

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Surrey HEATH LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 2 March 2017
at St Lawrence C of E Primary School, Bagshot Road, Chobham, GU24 8AE.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr David Ivison (Chairman)
- * Mr Chris Pitt (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Goodman
- * Mr Bill Chapman
- * Mr Adrian Page
- Mr Denis Fuller

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Vivienne Chapman
- * Cllr Rodney Bates
- * Cllr Valerie White
- * Cllr Josephine Hawkins
- * Cllr Paul Ilnicki
- * Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans

* In attendance

62/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from C.Cllr Denis Fuller.

63/17 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting (December 2016) were agreed and signed by the Chair.

64/17 UPDATE ON DECISION TRACKER [Item 3]

The decision tracker was discussed. The outstanding item on the traffic lights at Frimley Green should be regarded as red as this issue continues to be unresolved. The updated decision tracker was noted.

65/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were no declarations of interest.

66/17 PETITIONS [Item 5]**67/17 PETITION - PARKING IN LIGHTWATER [Item 5a]**

At the December meeting, the Local Committee received two signed petitions by local residents requesting the Local Committee provide additional parking spaces in Lightwater.

One of the petitions, presented by Cllr Rebecca Jennings-Evans, read "To ask Surrey County Council to investigate the viability and options to increase the number of parking spaces in Lightwater Village Centre". The decision on this petition was deferred to this meeting.

Thanks were given to Highways and Parking Officers, who had worked with Councillors and residents to provide options and a way forward.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted:

- (i) Residents of Lightwater have met with Officers and Members of Surrey County Council with a proposal to increase the amount of parking in Lightwater centre.
- (ii) The proposal was reviewed and determined to have a substantial cost implication that cannot be met by the Local Committee in the current financial climate.
- (iii) Surrey County Council Parking Team will review introducing time limited parking bays within the highway limit during the next Surrey Heath parking review.

68/17 SPEED LIMIT IN WINDLESHAM [Item 5b]

A written petition was received in advance of the meeting, requesting the Committee consider a 20mph speed limit, with relevant features, along Heathpark Drive, Birch Road and Oakwood Road, Windlesham.

The petition was received 15 December 2016 and was passed to Surrey County Council Officers to provide a report on the matter in time for this meeting.

The petition called for a 20mph speed limit on the estate. Although the County Highways report was not in support, the petitioners felt that common sense should prevail to ensure the safety of all residents. It was true that there had been no major crashes but their concern was to prevent any happening at all. Parents were particularly concerned for the safety of their children.

The petitioner stated that Heathpark Drive was the only residential road in Windlesham which was a "through road". Although Heathpark Drive was the main drag, Birch Road and Oakwood Road were also affected because drivers had to wait at a T-junction with Heathpark Drive to exit their roads. This was therefore a special case and granting their request would not cause a precedent.

It was claimed that traffic had increased dramatically over the last ten years and, due to the speed at which vehicles were coming through the estate, residents were angry and fearful of crashes occurring. Although the traffic situation might improve from a numbers point of view when the bridge

reopened - it was believed that it would not have an impact on the speed at which vehicles travelled.

A petition suggestion was for an area-wide signed 20mph limit. Signs, lines, and road markings could indicate that the driver was entering a residential estate and could be introduced without expensive traffic calming. This would cost 50 times less than humped zones and studies showed lower speed resulted in 20% fewer casualties. Compliance would be increased by publicity, driver awareness and community involvement, with light touch policing or community speed watch. 20mph speed limits could be indicated by terminal speed limit signs with an option to put in repeater signs. These were relatively cheap and easy to install on lamp posts and residents believed that a limit scheme would cost £5-7K.

After much discussion, it was agreed that this was an exceptional case (with an 80% increase in traffic over the past 3 years) and the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed that:

- (i) The Area Highways Manager reconsider the recommendations with the local County Councillor with the aim of bringing a designated 20mph scheme back to the next Local Committee.**
- (ii) The Chair of the Local Committee write to the relevant Cabinet Member stating Surrey Heath Local Committees' support for 20mph schemes within the local speed limit policy. (Step 6 of the policy states that if the Committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety).**

The amended recommendations were proposed by C.Cllr Mike Goodman and seconded by Cllrs Valerie White and Bill Chapman.

69/17 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were two written public questions submitted to the Committee. The questions and the written answers given out at the meeting are attached as Annex B.

The first question was about the Bagshot traffic lights and Members noted that the Cabinet Member had been asked to chase this work with the Contractor.

The second question regarding potential traffic through Chobham as a result of proposed new developments generated a lot of discussion. Residents raised a number of concerns about current traffic volumes and that any increase in traffic would be a disaster. Concerns were also raised that any mitigation measures would not decrease the volume of traffic and that a more joined up regional approach to traffic was needed. There was a lack of Community support for development without appropriate infrastructure.

70/17 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There were no written Member questions.

71/17 EDUCATION IN SURREY HEATH [Item 8]

Marc Scarborough, NW Area Education Officer, gave a verbal update on education issues locally.

It was noted that Surrey was facing some challenges. A number of very good head teachers were retiring, leaving vacancies. Recruitment of teachers was also a challenge, particularly in view of the cost of housing and living in the area. The Council had tried a variety of methods to attract staff, including inviting newly qualified teachers to come and visit local schools, but this had a very low take up. The numbers of newer teachers leaving schools had also increased. However, a “grow your own” scheme for non teaching assistants had worked well.

In Surrey Heath, there had been a spike year in terms of population and intake numbers would now go down (unless new houses were built). There were plans for a new school to accommodate the Deepcut development. There was a general mover towards Academies and partnership schools and the “no school left behind” scheme was encouraging partnership working.

Mark gave thanks to all the Heads and Teachers in Surrey Heath, who do a fabulous job!

72/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 9]

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2016/17 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Enhancement expenditure.

To report on relevant topical highways matters.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) agreed to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2016/17 financial year.
- (ii) Note the budgetary position.
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

73/17 MEMBERS ALLOCATION REPORT [Item 10]

Surrey County Council Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members’ Allocation.

For the financial year 2016/17 the County Council has allocated £10,296 revenue funding to each County Councillor. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since April 2016 to date.

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation budget, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

74/17 FORWARD PLAN [Item 11]

This report is produced for each meeting of the Local Committee (Surrey Heath) so that members can review the forward plan and comment on the items that are currently anticipated will be received (paragraph 3).

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) noted the forward plan outlined in the report

Meeting ended at: 8.50 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank