

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 7.00 pm on 22 June 2016
 at Council Chamber, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead,
 Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr W D Barker OBE
- Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- * Mr Graham Ellwood
- Mr David Goodwin
- Mr George Johnson
- Mrs Marsha Moseley
- * Mrs Pauline Searle
- * Mr Keith Taylor (Chairman)
- * Mrs Fiona White
- Mr Keith Witham

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Matt Furniss (Vice-Chairman)
- Cllr Nigel Manning
- Cllr David Bilbe
- * Cllr Julia McShane
- Cllr Tony Phillips
- * Cllr Tony Rooth
- Cllr David Wright
- * Cllr Illman
- * Cllr Reeve
- * Cllr Sarti

* In attendance

143/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Councillors: Keith Witham, Mark Brett-Warburton, David Bilbe, Marsha Moseley, Nigel Manning, George Johnson and David Goodwin

144/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

145/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

146/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

ITEM 2

The Community Partnership and Committee Officer (CPCO) made the meeting aware that the 'Informal Question' session and the first part of the Committee would be filmed using Periscope a social media tool to encourage public engagement. People wishing to watch the film could download the Periscope 'App'.

The Chairman welcomed the new Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee Councillor Matt Furniss and stated that this was resuming normal circumstances with a borough member as the Vice-Chairman. He also thanked Councillor Mark Brett-Warburton for providing a transitional period as Vice-Chairman for the last year.

The Chairman informed Members that Jo Long, CPCO would be going on maternity leave after the 8 July and wished her well, David Hall CPCO would be covering this role from August and Michelle Collins Community Partnerships Team Leader West could be contacted in the interim.

147/16 PETITIONS [Item 5]

Two new petitions were received.

The Committee received a petition on **improving the safety of the traffic lights on York Road outside Waitrose in Guildford** signed by 103 residents, agreeing with the statement:

Motorists exiting Waitrose car park turning right up York Road are being confused by seeing red traffic lights at the pedestrian crossing. They stop, then sometimes realise their mistake and drive through late, by which time a green man is displayed. Crossing is used extensively by primary school children. Suggested improvements: 1) add right filter light on opposite side of York Road to Waitrose 2) add a sensor to hold the pedestrian light on green when there are many people crossing.

Calum Shaw made the below points and suggestions to the Committee:

Confusion to motorists:

1. Traffic stops going up/down York Road
2. Traffic released from Waitrose, and turning right going up York Road about 20% of the time (in a 20 minute observation) the first car will stop at the lights (A/B/C) thinking it's red to stop them at the pedestrian crossing despite there being no stop line
3. Next car behind sits across the junction
4. Pedestrians start crossing as Traffic on York Road going down is released
5. Car across junction may realise it's in the way and goes around the incorrectly stopped car and goes through the lights

I have three reports (from Bethany Halliday, Ashley Harrison Stapledon, Claire Rogerson) of near misses where parents with children have been crossing when this exact situation has happened.

Adding long tubes to the lights and covering one of the lights has not solved the problem.

The pedestrian crossing is overloaded during two 20 minute periods each day when children are going to/from Sandfield primary school. This means that traffic is being released going up York Road while pedestrians are still crossing. The green man is lit for only 4 seconds. This was specified in design to be 5 seconds, but in any case this is too short during peak periods.

Suggestions

1. change the phasing of the pedestrian crossing so that they cross before Waitrose traffic released (though there will still be confusion and thus danger)
2. add a new light opposite the Waitrose exit to indicate that Waitrose traffic can proceed
3. add a box junction (though that doesn't necessarily stop the cars dithering)
4. remove the light at A for traffic going up York Road
5. allow crossing of pedestrians for a longer for 20 minute period at 8.30am and 3.15pm, or add a sensor to hold the pedestrian lights on green

The Committee **NOTED** the response of the Highways Manager Surrey County Council attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**. The Highways Manager noted the suggestions made by the petitioner and would pass these onto the Signals team.

The Member Question from Councillor Caroline Reeves was taken at this point as it related to the petition (see Item 7 Member Written Questions).

The Committee received a petition on **Improving Road Safety on Burpham Lane** signed by 155 residents, agreeing with the statement:

As residents, including the Burpham Community Association, we would like to ask the Local Committee to take action to improve road safety on Burpham Lane: to lower the speed limit to 20mph and to introduce additional traffic calming measures. We are asking the Committee to commission an assessment of the feasibility of a lower speed limit (20mph) via the local highways team. It was suggested by Mr. Duncan Knox, Road Safety Team Manager at Surrey CC, that the highways team could order some pneumatic tube surveys to collect data which could be used for this assessment.

George Harris who was presenting the petition on behalf of Joanna Chwatow also asked when the investigation would take place and when would the Transportation Task group meet to look at the issue.

The Chairman informed the petitioner that the Transportation Task Group (TTG) would be meeting on 17 October 2016 to consider Highway issues that have been brought to its attention thorough petitions etc, and they already had a long list. The TTG uses a Highways Prioritisation Framework to evaluate highways issues and will then make recommendations to the 13 December 2016 Local Committee. Any Highways Schemes agreed would be delivered in 2017/18. Mr Harris informed Members that Burpham Community Association could possibly assist with costs of a scheme.

ITEM 2

The Committee **NOTED** the response of the Highways Manager Surrey County Council attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**.

Action: Highways Manager to provide the results of the survey of this area to Councillor Ellwood.

Councillor Ellwood asked whether another survey could be done of this area to see if speeds differed from the first survey.

148/16 PETITION RESPONSE: [Item 5a]

The Chairman updated Members that the **Flexford Gap Petition** had been postponed until 20 September 2016 Local Committee for further investigation by the Surrey County Council Legal team.

The Committee had received a petition on **West Clandon – Stop HGVs travelling through the village** signed by 125 residents, at the previous Local Committee on 23 March 2016 agreeing with the statement:

We the undersigned request that you stop HGV 's travelling through West Clandon village and mounting the pavement to pass each other. That a restriction of 20mphs is put in place through The Street & Clandon Road and by the Primary School.

The Committee **NOTED** the response of the Highways Manager Surrey County Council attached to the minutes as **Appendix A**. The Highways Manager informed Members that officers are dealing with the Parish Council's concerns about this issue, a Highways officer had had attended a parish council meeting on this subject and the parish councillors were happy with the approach being taken.

149/16 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

One formal public question was received from David Fullbrook (Pete Webb speaking) (this was taken under Item 10 Guildford On-Street Parking Review – Proposals for Burpham Area and 'Ad-Hoc' Locations) regarding: a **Traffic Regulation Order for Barton Place**:

We would like to ask the Committee how can a TRO be placed on an area (accepted as private) that neither SCC nor GBC can prove has been adopted as publicly maintainable highway by due legal process and if implemented what legal standing would parking restrictions have in such a case? This is the case with the access drive of Barton Place which is clearly described in the planning permission and as shown on Land Registry Title SY 173174.

Would the members of the Committee not agree that it is not prudent to include Barton Place in the TRO given the lack of any evidence of adoption (the only "proof" given being an assumption by SCC of adoption because it had been maintained at public expense by GBC up to 1974 – not true.) and the possible legal ramifications of proceeding with parking restrictions?

Responses were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**, please also see Item 10.

One formal public question was received from Julie Brown regarding: **the A25 between Trodds lane and Albury turn off, increase in vehicles of 50,000 a week**

"A recent survey shows that 50,000 vehicles a week use the section of the A25 between Trodds Lane and the Albury turnoff. Therefore, this is a busy stretch of road which is made dangerous by the combination of the Trodds Lane junction, the crossing of the North Downs Way and the entrance to the Newlands Corner site, as regular accidents prove.

It has been confirmed by Cllr Goodman that the number of vehicles currently using the Newlands Corner site, and, therefore, performing slow manoeuvres on the highway when entering and leaving, has increased to 255,000 per year. This is 510,000 manoeuvres on the highway each year. These are manoeuvres on the highway, not on the Newlands Corner site. Why has no consideration been taken of this increase when considering the improvements needed to make this stretch of road safe?

Julie Brown asked an additional question: Which vehicle numbers were included when consulting with the Police.

The Highways Manager responded that: the consultation with the Police involved a number of site visits, the off-peak numbers of cars were not high and there had only been 2 accidents in a 4 year period. The figures used were appropriate for usage as of today.

Responses were tabled and are attached to the minutes as **Appendix B**

150/16 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

A Member question was submitted by Councillor Caroline Reeves regarding **Waitrose in York Road installing a yellow box.**

Councillor Caroline Reeves also asked whether it would be possible to have a green light on both sides of the central refuge. The Highways Manager stated that this would be a significant change and he would take this back to colleagues.

A response from Highways was tabled and is attached to the minutes as **Appendix C.**

151/16 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY 2015/16 (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]

The reason for the report was to tell the local story of how Services for Young People (SYP), working with our partners, has been making a difference to young people in Guildford.

Members asked if they could have reassurance that issues for young people such as: 'Sexting', Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and Internet Safety not in prioritised areas of the borough are still being dealt with. Officers informed Members that because they work in partnership with the Police, Guildford Borough Council etc they inform them of issues young people are facing and then they can provide a wrap around service. The example was given of

ITEM 2

recent issues around the Guildford Castle area where young people had been abusing substances and within a week detached youth work was deployed in that area straight after school when this was occurring. Services for Young People have also contacted schools on prevention and targeting of young people who need further support around 'sexting'.

Officers informed Members that 19 young people were at risk of CSE in the borough and that relevant services meet regularly to ensure that all services are aware of any issues. The service also supports families with education and in a preventative role. The Sliding Doors programme supports young women who are at risk of CSE. WISE also do one to one work with young people at risk of CSE up to the age of 24 years old. Also a big part of the work that the Community Youth Work service does is around CSE.

Members asked for any feedback on how things have moved forward on the mobile youth work and where the Life Train bus is pitching to reach more young people. Officers updated that the Life Train is working in the Guildford Castle area and there are sessions in Ash and Stoke and believe that the numbers of young people accessing the bus have increased.

Councillors commented that males coming into Guildford with the intention of carrying out CSE have been prevented through community safety work and that the new taxi livery colours will help people to identify registered taxis improving safety. Officers commented that perpetrators often related to peer on peer situation with a 5 year or less age difference with the victims of CSE.

Members asked whether the right resources are in place to support young people; officers responded that the Early Help services are taking some time to implement however in other areas the resources are in place.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted the report.

Reason:

The reason for this report is to tell the local story of how Services for Young People (SYP), working with our partners, has been making a difference to young people in Guildford.

152/16 TRAVEL SMART PROGRAMME CLOSE OVERVIEW (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

The purpose of the item was to provide an overview of all the work delivered in Guildford, as part of the Travel SMART programme that started in April 2011. Summarising the range of achievements, outcomes and challenges recognised across the programme, but with a specific focus on Guildford. It was intended to be used by the members of Local Committee initially to assess the success of the programme and to have sight of the open schemes that continue to be progressed.

Members queried why there was a delay in a permanent waiting area at Onslow Park and Ride being introduced and the site being handed over from Surrey University. Officers informed Members that the tender for the waiting room would be returned to them by 4 July and construction should be completed by Christmas 2016. Surrey University will sign the lease with Guildford Borough Council for the waiting room when they see the contract to

build the waiting room and there is a document ready to be signed by the University.

Members stated that it was imperative to have Park and Ride signs on the A3.

Actions: CPCO to follow progress on these actions through the Decision Tracker.

Councillor Reeves asked if the Travel SMART programme was doing anything on air quality - David Ligertwood to update Councillor Reeves outside of the meeting.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note the content of the report and the outcomes of the project.
- (ii) Agree that the remaining schemes in the Guildford programme will now be delivered through the most appropriate department, as set out in paragraph 4.5.

(iii) That an update report on the Outstanding Schemes as set out in paragraph 4.4, Table 6 be brought to Local Committee on 13 December 2016.

Reasons:

- As per the agreed governance structure of the programme, to keep the relevant Local Committees informed of progress.
- To facilitate the closure of the programme.
To ensure there is a mechanism to deliver the remaining schemes in the programme.

153/16 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - PROPOSALS FOR BURPHAM AREA AND 'AD-HOC' LOCATIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

Pete Web asked an additional public question:

“The simple question of HOW, WHEN, & WHY? the access drive to Barton Place was adopted will have to be answered prior to being included in the TRO.

Would the Committee members also agree that after our asking for 21 months, and recently Anne Milton MP asking the same question and both receiving no answer, that Barton Place should be removed from the TRO and the RESIDENTS ONLY markings be restored.

The Chairman responded that: Surrey County Council legal team have stated that the access drive to Barton Place has been adopted as Highways and if there was any objection this would need to be taken to court.

The purpose of the report was to present the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals in the Burpham shopping parade area

ITEM 2

and Burpham Lane and 'ad-hoc' locations and recommends that traffic regulation orders are made.

Members discussed whether or not to include Barton Place in the recommendations for a Traffic Regulation Order to be made to implement new controls and decided to vote on the question. Should Barton Place be included in the below recommendations:

For: 7 Against: 3 Abstained: 1

Barton Place therefore remained as part of the below recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls in the Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, shown in ANNEXE 3,
- (ii) that Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are made under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement new controls and changes to the existing, covering the 'ad-hoc' locations, shown in ANNEXE 5, and that the proposals in Millmead Terrace are not progressed at the present time.

Reasons:

To assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to make local improvements.

154/16 PARKING STRATEGY FOR GUILDFORD (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 11]

The Parking Strategy was developed to support other key plans held by the County and Borough Councils, including the Town Centre Masterplan, to help reduce congestion. It was agreed that additional signage along the A323 towards the Onslow P&R would be considered to help direct residents from Normandy and Pirbright. It was also confirmed that the borough council was still looking at two additional P&R in the north and the south of the town, and that consideration was being given to joining up all the public transport routes in Guildford.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) the principles set out in bold in the draft parking strategy attached as Annexe 1 and,

- (ii) delegate any changes to details within the strategy to the Parking Services Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

Reasons:

To provide a strategic framework for parking to guide and to assist decisions and help meet the wider policy aims of Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council.

155/16 SURREY CYCLING STRATEGY (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

As part of the Surrey Transport Plan, the Surrey Cycling Strategy was approved by Surrey County Council's Cabinet in December 2013. The Strategy set out a role for Local Committees to oversee the development of Local Cycling Plans. The purpose of the report was to provide members with information about the aim, objectives and content of the Surrey Cycle Strategy and the progress made in delivering it to date.

Action: Sustainable Transport Manager to send link to cycling survey to Councillor Reeve.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted:

- (i) The aim, objectives and content of the Surrey Cycle Strategy

Reasons:

As part of the Surrey Cycling Strategy, the County Council and Guildford Local Committee want to encourage more people in Surrey to cycle, more safely. This report provides more detailed information to the committee on the work that Surrey County Council and its partners are currently doing to deliver the strategy

156/16 SHERE RURAL AREA HGV REVIEW AND DE-CLUTTERING PROJECT (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 13]

This purpose of this item was to report on progress on the combined rural HGV review and de-cluttering project being carried out in the central area of the Surrey Hills AONB, currently focussed mainly within the Parishes of Shere, Ewhurst and Albury. The Parish Councils agreed to defer a report to this committee on a package of HGV management measures until a later meeting, pending further traffic surveys and consultations with Surrey Police on the feasibility of HGV restrictions.

Mindful of the extensive work already being carried out by Parish Councils in identifying superfluous road signing, and the recent changes in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD, 2016), which gives further legislative support to this work, it was decided to bring a report on the de-cluttering aspect of this project to this committee to ensure that the momentum of this work as a pilot study is maintained.

Members were updated that another working group would be meeting on 14 July to move the work forward.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) the implementation of road signing de-cluttering proposals developed through a risk assessment process trialled by parish councils, subject to appropriate sign off from Surrey Highways and available funding
- (ii) the continuation of a collaborative approach supporting Parish Councils to identify rural HGV and traffic issues and that a further report is brought back to this committee

Reasons:

Parish councils, with their in depth knowledge of their locality, are ideally placed to play a central role in identifying superfluous signing and street furniture and a number have already been trialling the Norfolk risk assessment process.

Much work on de-cluttering audits by parish councils has now taken place and so it would be timely to complete and review the trial assessment process before rolling out the initiative to other areas.

157/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 14]

The purpose of the report was to provide an update on the 2015/16 programmes of highway improvement and maintenance works funded by this committee and sets out the programme of works for 2016/17 as agreed by the committee at the meetings of December 2015 and March 2016.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note that three ITS and the Cluster Fund schemes were not completed by the end of the financial year in March. However capital funding of 137,000 has been carried forward which is expected to very nearly meet the cost of completing these projects within the current financial year.
- (ii) Note the 2016/17 programme of highway works and operations detailed at **Annex 1**.
- (iii) Agree to promote a traffic regulation order for the introduction of parking restrictions in the Boxgrove Lane area as shown at **Annex 2**.
- (iv) Agree to promote a traffic regulation order to reduce the existing 60mph speed limit on the A25 Shere Road to 40mph as shown on the plan at **Annex 3**. This proposal will also be subject to consultation with the police.
- (v) Agree that the 25,000 of revenue funding previously directed towards an additional jetter is now allocated towards minor maintenance works identified by the Area Highway Manager.

Reasons:

The recommendations above allow the implementation of ITS schemes included in the 2016/17 programme of highway works.

Action: Members to send any representations on Operation Horizon to matthew.gallop@surreycc.gov.uk and copy in Amanda.Richards@surreycc.gov.uk, John Hilder, Councillor Matt Furniss, and Councillor Keith Taylor.

158/16 PROJECT HORIZON AND PROJECT HORIZON PAVEMENTS UPDATE [Item 15]

The purpose of the report was to describe the potential Pavement Horizon 5 year programme, generated from the Footway Network Survey (FNS), for Guildford. These schemes include lower cost preventative treatment, in an asset management approach, to extend the life of the pavement. This programme also includes need based schemes that are higher cost reconstruction of the pavement, and the potential list of these is included in Annex 1 of the report.

The report is the start of the consultation process to engage and to better inform the prioritised list of the needs based schemes. The Local Committee were invited to identify schemes that are high priority (should be part of the 5 year programme), on the list which are low priority (work not required in the 5 year programme), or not on the list which are high priority and should be considered for the 5 year programme.

The Local Committee (Guildford) noted:

- (i) The list of potential Pavement Horizon needs based schemes, for the 5 year programme, generated from the FNS for Guildford. (**Annex 1**).
- (ii) The request to identify schemes that are
 1. High priority and should remain on the 5 year programme
 2. Lower priority and could be deferred to a future programme
 3. Currently not on the high priority list and should be considered for addition to the list.
- (iii) The process outlined in part 1 to verify that the schemes in **Annex 1** meet local and community needs.

Action: Members to send any representations on Pavement Horizon to Matthew.Gallop@surreycc.gov.uk and copy in Amanda.Richards@surreycc.gov.uk, John Hilder, Councillor Matt Furniss, and Councillor Keith Taylor.

159/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE MEMBERSHIP, TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND NOMINATIONS TO PARTNERSHIP (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 16]

ITEM 2

The purpose of the report was to address certain governance requirements to be considered by the committee on an annual basis and at the first municipal meeting of the year. Under Surrey County Council constitutional arrangements the Committee is required to agree if it shall accept substitute co-optee members to attend committee as directed by the Borough Council. Member task groups have been established to support the Committee in its work and membership and terms of reference are to be reviewed and agreed.

Finally, the Committee is invited to provide representation on local partnership bodies. The paper also asks the Committee to consider membership of these groups for the new municipal year.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) that there shall be substitute Borough Council co-optee membership for the municipal year 2016-17;
- (ii) the terms of reference for the two Task Groups as set out in **Annexes 1 and 2**;
- (iii) the nominated members and substitute members as below for the Transportation Task Group for the municipal year 2015-16;
- (iv) the nominated members for the Youth Task Group as below for the municipal year 2015-16;
- (v) To appoint the nominees as below from the Local Committee to the local partnerships as set out in the report.

Transportation Task Group:

Councillor Mark Brett-Warburton

Councillor Keith Taylor

Councillor David Goodwin

Councillor Paul Spooner

Councillor Matt Furniss

Councillor Tony Phillips

Substitutes: Councillor Bill Barker and Councillor Tony Rooth

Youth Task Group:

Councillor Pauline Searle

Councillor Keith Taylor

Councillor Iseult Roche

Councillor Caroline Reeves

Safer Guildford Partnership

Councillor Fiona White

Guildford Health and Wellbeing Board

Councillor Pauline Searle

Reasons:

Good governance practice requires that the Committee reviews membership arrangements regularly to ensure that representation on the committee, task groups and partnerships is fair and provides the best outcomes for the interests of Guildford borough residents.

Action: The Local Committee representatives on the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Safer Guildford Partnership to provide an annual update to a future meeting.

160/16 TRANSPORTATION TASK GROUP UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 17]

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed to:

- (i) Note and comment on the work and programme for the Transportation Task Group.

Reasons:

The purpose of the Transportation Task Group is to provide the Guildford Local Committee with considered and informed advice. The purpose of this report is to keep the full committee informed of matters under consideration by the TTG and when those items are likely be bought forward for the attention of the full committee.

161/16 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 18]

Members noted the update on the progress of the Local Committee decisions.

162/16 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 19]

Members noted the Forward Plan for the Local Committee Guildford.

163/16 INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

Meeting ended at: 9.30 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank