



**Minutes of meeting**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (Surrey Heath)**

**Date:** Thursday 18 October 2012

**Time:** 6.30 PM

**Place:** Ian Goodchild Centre, Knoll Road, Camberley

**Members present:**

**Surrey County Council [4]**

Cllr David Ivison (Heatherside & Parkside)

Cllr Stuart MacLeod (Windlesham, Bagshot & Lightwater)

Cllr Chris Pitt (Frimley Green & Mytchett)

Cllr Lavinia Sealy (Bisley, Chobham and West End)

**Surrey Heath Borough Council [4]**

Cllr Rodney Bates (Old Dean)

Cllr Vivienne Chapman (St Paul's)

Cllr Edward Hawkins (Parkside)

Cllr Valerie White (Bagshot)

All references to items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

The meeting was preceded by an Open Public Question Time. The notes are in **Annex A**.

**40/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from County Councillors Bill Chapman and Denis Fuller and from Borough Councillor Colin Dougan. No Borough substitute Members attended the meeting.

**41/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING – 5 July 2012 [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) held on 5 July 2012 were agreed and signed.

**42/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No pecuniary interests were declared.

**43/12 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No petitions were received.

**44/12 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

Two written public questions were received. A copy of the questions and the responses given are set out in Annex B. It was noted that Bagshot was a village and not a town.

**45/12 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

None were received.

Executive Items for Information

**46/12 SURREY LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY [Item 7]**

Deborah Fox, Strategy and Commissioning Team Manager and Mark Howarth, Drainage Asset Team Leader introduced a report on the Flood Risk Strategy, which had been produced following new legislation to look at all flood issues in one strategy.

It was noted that there were 47 incidents of flooding in Chobham and that Surrey Heath had a high risk for surface flooding.

Members discussed the following points:-

- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stated that developments should make greater use of recycled or “grey” water and therefore the flood strategy could include this for future developments.
- Surrey Heath was not included on the Surrey Partnership Board. In view of local flooding issues and the fact that the Borough Council had a drainage engineer, they should be considered for representation and it was suggested that a representative from Surrey Heath Borough Council should write to Jason Russell to ask for a place on the Board.
- Emphasis should be given to local action groups as local people were often more aware of the issues and their potential solutions. Local groups need action and resources attached to the strategy.

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

- The strategy needed to look at permitted development rights in flood risk areas as ditches could be filled and garages etc built over them.
- Insurance was an issue in flood risk areas and the strategy should suggest ways forward for affected households.
- The strategy did not include potential flood risk from collapse of the Basingstoke canal banks but this would be considered.
- The Strategy does not currently mention the Deepcut development
- The Frimley Fuel Allotments used to have catchment ponds but the Strategy did not consider the effect of their clearance on flood risk?

Members requested a further report at a future meeting from the Borough council setting out the situation in Surrey Heath

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the report.

**47/12 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REPORT 2011/12 (SURREY HEATH) [Item 8]**

Cllr Rodney Bates declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as he worked for Guildford Borough Council Community Safety Team.

Michelle Collins, Community Partnerships West Team Leader, introduced the report together with Sarah Groom, Senior Business and Community Development Officer, Surrey Heath Borough Council. It was noted that Surrey Heath was one of the safest Boroughs with a 10% reduction in crime. Issues to be tackled included drug offences and high risk drinkers.

Members welcomed the report, but it was noted that the report did not mention Neighbourhood Watch schemes. It was suggested that action could be more joined up with what has happened in previous years such as the successful alcohol awareness campaign last year, which included Peer Productions working in schools.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the report.

**Executive Items for Decision**

**48/12 MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING 13 [Item 9]**

Michelle Collins, West Team Leader, introduced the report which set out bids for member allocations. An additional bid for member allocations was tabled at the meeting as it was received too late to include within the agenda report but exceeded the authorised level of delegated powers.

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

An amendment was made to the recommended amount of funding for the Redwood School Campus Playground, which was agreed in the recommendations below.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Agree the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue and capital funding as set out below **(this includes the tabled amendment):-**

**RESURFACING OF REDWOOD CAMPUS SCHOOL  
PLAYGROUND**

Agreed from Member allocation (D Fuller) £2000

Agreed from Pooled Capital £2000

**YOUNG WITNESS SERVICE**

Agreed from Pooled Revenue £2000

**ST MICHAELS CHURCH KITCHEN REFURBISHMENT**

Agreed from Pooled Capital £3000

**CHOBHAM KITCHEN REFURBISHMENT**

Agreed from Member Allocation (L Sealy) £1000

Agreed from Pooled Capital £1499

- (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 (3.1 to 3.8).

**Part B – In Public (voting by County and Borough members on decision items)**

**Executive Items for Decision**

**49/12 RESPONSE TO PETITION TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED PARKING  
RESTRICTIONS ON FRANCE HILL DRIVE [Item 10]**

The response to the petition was noted.

**50/12 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 11]**

Cllr Stuart MacLeod declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item, as he had been professionally involved with a company that contributed towards the S106 funding.

## ***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager, introduced the report which updated the committee on highways schemes within the Borough and set out proposals for use of the 2013/14 ITS budget.

During discussions, the following key points were made:

- Portsmouth Road Toucan crossing – Cllr Hawkins asked to be kept in the loop regarding any objections.
- Members welcomed the proposal for spending next years funding on the Toshiba roundabout, and suggested that if any more funding became available they would like to use it to create a dedicated slip road into the Hospital.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;
- (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 in consultation with the Chairman of this Committee to agree any additional actions that may be required to ensure this budget is fully utilised.
- (iv) Allocate its ITS 2013/14 funding towards the Toshiba Roundabout scheme outlined in Annex 2 to the report subject to the anticipated provision of capital ITS and capital maintenance budgets.

## **51/12 UPPER CHOBHAM ROAD SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT [Item 12]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report. In response to a question regarding why the speed limit reduction was not for the whole of the road, Andrew explained that due to the difference in character between the two parts of the road, the rest of the road would not fit with a reduction in speed limit according to County Policy and would not be supported by the Police.

### **RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to :

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessment undertaken;
- (ii) Authorise the advertisement of a Speed Limit Revocation Order that will have the effect of revoking the existing 40mph speed limit

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

order and introducing a 30mph speed limit (by virtue of the existence of a system of street lighting) to the length of the B311 Upper Chobham Road highlighted in Annex A;

- (iii) Agree that any objections to the revocation of the existing 40mph speed limit and resultant introduction of a 30mph speed limit should be considered and resolved by the Area Team Manager (NW) in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman, and that this issue only be returned to Committee if any objections prove insurmountable
- (iv) Approve that once any objections have been considered and resolved, that the Order be made and the 30mph speed limit introduced.

**52/12 A319 CHERTSEY ROAD CHOBHAM SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT  
[Item 13]**

Andrew Milne introduced the report. Members agreed with the proposal, and Mrs Sealy suggested it would be helpful if the trees were also cut back.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) note the results of the speed limit assessments undertaken.
- (ii) approve the advertising of a Traffic Regulation Order the effect of which will be to introduce a 50mph speed limit over the length of the A319 Chertsey Road from the start of the existing 40mph speed limit (near its junction with Chobham Park Lane) to the Borough Boundary with Runnymede (as shown in Annex 1):
- (iii) approve the revoking of any existing Traffic Orders necessary to implement the above change;
- (iv) approve that any objections to the Traffic Regulation Order should be considered and resolved by the Area Team Manager for Highways in consultation with the Divisional Member and Chairman, and that this issue only be returned to Committee if any objections prove insurmountable;
- (v) approve that once any objections have been considered and resolved, that the Order be made.
- (vi) note that the proposed reduction in speed limit on the section of A319 Chobham Road considered as part of the assessment requires the approval of the Runnymede Local Committee.

**53/12 GUILDFORD ROAD, LIGHTWATER, AMENDMENT TO  
PREVIOUSLY APPROVED WAITING RESTRICTIONS [Item 14]**

David Ivison introduced the report.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (v) Approve the proposal for the removal of the 20 minute limited waiting parking place outside 82 Guildford Road, Lightwater, and its replacement with double yellow lines.
- (vi) Agree that the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 this amendment is advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the Order is made;
- (vii) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and that a decision on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and the relevant County Divisional Councillor.

**Executive Items for Information**

**54/12 FORWARD PLAN [Item 15]**

Cllr Ivison introduced the report for information.

**RESOLVED:**

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the report.

The meeting finished at 8:25 PM.

---

Chairman

**Open Public Question Time**

**1. David Chesneau, Castle Road, Camberley**

I understand from a press release by Atkins, that they have been awarded the contract for cycle routes and improved footpaths. I understand they specialise in large contracts and want assurance that they have the experience to cope with cycle paths. Will they walk around the Town and would there be public consultation on the projects?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

Atkins do deal with large projects and schemes, but are also able to deal with smaller scale contracts and their consultants have the relevant experience.

**2. Glyn Carpenter, Bagshot Ward**

I refer to the potential developments of housing at the Deepcut and DERA sites and I represent concerned residents. We want to have a united voice over traffic congestion and the impact on the A322, especially as the Highways Authority will not allow a further slip road on/off the M3. Would Andrew Milne be able to attend our local meeting to discuss our concerns?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

My Officers and I are happy to attend public evening meetings – If you are able to let us know the nature of the meeting and the proposed agenda then we can send the appropriate Officer along.

**The Chairman** confirmed that he was also able to attend evening meetings if invited.

**3. Murray Rowland**

I raise four questions as follows:-

A Although the Council makes no direct grant to the Citizens Advice Bureau it has provided vital funds for training of advisers. This has been cut completely at a time when benefit changes are about to happen – why?

B The Government are to top slice 20% off Surestart funds – what will Surrey CC do about this?

C There has been a reduction in the number of Breakfast Club attendees (a 50% drop in Surrey) – why?

D Council tax benefit is disappearing – will Surrey CC step in and assist?

**Reply from the Chairman**

To respond in writing



**4. Tim Dodds, Lightwater**

Mr Dodds had received a written response to his question and asked a supplementary question as follows:-

Ditch clearing has commenced along the Red Road and the work to date has been good, but this seems to have stopped. What is happening and when will all the works be completed?

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

Safety engineering colleagues have been working on the Red Road and this work should be completed by the end of the year, with additional vehicle activated signs and chevrons on the road. Ditching has been undertaken by local maintenance engineers and although I cannot update you on the detail here, I am happy to do so later if you contact me.

**5. Phil Stevens, Archaeological Society**

I understand that there are plans for a new service hub at Camberley to include a Library, Adult Education facility and Museum. How far has this progressed and could the Surrey Heath Archaeological Society be included in these plans?

**Reply from the Chairman**

The hub is a glint in the eye of SCC and SHBC who are looking to develop this area and the idea is to relocate several services into a single building in this general area. This is just an idea at present and will need to be funded – there is nothing definite as yet.

**Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC**

The plans for the Town Centre Development include land to the East of Knoll Road and it would make sense to have a hub of local services in this location. The SHBC offices now also house Police and Adult Services and the integration of services in this area is a long term plan.

**6. Nick Donnington, Bagshot**

I refer to the Leeds Study of Road Safety Accidents and the costs of this (which are around £1.5 million per fatality). Does Surrey County Council have a policy and criteria for looking at accident hotspots and how many accidents / fatalities does it take for action to be taken? The Lightwater Road, A30 and Bagshot High Street need to be looked at.

**Reply from the Chairman**

Every location has different problems. The County Council are well aware of each incident locally and these are factors which are taken into consideration, together with information from the Police and the Highways Agency. Surrey County Council does its best, within the budget. The worst location currently within Surrey Heath is the Red Road and actions are being taken there. Bagshot High Street is now a 20mph limit, but unless this is enforced, it is ineffective. Breaking of speed limits is a national problem. The Police do their best but cannot patrol this one area 24/7.

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

The Surrey Heath local committee make recommendations, but they are not always listened to (Members wanted a 40mph limit on the Red Road but have had to accept a 50mph limit).

**Reply from Andrew Milne, Highways Area Manager (NW)**

All personal injury accidents are important and foremost in people's minds when prioritising. Accident numbers are considered but the Council does have a set amount of funds and do the best we can.

**Reply from Lavinia Sealy, SCC**

Lightwater Bypass is another local area that has had serious accidents and this is also high on our priority list.

**Reply from Valerie White, SHBC**

We are pleased that there is now a 20mph limit in Bagshot, but this really needs more signage.

**7. Cyril Pavey, Camberley resident**

What proposals does Surrey County Council have to remedy the traffic issues at Southall Park Road with people doing U turns and using this as a short cut?

**Reply from the Chairman**

I would ask you what can be done, and would welcome your suggestions on this issue. We could return Southall Park Road to a main street and not a subsidiary road and we could introduce differential charging to encourage more use of the Atrium rather than the Southall Car Park?

**Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC**

The car park charges are set at £1.60 per hour vs £1.50 per hour currently for these two car parks. SHBC are looking at a different entrance and improvements to the multi storey car park to avoid backlogs from the car park to the road, together with refurbishment too.

**8. Sarah Taylor, Bagshot resident**

I am concerned about congestion and speeding off A30 towards Station Road Box junction. Where the traffic lights are placed, traffic cannot get in or out. Parking along the road also causes jams and issues.

**Reply from Stuart MacLeod, SCC**

There is a meeting next week to look at traffic issues in Bagshot. The box junction is on our strategic list for a longer term solution. We might want double yellow lines on the road to stop parking.

**9. Mick Sheerhan, Lightwater**

The Red Road has always been an accident hotspot due to the shape of the road. There have been two accidents where the drivers knew the road very well. The straightening of roads will just cost money and move the problem elsewhere – drivers need to be more responsible.

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

I would like to know what is happening regarding developments locally. I understand that we will be building 6 Towns the size of Bracknell in the South East. How do the public know about these plans?

**Reply from Vivienne Chapman, SHBC**

The Surrey Heath Local Plan designates areas for development. Central Government give us housing allocations that we need to include in our local plan.

**Reply from Stuart MacLeod, SCC**

There have been 7 fatalities on the Red Road since 2002. We do need a revision of the road – but it is becoming safer.

**10. Ruth Hutchinson**

The Lighwater safety barriers were 4<sup>th</sup> on the list, I understand they are now number 29.

**Reply from Lavinia Sealy, SCC**

I will take this up outside the meeting.

**Written Public Questions [Item 5]**

**Q. Written question from Mr. Tim Dodds, Borough Councillor for Lightwater, on the Red Road, Nr Camberley – taken as two parts of the same question.**

"I've submitted a report to the local committee previously about the missing traffic warning signs on the S bends on Red Road. Pleasingly, some have been replaced, only to be subsequently demolished in a serious traffic accident. There are now four missing signs. Both are double directional warning signs. When will these signs be replaced?"

"I understand that the Surrey Heath Road Safety Working Group have plans to improve driver awareness of the hazards on Red Road [B311]. Can you please provide an update as to what is being planned and when the plans will be implemented."

**Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

An order has been raised to replace the missing chevrons, and it is intended that these are installed at the same time as additional safety works forming part of the Safety Engineer scheme for Red Road that will be completed by the end of this financial year.

This scheme includes the implementation of a speed limit reduction to 50mph, and the introduction of additional Vehicle Activated Signs and a further chevron facing Westbound.

**Q. Written question from Mr and Mrs Flower, 50 High Street, Bagshot.**

"We refer to an incident when our property, Anchor House, 50 High Street, Bagshot was badly damaged when an articulated lorry ran into the roof in January of this year. We are unsure if the road width complies with regulations, particularly at the pinch point outside No.71 High Street, and whether it is considered an appropriate width for HGV's bearing in mind the roof lines, narrow footpath and parking bay widths, and would like to ask what will be done to prevent this happening in the future? (including short term works, removal of parking bays, longer term solutions to properly address and remove the health and safety problems, timescales and clarification of whether the road widths are considered appropriate)"

**Response from Chairman on behalf of the Committee:**

In the incident in January 2012, the overhang of the property at 50 High Street was struck by a lorry. No personal injury occurred as a result of this collision and the damage was limited to the property and the vehicle.

Since this incident, there has been ongoing dialogue between Surrey Highways and the property owners. One of the short term measures

***DRAFT MINUTES to be formally agreed at the next meeting***

suggested was to encourage the property owner to highlight the section of property overhanging the highway with a high visibility marker to discourage any further collisions. It is not known whether this action has been carried out.

In addition to this, a number of different options have been explored by Surrey Highways, including placing bollards on the footway outside of this property, amendments to the present parking arrangements in the High Street, reversing the one way system and pedestrianisation. However all of these options impact upon other residents and highway users and must be considered in a wider context.

A meeting has been arranged between Mr Flower, Surrey Highways and representatives of the local community to discuss these issues further at Anchor House. This meeting will take place on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

It should also be noted that Surrey Health Local Committee have allocated funding for a feasibility study for improvements to Bagshot Town Centre and this and other local issues will also be considered as part of this project.

As many of the potential solutions to this issue are longer term, in the short term, Surrey Highways have organised the design of a sign to be placed at the entrance of the one way system to warn drivers of the overhanging property. An order has been placed for this and it is anticipated that it will be erected on site within the next three months.

There is presently no ban on HGVs using High Street, Bagshot and were one to be introduced, this would not prohibit the use of the High Street by HGVs for local deliveries. There are many situations where historic road layouts have difficulty accommodating large modern vehicles, but there is no legal minimum road width as legislation presently stands.

This page is intentionally left blank