

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford LOCAL COMMITTEE
 held at 7.00 pm on 19 September 2017
 at Council Chamber, Guildford Borough Council, Millmead House, Millmead,
 Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Keith Taylor (Chairman)
- * Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mrs Julie Iles
- * Mr Matt Furniss
- * Mrs Angela Goodwin
- * Mr David Goodwin
- * Mrs Marsha Moseley
- Mrs Fiona White
- * Mr Keith Witham

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Cllr Paul Spooner (Vice-Chairman)
- * Cllr David Bilbe
- * Cllr Nils Christiansen
- * Borough Councillor Nigel Kearse
- * Borough Councillor Julia McShane
- * Borough Councillor Tony Phillips
- * Borough Councillor Mike Piper
- * Borough Councillor David Reeve
- * Borough Councillor David Wright

* In attendance

1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fiona White and Graham Ellwood.

2/17 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The Guildford Local Committee agreed the draft minutes as a true reflection of the meeting.

3/17 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 3]

The report was provided to update Members on progress with Decisions made by the Local Committee. The Chairman and Vice- Chairman have recently updated it to ensure that it is still relevant.

4/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

ITEM 3

There were no declarations of interest of made.

5/17 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 5]

One petition was received from Heather Jones - Finish off relaying the Stoughton Road surface in Guildford.

Nick Holloway asked a supplementary question:

Why isn't this work to Stoughton Road in the Horizon plan and why has it been allowed to get into this state of disrepair? We would like to be present at any re-assessment of the road.

Local Members supported the petition and stated that there was heavy traffic on this road. The Highways officer response to the petition had been published as a supplementary paper to the agenda.

6/17 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

One question was raised in the informal public question session before the start of the Committee. The question and response is attached as Annex B.

Two formal written public questions were received.

The first public question was presented by Roy Davey, Chairman of Shere Parish Council

'Will the committee now actually consider and make a decision on our specific and localised petition, of June 2014 to establish a ban on HGVs over 7.5 ton from travelling through Shere Village?'

The officer response to the question was published as a supplementary paper to the agenda and is attached as Annex A.

Supplementary question:

Will the Committee re-look at the petition which was requesting a very specific local ban to stop HGVS going through Shere not an area wide ban.

Members commented that Middle Street in Shere is not able to cope with heavy vehicles and there has been damage to ancient buildings and asked the Committee not to lose sight of this issue.

The second public question was presented by Hugh Anscombe from the Guildford Society Transport Group.

Would SCC and GBC be prepared to consider two ideas relating to Onslow Park and Ride? The officer response to the question was published as a supplementary paper to the agenda and is attached as Annex A.

Supplementary question:

Please can we have a breakdown of the cost and number of users of the Onslow Park and Ride?

The Parking Manager informed the Committee that the park and ride facts and figures are published in his annual parking report.

7/17 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 7]

Two Member Questions were received.

At the July Local Committee meeting, it was explained that the urgent resurfacing work on the Hog's Back A31 was being funded out of the Project Horizon scheme which has resulted in a number of roads being knocked off the programme.

Question 1 from County Councillor Angela Goodwin

Question: Which roads have been knocked off the Project Horizon scheme and what does the latest prioritisation list / revised resurfacing list look like now for Guildford?

Answer 1

Unfortunately these costs, in the region of £800K, will need to be funded from the capital maintenance budget. At this stage SCC do not need to alter the published list of schemes on the Horizon 2 programme. Any scheme postponement will be identified through normal programme management e.g. where a clash with utility works occurs. The 'future schemes for consideration list' are only provisional and therefore replacement schemes will not be identified as future budgets remain uncertain.

Question 2 from County Councillor David Goodwin

Question: The Hog's Back A31 was resurfaced in the not too distant past. Was this work covered by its contractor and, if so, is Surrey Highways looking to claim the £800k costs (or part thereof) from the contractor and, if it is unable to do so, what is the permanent solution to source the missing funding that was required to undertake these urgent repairs?

Answer 2

The costs for emergency works on the A31 Hogs Back will not be recovered under any guarantee from previous surfacing scheme suppliers. The material that was removed from the top layer to allow the new surfacing to be applied was a previous surface dressing in excess of ten years old.

8/17 PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF ALL VEHICLES ON PART OF BYWAYS OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC NOS. 518 & 519 AMENDMENT ORDER (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

The Chairman introduced the item and explained that Rights of Way matters are dealt with slightly differently as they are a quasi-judicial function. The Chairman gave Members the opportunity to declare any interests in the item.

ITEM 3

Members had resolved at their meeting on 6 July 2017 to advertise a Notice of Intention to make a TRO Amendment Order:

- (i) That a Notice of Intention to make a Traffic Regulation Amendment Order (TRO) be published as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/54/H22 (Annex A). Where significant (and relevant) objections are received, or no objections are received, to delegate to the Countryside Access Manager the ability to agree whether an Order may be made, in consultation with the Divisional Member, and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The TRO would not be made until a detailed highway improvement works plan for Ash Green Lane West has been approved.
- (ii) To delegate to the Countryside Access Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member the ability to accede to any unresolved objections and decide whether the TRO may be made.
- (iii) Where substantial (and relevant) objections are received, or significant modifications proposed, the Countryside Access Manager in consultation with the Divisional Member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, may refer the decision on whether the TRO be made back to the Committee.

The Notice, Draft Order, Statement of Reasons and details for making Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders were published on 14 July. Twenty-eight objections were received within the statutory period. In light of the public interest evidenced by the number of objections the Countryside Access Manager has referred this matter back to Committee. Members were asked to consider the objections and to decide whether the legal and policy criteria for making the TRO Amendment Order still apply. Members may then decide whether the Order should be made. Alternatively, Members may decide to hold a Public Inquiry to decide the matter. There is no legal requirement to hold a Public Inquiry. The recommendation to Members is that the TRO Amendment Order should be made as advertised.

Speakers in favour, objecting and the applicant's response:

In favour: (no notifications of speakers were received)

Objector:

Ms S Wyeth-Price stated that the TRO is no longer relevant and the Council have no legal obligation to lift the TRO on the BOAT in order to give the land over to the development. The TRO is not a requirement for planning permission.

In addition, the BOAT Modification Order Report is factually incorrect in many places and misleading. The report states that plans have been approved when they have not been and the BOAT Modification Order report has merged several statements into one quote to make it appear to the public, and to the councillors, that this is a condition imposed by the Planning Inspectorate when it is not.

Work has been started on the development, specifically the installation of a new surface to BOAT 518, safety and drainage are significant concerns. The road is not wide enough for motorised traffic and the proposal is unsafe.

The BOAT is used by walkers, horse riders and cyclists many of them children this section will connect to the made-up lane directly into the path of on-coming traffic. The BOAT will also increase parking on this narrow road making it more unsafe. The BOAT is unsuitable for the site conditions. The current development drains into the old surface causing flooding. The BOAT has already been temporarily re-surfaced and is already flooding to a greater degree. The new surface of the road is likely to de-grade in the first few years creating flooding water on the surface and exacerbating the flooding further.

This application should be referred to a public enquiry or be denied.

Applicant:

Andy Morris from Bewley Homes stated that they would be surfacing the BOAT and there would be a separate footway for pedestrians. The Planning Inspector had said that the BOAT Modification Order would be a change of use but it was acceptable to re-use the road. The applicant has entered into a S.278 agreement with Surrey County Council and were working to meet the requirements to clear all the ditches, lay the footpath and lay a porous surface on the road. The road will be suitable for motorised vehicles, they are aware of the concerns with drainage works yet to be completed however this will improve drainage and all year round accessibility.

The Countryside Access Manager responded to Ms S Wyeth-Price representations. He informed the Committee that the obligation to amend the TRO does not come directly from the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, but from the Council's own policy and the acceptance of the access road as safe and suitable for public use from the s278 agreement. Not amending the TRO would effectively contradict these documents/decisions.

He confirmed that the report to the Committee was correct/accurate and as far as he was aware the plans have been approved by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) Drainage. He was not sure whether the works have been completed to the satisfaction of GBC Drainage, but this was an issue for them to follow up.

Comments on s.278 and planning process are not relevant. The temporary closure order is required to ensure public safety during works. SCC agreed construction of the temporary road. Site access for clearance would cause significant deterioration of the previous unmade surface, so permission was given to build a temporary road. Comments on s. 278 are not relevant for determination of TRO amendment. The route will remain open to persons on horseback or foot.

Road widths set out in the Council's Definitive Statement are legal widths, which are not always practically available for public use, due to issues such as vegetation growth.

Surrey county Council (SCC) are satisfied that the access road will be safe and suitable for public use. Flooding and drainage has been a longstanding issue on the BOAT. Implementation of the approved Drainage Plan aims to

ITEM 3

mitigate any effects from the development. The BOAT is already an adopted highway.

The Local County and District Councillors commented that there are issues around land ownership, flooding and drainage surrounding the BOAT, however there were no legal issues to prevent the BOAT going ahead. The Local County Councillor requested two actions to be included in the recommendation (please see amended recommendation below).

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that:

The Surrey County Council Ash Green Lane West (Right of Way No. 518, D80) and Spoil Lane (Right of Way No. 519, D74) in the Parishes of Ash, Normandy and Tongham) (Prohibition of Through Traffic) Amendment Order 2017 as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/54/H22 be made, **following the conditions being met:**

- (1) An adequate flooding plan is in place having been agreed by the Countryside Access Team Manager in consultation with the Strategic Network Resilience Team, Area Highways Manager and Divisional Member**
- (2) Highways plans are updated to include drainage for this scheme**

Reasons: Officers support the application to make an Amendment Order to allow public vehicular access to the new housing development on the basis that the BOAT will be surfaced to withstand traffic. The Order would meet the legal and policy criteria for making such Orders.

Members voted on the recommendations:

For: 15

Against: None

Abstaining: 3

9/17 GUILDFORD ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW - CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSALS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

The report presented the representations resulting from the formal advertisement of proposals for new or changed parking restrictions listed in paragraph 1.2. The Committee was asked to consider the comments received and decide whether or not to make traffic regulation orders needed to introduce the proposals.

The Local Committee (Guildford) agreed that, having considered the comments made during the formal notice period, 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 as shown in Annex 3 of the agenda report, but that the proposals in Pewley Hill (upper) and Tormead Road are not progressed at the present time.

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the outcome of local stakeholder engagement regarding HGV management measures.

To enable the proposed concept to be brought to the Local Committees of neighbouring boroughs and districts (Mole Valley and Waverley) for agreement and subsequently included in a future Local Transport Strategy forward programme of transport measures for implementation via appropriate funding streams.

10/17 GUILDFORD SUSTAINABLE MOVEMENT CORRIDOR - PUBLIC CONSULTATION (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

The report presented details of the public consultation for the Sustainable Movement Corridor: West (SMC1) transport project. This project has been developed by Guildford Borough Council over the last two years and represents the first project from a package of transport measures which Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council will be submitting for funding this financial year. These works will be primarily funded by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP) with match funding from Guildford Borough Council, the Environment Agency and other sources.

The paper explained the process being followed and made all Members of Local Committee aware of the proposed plans and the consultation; the consultation formally commenced on 18th September with two public meetings planned in October.

Members endorsed the consultation approach to the Sustainable Movement Corridor West (SMC1) transport project.

The Local Committee (Guildford) acknowledged that the public consultation on the SMC1 is underway as described in the report.

Reasons for recommendations

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the project and the consultation process and to enable Members to provide their feedback on the proposals and share the information with constituents during the consultation period.

11/17 SHERE RURAL AREA HGV REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]

Members asked how the Quiet Lane/Unsuitable for HGV pilot zone would be enforced and what alternative routes would HGVs travel on. Officers informed members that advisory signs would be put up. Members commented that a proper monitoring investigation needs to be undertaken as part of the pilot in and around the area using base line data and then gathering data after the signs have been in place for a period of time. Officers stated that base line data was available in the feasibility report and that it would be of benefit to undertake monitoring.

Members discussed the usefulness of Sat Nav data from the HGV lorries which could be useful for monitoring purposes.

ITEM 3

Action: Officers to look into whether there is route information available from sat Nav providers that would be helpful for data monitoring purposes.

Members also queried whether an HGV ban would be possible, the pilot wouldn't prevent an HGV ban in the future however HGVs still need to be given access to areas and it would be difficult to enforce a full HGV ban.

The Chairman stated that the pilot would be looking for financial support from Waverley and Mole Valley Local Committees also covering the pilot area.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Acknowledged the outcome of continued dialogue with local parish councils regarding the development of HGV interventions in the area.
- (ii) Agreed the concept of a proposed 'Quiet Lane / Unsuitable for HGV' pilot zone to cover a defined area of the Surrey Hills (as set out in Annex C) within the wider study area.

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure that Members are kept informed of the outcome of local stakeholder engagement regarding HGV management measures.

To enable the proposed concept to be brought to the Local Committees of neighbouring boroughs and districts (Mole Valley and Waverley) for agreement and subsequently included in a future Local Transport Strategy forward programme of transport measures for implementation via appropriate funding streams.

12/17 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS - UPDATE [Item 13]

The Cabinet Member for Highways Councillor Colin Kemp updated the Committee on highway budgets and funds spent in Guildford on road improvement schemes and the Horizon 2 project on roads and pavements. He confirmed that 80% of Local Committee highways funding had been reduced however overall 90 million was being spent this year on highways in Surrey. Councillor Kemp stated that more needed to be done to publicise the amount being spent on highways improvements.

The Cabinet Member asked for Member's action and views on:

- How developer's funds can be used and accessed
- Scrutinising how parking enforcement funding has been applied
- Considering how to charge for parking around commercial centres
- Charging for on-street parking

Members discussed the reduced Highways funding to the Committee and in Surrey. Councillor Kemp explained that criteria is used to prioritise which road schemes to undertake through Project Horizon. He recommended the Highways on-line system on the Surrey County Council website for members

of the public and councillors to report highways issues. He asked for members views on local highways issues and asked them to copy the local County Councillor in on any e-mails to him. Councillor Kemp also said that he would like to bring a report on what is being proposed in terms of highways for the next 12 months to a future Guildford Local Committee meeting.

**13/17 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE ANNUAL REPORT (FOR INFORMATION)
[Item 9]**

The Surrey Fire and Rescue item was postponed until after the Cabinet Member's Update item as the meeting had progressed more quickly than expected.

The report outlined the major strands of activity undertaken within the Guildford area by the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) teams based at Guildford and Gomshall Fire Stations during 2016 – 17. It contained information on the various activities undertaken by the Borough team to reduce the risk from fire, water and road traffic incidents to the residents of Guildford Borough, including direct contact, public education programmes and campaigns. Relevant County wide activity was also included. Appendix 1 to the report provided specific Key Performance Indicators for SFRS.

Members asked how they could assist the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service the Group Commander for North West Surrey responded that the Committee could help by supporting the service's public safety plan and supporting Senior Fire Officers to meet their budgetary requirements sooner rather than later.

Members expressed thanks to the Fire and Rescue Service for all their hard work. Members also asked how the service compares with others across the country. The Group Commander informed the Committee that in the last 10 years there has been a significant reduction in fires across the United Kingdom and in Surrey the service has outstanding equipment and training and are the fittest in the country. Members requested that if any hotspots came up in Surrey to make them aware.

Guildford Local Committee agreed to:

Recognise the achievements of SFRS teams both within Guildford and across the County this year, support their commitment in further identifying and improving initiatives to reduce risk and make the Borough of Guildford safer especially for those more vulnerable within the community.

Reasons:

SFRS dedicates a great deal of time in supporting the safety of members of Guildford's Communities. It is important to appreciate that the requirement for and themes of initiatives will change to meet identified needs within the community, for which continued support throughout the year and into the future is essential to allow maximum effect.

**14/17 PEDESTRIAN SAFETY ON BRIDGE STREET, GUILDFORD (EXECUTIVE
FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 14]**

ITEM 3

The report provided an update on the development of proposals to improve pedestrian safety on Bridge Street, Guildford. This followed a road traffic collision on 20 February 2016 that led to the deaths of two pedestrians. This issue was the subject of a petition to the council on 17 May 2016. It was subsequently considered by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board on 9 June 2016 and then again on 2 March 2017 where it was recommended that officers continue to undertake work to refine the design proposals before presenting the final options to the Guildford Local Committee for approval and funding consideration.

Members asked the Cabinet Member for Highways if the proposals for Bridge Street would be centrally funded as originally agreed.

Action: Councillor Kemp to check the central Highways budget to ensure that funding had been allocated for this work and come back to the Committee and Road Safety Team Manager.

Members queried why the raised tables were going to be put in a different position at the pedestrian road crossing rather than the location of the collision. The Road Safety Team Manager informed members that there is a pattern of incidents that have occurred at the pedestrian crossing. Members also discussed whether it would be better to go with Option C in the report to improve the traffic signal sequence and signals for pedestrians. The officer stated that he wasn't convinced that signalling timing would reduce collisions but it was likely to increase delay times and traffic congestion. Members also discussed the general issues with pedestrians crossing that stretch of road such as not using the crossing and crossing in between traffic at different points on the road.

The question was raised whether possible issues of introducing raised tables at the crossing for cyclists and motorcyclists had been considered. Officers had discussed this with the police and consequently the tables will be made perpendicular with the road.

The Local Committee agreed that:

- (i) The proposals to provide raised road tables at the signalised crossing points across Onslow Street at the junction with Bridge Street, described within this report as Option B, proceeds to implementation. This will be funded from central county council budgets separate from the budget allocated to the local committee for highway improvements.
- (ii) A traffic regulation order to implement the raised road tables will be advertised and authority delegated to the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Members for Guildford South West and Guildford South East to consider any objections before proceeding.

Reasons: Analysis has highlighted a pattern of pedestrian casualties at the junction of Bridge Street with Onslow Street in Guildford. The proposals will help to reduce the risk of further pedestrian collisions and will improve the facilities for pedestrians when crossing the road at this important link between the railway station and town centre.

15/17 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 15]

The report provided an update on the 2017/18 programme of highway improvement and maintenance works funded by this committee. It also provided an update on other centrally funded projects being promoted in the local area.

Members queried the location of the proposed raised tables on North Street and whether the road was going to be re-surfaced. The Road Safety Manager had highlighted with Guildford Borough colleagues additional safety work to be undertaken as part of any further development of North Street. The Highways Manager informed members that the intention is to re-surface North Street at the same time as the table is installed.

The Highways Manager updated the Committee that work on Compton Bridge will take place in March 2017 for 3- 4 months and HGV traffic will be diverted leading to lorries coming through Guildford town centre.

Action: Highways Manager to arrange a public meeting on the intended works to Compton Bridge.

The Local Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Noted the capital works completed and expenditure to date.
- (ii) Noted the ongoing revenue works being carried out.
- (iii) Approved the introduction of the road table in North Street, as shown at Annex 2 (paragraphs 2.6.1 - 2.6.6 as per the agenda report)

Reasons for recommendations:

The recommendations are intended to facilitate delivery of the 2017-18 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee, whilst at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

16/17 FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

The Chairman updated Members that the Local Committee on 6 December had been moved to 13 December due to a meeting clash.

Meeting ended at: 9.35 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank