

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Woking LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 6.00 pm on 5 December 2012
at Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking GU21
6YL.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Liz Bowes (Chairman)
- * Mr Mohammed Amin
- * Ben Carasco
- * Will Forster
- * Mrs Linda Kemeny
- * Mr Geoff Marlow
- * Mrs Diana Smith

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr John Kingsbury (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr Tony Branagan
- * Cllr Bryan Cross
- * Cllr Kevin Davis
- * Cllr Tina Liddington
- * Cllr Derek McCrum
- * Cllr Richard Wilson

* In attendance

The meeting was preceded by a public engagement session. The notes of this session are set out in Annex 1 of these minutes.

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

54/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

There were no apologies for absence.

55/12 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the last meeting held on 26 September were agreed and signed.

56/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Will Forster declared in pecuniary interest in Item 13 paragraph 2.7 due to that fact that he is a member of the Executive Committee of the Old Woking Community Centre.

57/12 PETITIONS [Item 4]

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mrs Sara Rhydderch presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. The petition received 426 signatures:

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to: 'provide as soon as possible a pedestrian crossing on Chobham Road (A3046) between Horsell Rise and Brewery Road, at a point deemed appropriate by the Council.'

Chobham Road has long been recognised as a dangerous road to cross.

- 1999 plan for pedestrian crossing between Brewery Road and Ferndale Road drawn up.
- 2001-2 delayed due to finances.
- 2002-3 Local Transport Plan included scheme for construction in financial year. Public consultation survey ordered. Carried over into 2003-4. 24/6/03 survey found 664 pedestrians crossed, including 136 children.
- 22/10/03 Local Committee for Woking meeting deferred decision and requested further survey.
- 26/4/04 further survey presented to Local Committee with same recommendation to construct Pelican Crossing just south of Broomhall Road.
- 20/2/08 Petition signed by 50 residents presented unsuccessfully to Local Committee Woking meeting.

Scheme still an item on SCC's "Integrated Transport Scheme". Further consultation to be undertaken during 2013/14 financial year, with construction in 2014-15 (supposedly). This petition aims to bring forward timescale and get crossing erected in 2013-4 financial year.

Mrs Rhydderch introduced the petition and explained that this is one of the main roads out of Woking. It has curves and dips, and visibility is an issue. Cars also speed. Local school children, parents, the elderly, commuters and those wishing to access the local nurseries and Wheatsheaf Common recreation ground are all affected. The petitioners are aware that this has been discussed by the committee previously. They feel that there is an accident waiting to happen, and if a crossing is provided, then more people may feel able to walk safely and therefore avoid using their car resulting in reduced congestion.

The Chairman invited members of the committee to ask questions of clarity:

- The petitioner thought the ideal place for the crossing would be around Horsell Rise, but they would appreciate a consultation on the best location.
- In addition to the people mentioned, the other communities affected by the petition include pupils from Woking High, those using the local

dentist, people parking for town, members of Horsell Residents Association etc.

Paul Fishwick explained that he had met the petitioners on site and two possible locations for a crossing had been identified, and they would go out to consultation on these in the spring. The results would be brought back to the Local Committee meeting in summer 2013.

The Chairman thanked the petitioner for coming.

In accordance with Standing Order 65, Mr David Mearns presented the following petition on behalf of local residents. The petition received 53 signatures:

We the undersigned all live in Firbank Lane/Firbank Drive, which are located immediately adjacent to the traffic lights on St John's Hill Road. Accordingly, we are directly affected by the traffic flow scheme for the bridge.

We believe that the only safe and effective traffic flow scheme is traffic lights. The volume of traffic has increased considerably in recent years and this includes an increase in the number of heavy goods vehicles that we see using the route. This volume, combined with the speed of traffic, would make any priority signage scheme very dangerous.

Without traffic lights it will be very difficult for us to exit Firbank Lane/Firbank Drive safely. In particular, with a traffic priority scheme, drivers of vehicles approaching on the other side of the bridge will likely be concentrating on the bend ahead to see if any vehicles are approaching the bridge along the main road on the other side. Consequently, they may not see a car pulling out of Firbank Lane/Firbank Drive to the side.

We, the undersigned, therefore call on all parties concerned to retain traffic lights as the traffic flow scheme for the bridge and to provide a set of permanent, well maintained lights with suitably positioned vehicles detectors on both sides of the bridge to trigger the lights whenever a vehicle approaches the main road or from Firbank Lane/Firbank Drive.

Mr Mearns introduced the petition and explained that they believe that traffic lights are the only way of managing the traffic. Before they were put in there were a number of near misses on the bridge, and since then the volume of traffic has increased, which would make the situation even worse. The petitioners would also find it very difficult to exit their road if the traffic lights were removed.

The Chairman invited members of the committee to ask any questions of clarity. The following responses were noted:

- The number of cars on road have increased considerably in last few years.
- Children using the road attend Oaktree, Hermitage and Winston Churchill schools.

Zena Curry thanked the petitioner and explained that the member discussion would take place under item 8 of the agenda. The options would look at addressing incursion onto the railway, road safety, drainage and the road surface.

58/12 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Four public questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 2 of these minutes.

Question 2: Mr Stubbs asked whether it was standard practice to carry out a full traffic assessment for a new school. Andrew Milne explained that it would be expected for the impact to be considered as it would for all developments.

Question 3: Cllr Barker explained that puddling issues were caused by the levels of the road. Andrew Milne explained that every effort is made to address these issues. If there are problems, these should be raised with the Surrey County Council Highways to address in the usual way.

Question 4: Mrs Marshall explained that there is already a Wayleave in either the builders yards deeds or the deeds for the land. A response would be given in writing following the meeting.

59/12 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Eleven member questions were received and tabled. A copy of the questions and answers can be found in Annex 3 of these minutes. Supplementary questions and responses are recorded below.

Question 1: In response to Cllr Davis, Andrew Milne confirmed that the response was written before he knew that there was to be a new school in the area, but he noted that the limitations in the response still apply.

Question 2: Mrs Smith asked whether CCTV could be considered again at the site, or if the doors could be made more secure. Andrew Milne explained that CCTV had been looked at but was not possible, and would also not stop the damage to the bollards. The relevant officer would be asked about the doors, and a response would be provided to Mrs Smith outside the meeting.

Question 3: Mrs Smith requested an item on the forward plan on how improvements could be made to the bus stops in the town centre.

Question 6: Mrs Kemeny explained that only half of Hollybank Road had been resurfaced and requested a meeting on site with Chris Higgs to look at the section of Hollybank Road which has not been resurfaced. Andrew Milne explained that a list has been drawn up for resurfacing under Project Horizon, and once he has clarification of this list he will update members.

Question 9: In response to Cllr Branagan it was confirmed that there was a link between the response at the meetings and what happens on the ground.

Question 10: Cllr Cross asked whether any further action could be taken under the SLA. Andrew Milne confirmed that we could ask them to hurry, but could not make them. If it is a recurring problem, then this is another issue. He will check that the works have now been carried out.

60/12 PETITION RESPONSE - ROAD SAFETY , MORTON ROAD - MEADWAY DRIVE, WOKING HIGH SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT [Item 7]

Andrew Milne introduced this item, which gave a response to the petition received at the last meeting.

The following comments were made:

- Will Forster requested that an item looking at 20mph zones outside schools be added to the forward programme.
- It was noted that lines can take about a year to be made on the ground after a parking review. David Curl would be asked to respond to the local members on whether it would be possible to accelerate the timescale for these lines. It would also be raised at the next meeting of the Parking Task Group.
- It was noted that Woking High had not yet been spoken to by the County.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking) noted the contents of this report.

61/12 ST JOHN'S HILL ROAD BRIDGE [Item 8]

Zena Curry and Andrew Milne introduced the report and explained the options available to committee. Andrew explained that works needs to be carried out on the drainage and the current road surface is in need of remedial work. If the committee were to support option 3 of the report, then the Local Committee could make a £30k contribution from the 2013/14 capital maintenance budget to the scheme to address the drainage and resurfacing work.

The following comments were made:

- Cllr Kingsbury is supportive of the scheme and the weight restriction and would ask members to support option 3.
- In response to Mrs Smith it was noted that the scheme had to be implemented in one go to save digging up the road twice.
- Cllr Forster is aware of some emails against the proposal for traffic lights, and would welcome a wider consultation.
- It was noted that the works would take approximately 4 weeks, but the road would not be closed for all of this period.
- Mrs Kemeny, as local County Councillor is aware of the mixed views of some residents, but as the majority of residents are for option 3, then she will support it. Mrs Kemeny offered to use her 13/14 Community Pride towards the scheme if it was necessary.

By approving option 3, it would provide residents with a robust permanent solution for the site which reduces the risk of vehicle incursion onto the railway, improves drainage and the quality of the highway surfacing in the vicinity of the bridge. The weight limit is required as the strength assessment calculations for the bridge indicate that it is not adequate for full highway loading.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking):

i) Agreed traffic control option 3 (to replace the current traffic signals with permanent traffic signals) and agreed to inform the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.

ii) Approved option 3 and:

a) approved the installation of permanent signals as shown on the plan in Annex 3.

b) confirmed that the remaining £30,000 will be funded via a Local Committee budget.

iii) Agreed to give authority to advertise notice of a 13T weight restriction on the bridge, and subject to no objections being maintained, the Order be made. Where significant objections are received, the Area Team Manager to decide in consultation with the divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman/Vice Chairman whether the Traffic Regulation Order may be confirmed.

62/12 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 9]

Andrew Milne introduced this which updated the committee on the local highways budgets.

Members discussed the proposed ITS programme for 2013/14. It was noted that the Albert Drive scheme would go ahead subject to the outcome of the consultation. A report would come back to committee if the scheme was not going to go ahead so members could consider the implications of going ahead with the Maybury Hill, as the contingency scheme, on the rest of the programme. Andrew agreed to advise members outside the meeting on when the consultation will be carried out.

Cllr McCrum asked for an update outside the meeting on Balfour Avenue.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee:

- (i) Noted the progress with the ITS highways and developer funded schemes;
- (ii) Noted that a further Highways Update report is to be brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.
- (iii) Agreed the ITS proposals for 2013/14 subject to the anticipated provision of capital funding.

63/12 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS AMENDMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT-RELATED HIGHWAYS WORKS ASSOCIATED WITH BARRATT DEVELOPMENT ON LAND AT GUILDFORD ROAD, WOKING [Item 10]

Bronwen Fisher introduced the report which sought amendments to on street parking arrangements in Guildford Road, Woking.

In response to members comments, the following points were noted:

- Once the area has been adopted, the enforcement of the bays will be under the contract with Woking Borough Council.
- The safety of the car during the evenings is not a concern of the car club.

Cllr Kingsbury asked for an update on the rest of the highways works associated with the development. This would be provided outside the meeting.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking) agreed:

- (i) The intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to amend the on street parking restrictions in Woking as described in this report.
- (ii) 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, vice chairman of this committee and the relevant county councillor, after which the order can be made and the amendments implemented.

64/12 TRAVEL SMART - LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND [Item 11]

Paul Fishwick introduced the item which set out the draft programme for 2013/14. Paul referred to the petition on the Chobham Road crossing presented earlier on in the agenda and confirmed that he would liaise with the petitioner over the consultation on this item.

Mrs Smith suggested the the Bisley to Knaphill cycle route could follow Warbury Lane and Barrs Lane. Paul agreed to look at this as an additional possibility, but the other route was required for the link to Knaphill.

In response to Cllr Wilson, Paul confirmed that he had written approval from the Highways Agency that they were happy with the proposals for the bridge over the motorway on the A245 raised in the safety audit.

It was confirmed that the community funding was agreed in the original bid, and this would continue to be focussed on Sheerwater and Maybury.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking):

- i. Agreed the draft programme of LSTF (Key Component and Large Bid) allocation for schemes for the 2013/14 financial year as set out in Annex A.
- ii. Delegated amendments to the LSTF Programme to the Chairman of the LSTF Delivery Board in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and appropriate county and borough officers and members.
- iii. Agreed to consider the responses from the Egley Road survey at the forthcoming Task Group meeting on 31 January 2013 and report back to this Committee at the next planned meeting.
- iv. Agreed to carry out a feasibility study for the A245 Parvis Road (Camphill Road to Chertsey Road) Phase 2 (junction treatments) and report back to this Local Committee at the next planned meeting.

65/12 YOUTH SMALL GRANTS [Item 12]

Liz Bowes explained that, as Chairman, she had pulled the bid from Dot Sign language as she did not feel that there was enough information in the bid. She would ask officers to ask them to reapply with fuller details through members' allocations for consideration at the March 2013 meeting. As a result of this, it was proposed that the £2,997 should be allocated to the Woking Sea Cadets towards a replacement minibus instead.

Jeremy Crouch introduced the report and explained that the grants were for direct delivery for young people in Woking.

Mr Carasco suggested, that in future he would like to see the bids have a member sponsor. Jeremy explained that the small grants process was currently under review and he would feed this request in.

In response to Cllr McCrum, Jeremy explained that the minutes from the quarterly meeting with the provider would be circulated as soon as possible.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking) approved the **amended** recommendations in sections 2.2 of this report on the award of funding (as set out below):

- 1 Holy Trinity Church - £575
- 2 Horsell Tennis Club - £600
- 3 St Andrew's Church, Woking - £1,000
- 4 **Woking Sea Cadets - £2,997**

66/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING - MEMBERS ALLOCATION [Item 13]

Mr Will Forster declared in pecuniary interest in paragraph 2.7 of this item due to that fact that he is a member of the Executive Committee of the Old Woking Community Centre, and therefore left the room.

Michelle Collins introduced the report and the additional bids in the tabled paper for Boltons Lane, Pyrford and Byfleet Methodist Church which arrived after the report had been published, but were eligible for decision by the committee. It was noted that the money for tree planting in Pyrford was also for island improvements, and an amendment was made to the figures in 2.9 as the capital and revenue needed to be reversed.

Following on from the item on the Youth Small Grants and the decision to award the Woking Sea Cadets £2,997 towards a replacement minibus, officers proposed that the remained £3,003 was allocated to them through members allocation.

RESOLVED

The Local Committee (Woking):

- (i) Agreed the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 **revenue** and **capital** funding as set out in paragraph 2 of this report **and the tabled additions**.

SATRO - £1,000

Outline - £1,000

Byfleet Parish Day 2013 - £4,000

Bridge Barn Grit bin - £1,000

Flower Show Display Boards - £3,000

Old Woking Community Centre - £4,000

Community Pantomime - £4,000

Outside Light - £3,870

Brookwood Babies and Toddlers - £975

Brookwood Christmas Tree - £700

WUWO Magazine - £2,760

Park Road Speed Reduction - £6,000

Boltons Lane Grit Bin - £1,000

Tree planting and island in Pyrford - £2,000

Byfleet Methodist Church - £2,608

Woking Sea Cadets - £3,003

- (ii) Noted 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.

[Will Forster returned to the meeting.]

67/12 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 14]

RESOLVED

Noted as in the report with the addition of a report on 20mph speed limits outside schools and a report from Passenger Transport on improvements that could be made to the bus stands and shelters on the town side of Woking station.

68/12 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC [Item 15]

Meeting ended at: 9.55 pm

Chairman

Annex 1

Notes from Public Engagement Meeting

1. Open Public Question Session [Public Engagement Item 1]

Question 1: Cllr Simon Bellord

Flooding is an issue under Prey Heath Road railway bridge. Would like co-ordinated effort to let the public know what should happen when there is a flood.

Andrew Milne explained that the ideal is to address the issue so that there is no flooding. Prey Heath Road is on the ITS for pedestrian improvements for next year.

Question 2: David Clough – Firbank Lane

Regarding St John's Hill Road bridge – how can the council justify the removal of the traffic lights given the safety implications?

The Chairman explained that comments made on St John's Hill Road Bridge would be noted and taken into account during member discussions on item 8 of the agenda.

Question 3: Dan Cupis, Dean Close

It has been agreed that Dean Close needs resurfacing, when will the remainder be done as the road surface has deteriorated further?

Andrew Milne explained that the condition of the road is not a safety issue, but it is in need of repair. The committee may wish to fund this next year when the LSR programme is drawn up. The county policy regarding how safety is determined is set out on the SCC website.

Question 4: Cllr Melanie Whitehand

Some of the parents dropping off at Knaphill Lower School park inconsiderately. Could the school be asked to work with Councillors to address this?

Linda Kemeny, Cabinet Member for Children and Learning agreed to ask Kieran Holliday to investigate the travel plan for the school to see how it can be strengthened.

Question 5: Cllr Richard Hennessey

Regarding speeding on Park Road, the data collected is flawed because it was collected in half term when building work was being carried out. The Speedwatch have recorded many vehicles speeding along the road. The residents would like a series of chicanes put in – they are not in favour of VAS or traffic calming bumps.

Andrew Milne explained that they have to comply with County Policy regarding the type of traffic calming introduced and they need to consider needs across the borough. A speed survey will be carried out, and once the data is available, the issue and solution can be looked at, taking into account residents wishes as well as SCC policy.

Question 6: John Bunk

I live 100 yards from the traffic lights and did not hear about proposals until last night and am surprised at the lack of consultation. Hook Heath Residents Association only became aware a few days ago. How far has the proposal got and how can the opinion of the residents be gathered?

Question 7: David Mearns

What assurance can be given that debris from an incident on St John's Hill Road bridge won't go on the railway? Can I be sent a copy of the original risk assessment and the revised risk assessment under Freedom of Information?

Question 8: Mrs Davis

Would like a complete resurfacing of Holyoake Road as nothing has been done in over 71 years. Works carried out to repair some driveways on 27 November is already lifting. When will work be done?

Andrew Milne gave a written response to a similar question from Councillor Branagan under item 6 on the agenda. To summarise, the work carried out will be inspected, and Holyoake Avenue has been put forward for inclusion in the County Council's five year capital maintenance programme.

Question 9: Mrs Marshall

Referring to Mrs Smith's written question, the bus bollard in Knaphill is down again today.

Question 10: Cllr Tina Liddington

During the street light replacement programme, several Neighbourhood Watch signs have been badly scratched or are missing. Can they be replaced?

The Chairman advised that a written answer would be given outside the meeting.

Question 11: Cllr Beryl Hunwicks

Could we have clarification of which roads are covered by Skanska under the PFI lighting contract?

The Chairman advised that a written answer would be given outside the meeting.

2. Presentation on Enterprise M3 [Public Engagement Item 2]

Geoff French, Chairman of Enterprise M3, gave a presentation on the Local Enterprise Partnership. The aim of the partnership is for the public and private sectors to work together to decide what is best for the area, and to ensure that the business voice is heard when issues, including barriers to growth, are looked at.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- A monthly newsletter is produced and put on the website, along with the minutes of the meetings.
- All funding allocated is as a loan rather than a grant.
- Local transport bodies are being established based on LEP geography, and they will have a budget from 2015. The governance arrangements for these will be finalised by the end of the year, and priorities will be identified next year.
- A strong airport capacity is crucial, and a position on this will be established after the county elections.
- The LEP has started discussions with South West Trains, and parking at Farnborough station is seen as a priority.
- The heathland is valued amenity which needs to be protected.

Members welcomed the presentation and the Chairman thanked Mr French for his presentation.

3. Presentation on Dementia Care in Woking [Public Engagement Item 3]

Anne Butler, Assistant Director for Commissioning in Adult Social Care gave a presentation on dementia care in Surrey and the challenges locally. Anne was joined by Donal Hegarty from the commissioning service, who has been liaising with staff at the Bradbury Centre in Woking. It was noted that a DVD on dementia care was available for Members to borrow (please contact Sarah Goodman).

During discussions, the following points were noted:

- Officers were keen to understand the concerns about Brockhill and ensure that the delivery of services is right.
- Officers are aware of the issues at the Bradbury Centre and are working with the Alzheimer's Society, the Friends of the Elderly and users of the centre. They are hoping to come to a resolution by the end of January 2013. Staff will be kept appraised.
- Discussions are ongoing regarding setting up a Well being Centre in Woking, and they hope to conclude discussion on 7 January 2013.

Members welcomed the presentation and the Chairman thanked Anne and Donal for their presentation.

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)**

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

5 DECEMBER 2012

1. Question from Mr Cuckow

The road surface in Dean Close is in a dreadful state and needs to have some attention as soon as possible. Please advise when Dean Close is due to be resurfaced.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Dean Close has been identified for repair by the local Highways team, and was proposed to form part of the secondary Localised Structural Repair (LSR) programme this financial year, in the event of there being an underspend on the capital ITS budget.

As an underspend is now unlikely, this location has also been nominated for inclusion in the five year capital maintenance resurfacing programme. As this programme is in the process of being drawn up, information about when the resurfacing might take place is not presently available.

The Maintenance Engineer for Woking, Chris Higgs, has inspected Dean Close, and noted that the first 75m of the surface is in a poor state, but that there are presently no safety defects. Chris will continue to monitor the condition of Dean Close, and will continue to address any safety defects that do arise, to ensure that the road is kept in a safe condition prior to any surfacing work taking place.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking

2. Question from Mr Stubbs

At the June meeting of the SCC Local Committee (WOKING) it was stated that SCC were looking for suitable site for a new school in the Knaphill/Brookwood area.

On 23 November we were notified by WBC that land had been allocated on Brookwood Farm for a new school.

Given the above information I would like to know:

- 1) What kind of school is being planned, an LEA Primary School, an Academy or a 'Free School'?
- 2) If the LEA are to finance the new school have funds been set aside for the project?
- 3) What is the age range of the children the proposed school will take?
- 4) What is the timescale for submitting an application for planning permission and target date to commence building?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

1) The Local Authority is proposing to expand Brookwood Primary School (Community School) from a one form entry school (capacity of 210) pupils to a two form entry school (capacity of 420 pupils) split on two sites and linked to the Brookwood Farm Housing Development. Under the current plans, the existing Brookwood Primary School site on Connaught Road would become the infant base (Reception to Year 2 (ages 4-6), with capacity for 180 pupils) plus the Sure Start Children's Centre. A brand new building would go on the Brookwood Farm site as the junior base for the school (Years 3 to 6 (ages 7-11), with capacity for 240 pupils). Assuming the housing development takes place and properties are completed in a timely fashion, the new school building is planned to be operational from September 2014.

2) There is no agreement at this stage on how the school will be funded, however the Local Authority (SCC) will seek developer contributions to support the funding of the new school site. Any other costs would have to be met from the basic need capital programme managed by Surrey County Council.

3) See answer above

4) An outline planning application will be submitted by the end of this week. Pending the outcome of this, a full planning application will be submitted next year. We will not be able to give a start date for some time as it will depend on

www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking

the process of obtaining detailed planning permission and funding decisions. The target date for school opening is the key one.

3. Question from Cllr Barker

I asked a question about flooding at the last Local Committee but don't believe the matter was fully addressed. Improvement has been seen on Arthur's Bridge Road because I believe this was a drain clearance issue but in the last couple of months I have noticed that there are several roads which have been resurfaced or re-laid as part of road improvements in recent years that now have large puddles when it rains heavily. Locations are:

- the lower part of Church Hill where the pavement was widened and dropped kerbs added several years ago
- the junction of Brewery Road with the Arthur's Bridge Road roundabout which was created in the last few years
- Brewery Road outside the entrance to the WWF building site (this has improved a little I think from drain clearance) but there is still a large puddle. This part of Brewery Road was resurfaced earlier this year and the problem has been there since that time
- the pedestrian crossings over Chobham Road and then Victoria Way into Woking town centre
- the pedestrian crossing over Victoria Way by the Lightbox into Woking Town Centre

Would you agree that there does appear to be a problem when Surrey Highways contractors resurface or create new road structures?

What will be done to remove this puddling in the short term?

What can change in future so that these problems do not continue?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

It is not the case that resurfacing work, or making amendments to the highways network, generally causes drainage problems. The opposite is usually the case.

During the design and implementation of major maintenance schemes on the highway, the site will be inspected, and if there are any existing drainage problems, an effort is made to address these as part of the resurfacing work, both by making minor adjustments to the profile of the new surface, and also by making minor or significant improvements to the drainage system. Where schemes on the highway involve changes to kerblines, or the introduction of features such as dropped crossings, the design process takes levels into account to ensure effective drainage.

It is not possible or practical to ensure that there is never any ponding on the public highway, and it is evident that after heavy rain, ponding will occur. What is critical is the scale of ponding, and the length of time water remains on the public highway for. Resources are prioritised towards those instances

of ponding that affect public safety, or the ability to reasonably enjoy the use of the highway.

To ensure that problems of this nature do not continue, it is important that instances of concern are reported to Surrey Highways as soon as possible through the existing reporting systems (including the Surrey website), so that individual sites can be assessed by local Highways staff and appropriate action taken.

4. Question from Mrs Marshall

"GARIBALDI LAND, PART OF BISLEY COMMON

What is the position regarding the Garibaldi land? A BT post was erected near the Limecroft Road track entrance which I understood the Council objected to. A BT/Openreach fibre optic box was installed just before the entrance to the field.

- a) Has a wayleave been negotiated for these, and if not, why not?
- b) Why have these been allowed when the engineers who designed the Garibaldi crossroads traffic lights were unable to put their control box on the land?
- c) What is to stop BT/ Openreach operatives putting their van on the area and causing damage there?

There are other wayleaves covering this piece of land.

The track has been widened and the bunds decreased in height, cars for sale park in the Limecroft Road end and there are numerous vehicles parked on the other end of the track which has no drainage as it slopes away from the ditch, so it is impossible to walk on the track in bad weather. Why is there no supervision on the area?"

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Officers are not aware of any agreement with BT, but are investigating and will provide a written response to Mrs Marshall, copied to the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Local member following the meeting.



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(WOKING)**

MEMBER QUESTIONS

5 DECEMBER 2012

1. Question from Cllr Kevin Davis, Woking Borough Council

The Brookwood Crossroads is a significant bottle neck on the western side of Woking. It is the point at which the A322 and A324 cross. It has been the scene of many accidents over the years primarily due to signal confusion. It also causes rat running problems and speeding issues in other areas nearby as people do everything they can to avoid it (Blackhorse Road being one such road dealt with at the most recent Local Committee meeting).

The re-development ten years ago and the linking of the junction with the Cemetery Pales junction has had limited success with regards to safety, and has caused additional congestion due to waiting times. The A322 is prioritised over the A324 and it can mean that traffic begins to back up towards Woking on the A324 from half past four through to half past six with waiting times often exceeding 15 minutes to cross.

The Cala homes development is recommending changes to this junction to help the flow of the A322 which is welcome.

However, with development likely to occur outside of Woking Borough to include Bisley (old Fox garage), Deepcut, and possibly the old MoD site at Chertsey none of these developments will have to take into consideration the Brookwood Crossroads junction. Arguably, Deepcut will increase traffic along the A324 into Woking, Bisley and Chertsey will increase traffic along the A322 towards Brookwood railway station and Guildford.

The time for sticking plasters is over, an ambitious strategy and

www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking

redevelopment of this junction must be forthcoming.

What is SCC planning and if not planning anything why not?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The Brookwood Crossroads is recognised as a point of constraint on the highways network, as it is the crossing point of two heavily used A class roads. Work was carried out approximately ten years ago to reduce congestion and improve the flow of traffic at this location, and this did result in significant improvement. However, there has been a general increase in traffic levels across the network since this time, and there are many junctions that unfortunately now operate at or above their design capacity at certain times of the day.

The Cala Homes development at Brookwood Farm is going to result in some changes to the traffic signal timings, and an upgrade of the operating system. It must be recognised that the extent of what can be expected from any development is mitigation of the effects of the development being introduced, and not alleviation of highways issues that already exist. Being so close to the crossroads, this development is likely to have more of an impact on the junction than the Deepcut redevelopment. However, this does not mean that the impact of the traffic from Deepcut has not been considered. It is estimated that Deepcut will result in an additional 40 movements at the crossroads in each peak hour, which equates to about 1 extra vehicle per signal cycle.

The Fox Garage, Bisley development is relatively small, and Transportation Development Officers have advised that this is unlikely to have any significant impact on the crossroads, and may not be any worse than the traffic movements generated when it was a garage site. The MoD DERA site at Chertsey could conceivably generate additional traffic at the junction, but given the distance between the two locations, it is extremely difficult to assess the impact, which will be so diluted at the crossroads that it would not be practicable to estimate the traffic effects that might be created.

Plans do exist for a West End, Bisley and Knaphill bypass, although the southern extension of this, between Brookwood and Bisley, was abandoned in November 1999, shortly before the crossroads were modified. The land for this project has remained safeguarded, but later this year, it is likely that this status will be removed, as the project is no longer considered viable.

The proximity of the rail bridge and private dwellings does place significant physical constraints on what improvements could be introduced at this location, and it is correct that to achieve any further significant improvement, this would need to take the form of a major scheme, which is likely to require the acquisition of land, and would be administered through Transport for Surrey. Funding for major schemes is of course limited, and it is necessary to carefully prioritise schemes across the whole of the County Council, ensuring

that funding goes to those schemes that provide the greatest benefit to the residents of Surrey. This location does not presently form part of the proposed major schemes programme, but in view of the concerns expressed, this has been raised with Transport for Surrey for future consideration.

2. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

In the three months since the maintenance contract for the rising bus bollards separating Redding Way and Cobham Road in Knaphill was changed, how many times and for how long were the bollards not fully operational?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

We have had three reports of bollards stuck down since 1st August (new direct contract with ATG). The details are as follows:

23/8/12 - Bollards stuck down. Passed direct to ATG. We did not get a call to advise of the repair.

28/9/12 - Bollards stuck down. Passed direct to ATG. 1/10/12 ATG advised that their engineer would attend on 2/10/12. 2/10/12 ATG engineer attended and advised that the controller cabinet doors had been ripped off. He said that the hinges and possibly the doors would need replacing. He arranged for ATG to draw up a quote for the repairs. He also reported that there appeared to have been a power failure and that one of the bollards was not coming up properly. This would also need follow-up repairs. 23/10/12 Quote received from ATG for the door repair and they were instructed to proceed with the repair.

29/10/12 - Bollards stuck down. Passed direct to ATG. 30/10/12 ATG attended and replaced a signal head (red/green indicator), and repaired a fault on the card reader. He left the bollards fully operational.

On 7th November ATG carried out a routine service, so the bollards would have been out of action while the engineer worked on them that day, but this was not a fault.

3. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

The bus stands and shelters on the town side of Woking Station used by many residents in my Division every day while commuting are poorly maintained and deteriorating. Also cars and taxis habitually misuse the bus stands for parking and the layout of the stops does not deter this. Where does the responsibility for the improvement of Woking's *de facto* bus station lie, and what can this Committee do to improve the situation?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The responsibility for improvement of the bus station in Woking Town Centre is shared between Surrey County Council as Transport Authority, Woking Borough Council, and to some extent, SW Trains. It is recognised that this facility would benefit from improvement, and aspirations for this link with the development of the Town Centre itself. Complete revision of the bus station would be a major project, and works would need to be agreed in partnership between all stakeholders. The issue of cars and taxis using the bus stands is common to the majority of bus stops, with drivers pulling over for short periods to drop off and pick up passengers, and at certain times of the day Taxis waiting for longer periods. The bus service is not unduly affected by these activities, and it must be recognised that Taxis do form part of the network of transport options that residents and commuters rely upon.

The Local Committee can of course raise concerns with Surrey's Passenger Transport Group, and Woking Borough Council, if that is considered appropriate.

4. Question from Mrs Diana Smith, Surrey County Council

What is SCC doing to ensure that the 'through traffic only' sign in the narrow section of Barleymow Lane, Knaphill, is legally enforceable?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

There is presently signage stipulating a prohibition of motor vehicles in Barleymow Lane, Knaphill. However, it has not been possible to enforce this as historically, no Traffic Regulation Order had been introduced. To ensure that this prohibition can be enforced, a Traffic Regulation Order is now being promoted. This will shortly be advertised, and subject to their being no insurmountable objections, the Order will be made before the end of this financial year.

5. Question from Mr Geoff Marlow, Surrey County Council

When is the bollard outside Mr Nelson's house at 1 Pyrford Road, West Byfleet going to be replaced? This was first requested in September 2010.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The bollard in Pyrford Road has been scheduled for repair, and it is expected that this work will be completed by 7 December 2012 at the latest.

The order for this work was raised in May of this year, and there has unfortunately been a delay in this being implemented despite the matter being repeatedly chased with our contractor.

6. Question from Mrs Linda Kemeny, Surrey County Council

I am pleased that at long last a section of Hook Heath Road from Hook Heath Gardens to Saunders Lane has been resurfaced and the contractors have done a very good job. However, I had understood that the job would include all of that part of Hook Heath Road which had not been resurfaced for more than 10 years, namely the area from the Holly Bank Road junction to Hook Heath Gardens. When can I expect that part of Hook Heath Road to be resurfaced as it is in a very poor condition.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The recent resurfacing work carried out in Hook Heath Road was intended to address the part of the road that was in the worst condition, and it was not planned to resurface the remainder of the road at this time.

It is worth noting that resurfacing work is carried out in response to the condition of the road, and not the length of time that has elapsed since it was last resurfaced. The reason for this is that the life of a road surface can vary significantly depending upon the volume of traffic using the road, the material that the road is surfaced with, and other environmental factors.

The remainder of Hook Heath Road has been identified for resurfacing through the five year capital maintenance programme, but no programme date is available at this time. In view of the concerns that have been expressed about the remaining length, the Maintenance Engineer, Chris Higgs, has been asked to review the condition of the road surface and raise any minor repairs necessary to maintain the road in a safe condition prior to the future planned resurfacing works.

7. Question from Cllr John Kingsbury, Woking Borough Council

I would like to ask the Chairman the following question: Knowing your concern about speeding along Park Road (as years of evidence from Community Speed Watches have shown that there is an issue), would you and Surrey County Council advise residents how you intend to reduce speed along this road and, apart from providing parking spaces, identify the options available for what is becoming a significant problem.

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

I am very much aware of the concerns expressed by local residents about speeding in Park Road, Woking, and recognise the hard work that has been

put in by the local Speedwatch Group. I have been in close dialogue with Surrey Highways with the intention of addressing these concerns, and have received the following response:

Recent speed data collected by Surrey Police suggests that there is generally good compliance with the posted speed limit in Park Road. Before considering the introduction of speed reducing measures, it is recommended that a further week long speed survey is commissioned by Surrey Highways. It is proposed that the speed monitoring equipment is sited along Park Road at one or two different locations agreed by residents through the local County Councillor, recognising that the only constraint would be the need to attach the monitoring equipment to a lamp column or other item of street furniture. It is suggested that this survey is carried out in mid to late January 2013.

If the results of this survey confirms that speeding is a significant problem, the following measures could be considered as a means to address this, subject to available funding. It must be noted that some of these options would require the support of Surrey Police, the passing of a safety audit carried out by Surrey County Council's Safety Engineering Team, and the formal approval of the Woking Local Committee together with the promotion of a relevant Traffic Regulation Order:

1) Vehicle activated signs (VAS)

Signs are best placed in pairs and would cost in the region of £4500 per pair.

2) Build-out at entrance to Park Road

It is understood that this is one of the options favoured by some residents, and this has recently been discussed during a site meeting with the Local County Councillor. There are site constraints, and consideration would have to be given to the proximity of underground services. Although Surrey Highways are in the process of establishing what services are present, this option is not considered to be appropriate to effectively address speeding along Park Road, and at best, if it were to be introduced, would only reduce vehicle speeds over a limited distance at the Maybury Inn end of the road.

3) Physical traffic calming

If speeding is a significant problem then physical speed reducing features can be considered. These would generally take the form of speed cushions or speed bumps. Such measures tend to be met with a mixed reception from residents, as some do not like being affected by them. Physical traffic calming features should not be introduced in isolation and should preferably have entry and exit features. To address speeds along the entire road it would be necessary to put eight pairs of speed cushions in place together with illuminated warning signs at each end of the road. Speed cushions cost approximately £1800 per pair, and the illuminated signs would cost in the region of £10k, and so subject to the solution chosen, and there being no complications with drainage, a scheme for Park Road would cost in the region of £25-26k.

4) Introduction of parking bays

This can be an effective alternative to speed bumps or speed cushions. Although Park Road falls within the existing Controlled Parking Zone, it would be possible to introduce a limited number of parking bays without time restrictions to reduce vehicle speeds. Although this could potentially encourage a limited number of commuters to park in the road all day, numbers would be restricted, and this would have very little impact on residents.

Guidance on Surrey County Council's approach to traffic calming can be found by following this link:

http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/166422/Traffic-Calming-Good-Practice-Guide.pdf

8. Question from Cllr Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Holyoake Avenue, Horsell

Recent repairs have taken place mostly to the driveways rather than the highway itself. The repairs are welcome however the standard of the workmanship is a concern. The next heavy rains will lift the tarmac and the situation reverts to repairs being required again. What remedial action is to be taken to ensure the above mentioned scenario does not occur?

Could the actual highway outside 27 and 29 be examined and any holes filled in?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Holyoake Avenue has been identified by the NW Area Team for inclusion in the County Council's five year capital maintenance programme. However, in view of the concerns expressed by Councillor Branagan, the Community Highway Officer, Matt Borrie, has been instructed to visit and assess the quality of work recently carried out to the pavements. If repairs have not been carried out to a satisfactory standard, or fail prematurely, further repairs are carried out at the contractor's expense. Whilst undertaking this site inspection, the carriageway in the vicinity of Nos 27 and 29 will also be inspected, and any safety defects identified will be raised for repair.

It should be noted that works carried out by highways contractors are routinely audited, and any quality issues identified are raised for appropriate action. The County Council also operates a robust Highways Inspection system, and regularly inspects the highway network, identifying safety and non-safety defects, and arranging for repairs to be carried out as necessary.

9. Question from Tony Branagan, Woking Borough Council

Weight Restriction Post, Carthouse Lane

This is the THIRD time a written question has been put on this topic. A site visit on 28 November shows the request has not been resolved. The post is adjacent to the entrance of Greenbays Park. It has been knocked over into the hedge and the growth during the summer means the sign is not visible.

In view of the number of requests to have this matter resolved is the Chairman able to provide a specific date for the necessary work to be undertaken?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

Repairs to the Weight Restriction sign and post in Carthouse Lane have been organised by Surrey Highways, and it is expected that these works will be completed within the next 21 days (before the Christmas period).

Please accept my apologies on behalf of Surrey Highways for the delay in this work being completed.

10. Question from Cllr Bryan Cross, Woking Borough Council

Would the Local Transport Manager please let me know when he anticipates that the Street Lights in Lockfield Drive close to the Victoria Way junction will be repaired as they have been out of action for several weeks now?

Would he also please confirm that the markings will be painted on the shared cycle/pedestrian path opposite Sythwood School during the current construction of the new crossing?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

The street lights in Lockfield Drive close to the junction with Victoria Way are out of action due to a failure of the power supply, rather than there being a maintenance issue with the lights themselves.

This was raised with UK Power Networks on 24th October, and the service level agreement allows 30 working days for them to effect repairs. A firm date for repairs has been requested, but unfortunately no date has yet been given. To comply with service standards repairs should take place no later than 5 December 2012.

With regard to the shared facility markings in the vicinity of Sythwood School, it is intended that these will be applied at the same time as the new crossing facility markings.

11. Question from Mr Will Forster, Surrey County Council

There are County Council Rights of Way in my division that connect South Woking with Guildford Borough and Send.

For sometime now the footpaths and bridges near Moor Lane and Runtley Wood Lane have not been accessible.

Please could the Chairman confirm when the necessary repairs will be undertaken and when the Rights of Way can be fully open to the public?

Answer from Chairman on behalf of the committee:

There is currently one closure in the area on a short section of Send FP 52. The reason is that the second vehicular bridge east of Fishers Farm is considered to be unsafe for the public to use. This is a privately owned bridge which also carries a public footpath. The estimated costs for this bridge could be in excess of 80k and until recently the landowner has not been interested in partnership working. We sought legal counsel as to responsibility and it has been confirmed that Surrey County Council does not have a maintenance liability for this bridge and neither does the landowner. We are very keen to reopen this footpath and so have been investigating alternative solutions that do not involve the existing vehicular bridge. However this situation is constantly changing and we are now waiting for the landowner to supply a specification and costing to either repair or replace the bridge. Once we receive these we will be able to consider what our actions will be.

This page is intentionally left blank