.
- A request was made for officers to see whether any further support could be provided to the Cabin in Knaphill.
- The Youth Task Group can decide on the local priorities and the allocation of resources around the borough, and would welcome additional views being fed in. A request was made for the needs in Pyrford to be mapped.
- Repairs to Walton Road Youth Centre are planned to take place before March.
- Woking Youth Arts Centre will be delivering music workshops, but there is additional availability for the building which will be discussed at the Task Group.
- Three groups are currently using YPOD, but there is still additional capacity during the day.
- The use of the Pavilion at Woking Park was discussed.

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed:

- (i) To approve the priorities of the Integrated Youth Strategy

68/14 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 14]

RESOLVED

Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the forward programme contained in this report with the addition of a report in June 2015 on plans for Ride 100, with a further potential report looking at how the event went in September or December 2015.

Meeting ended at: 8.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 DECEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: WOKING

1. Question from Littlewick Common Residents Association

Can a safer crossing be provided on the Littlewick Road between Littlewick Common and the Goldsworth Park estate?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

A similar request was the subject of a petition received in 2007. The report to Committee advised that a zebra crossing would be inappropriate due to the road speed, there was insufficient road width to accommodate a pedestrian island, and that the only deliverable option would be a signalised crossing at an estimated cost of £120k. However, pedestrian usage was found to be exceptionally low (8 people per day) and on that basis the cost of such a facility could not be justified.

Pedestrian signage at the location will be reviewed.

This page is intentionally left blank



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 3 DECEMBER 2014
SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS
DIVISION: WOKING

1. Question from Mr Will Forster, Surrey County Council

Large vehicles regularly get stuck under the Victoria Arch railway bridge on the A320 which causes delay to rail and road users, the latest incident was on 5th November.

Please will the Borough and County Councils as part of their work to construct cycle and pedestrian tunnels either side of the Arch, also consider lowering the road resurface to reduce these regular delays to benefit rail and road users in the long term?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The project team looking at the pedestrian and cycle tunnel project at Victoria Arch is considering the road layout under the main arch, including levels, as part of the existing project proposals. Any proposals that are put forward will be done in consultation with the Highway Authority. However, initial investigations to date have highlighted that it is unlikely that any significant change in level under the arch can be achieved without major changes to the highway layout south of the arch due to the gradients required. The scale of these alterations would be outside of the scope of the project and cover land not owned by either Surrey County Council or Woking Borough Council.

This page is intentionally left blank