

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 4.00 pm on 17 March 2021
at Remote.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Committee Members:

- * Borough Cllr John Rigg (Chairman)
- * County Cllr Keith Taylor (Vice-Chairman)
- * Borough Cllr Joss Bigmore (
- * County Councillor Mark Brett Warburton
- * County Cllr Matt Furniss
- * County Cllr Angela Goodwin
- * County Cllr David Goodwin
- * Borough Cllr Jan Harwod
- * County Cllr Julie Iles
- * Borough Cllr Julia McShane
- * Borough Cllr Bob McShee
- * County Cllr Marsha Moseley
- Borough Cllr Susan Parker
- * Borough Cllr George Potter
- * Borough Cllr Jo Randall
- * Borough Cllr Pauline Searle
- * Borough Cllr Paul Spooner
- * County Cllr Fiona White
- * County Cllr Keith Witham

* In attendance

31/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

No apologies for absence were received.

32/20 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th November 2020 were approved as a correct record.

33/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

34/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

It was noted that Graham Ellwood was no longer a County Councillor. Cllr David Goodwin would not be standing for re-election at the local elections in May, and the Chairman thanked him for his years of service to the Joint Committee. He also thanked former councillor Caroline Reeves, who had resigned from Guildford Borough Council the week before this meeting, and noted her contribution to GBC across a range of topics as well as her period

as Leader. Cllr Jan Harwood, who was taking up the vacant seat on the committee, was welcomed.

The Chairman particularly thanked the vice-chairman Cllr Keith Taylor, also not seeking re-election in May. Cllr Taylor had been a borough councillor for 32 years and in May will have served as county councillor for 12 years, with periods as chairman of both the Local and Joint Committees. Cllr Rigg thanked him for his impartial advice and support over the last year.

Good progress on the Walnut Tree Close and the new Walnut Bridge works was noted.

An announcement on the M25 junction 10 is expected in May.

The Chairman highlighted the A3 congestion as an area of continuing concern where GBC and the County Council, with the support of local MPs, need to continue pressing the government for a resolution.

Ripley Parish Council had contacted the Joint Committee in December 2020 asking for a meeting to discuss potential levels of traffic resulting from proposed housing developments. A written reply was sent to the Parish Council addressing their areas of concern. The Joint Committee is kept updated on developments by the Infrastructure Delivery and Transportation working group, which includes the Divisional members whose areas cover Send and Burnt Common.

35/20 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers Attending: Bahram Assadi, Traffic Engineer, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: Three petitions were received before the deadline. The full wording of the petitions and officer responses were available to view within the agenda.

5a – Petition to: Create a pedestrian crossing at the dangerous crossing point by the railway bridge on Saltbox Road, so that pedestrians may safely access Whitmoor Common via the public footpath.

The lead petitioner, Mr Michael Bambrough, attended the meeting. He addressed the committee and stressed the problems of crossing Saltbox Road safely particularly with a young family and a dog. The situation has discouraged him from making the journey from his home to Whitmoor Common.

The Traffic Engineer confirmed that the path will be extended on both sides of the road in order to locate the crossing point farther from the railway bridge and to give drivers better sight lines as they approach.

Members noted the officer's response.

5b – Petition to: Make the Guildown Road/ Portsmouth Road junction safer. The lead petitioner, Ms Christie did not attend the meeting to present the petition. However, she had sent a written response which the Chairman read out. The text is included as Annex 1 to these minutes.

Cllr D Goodwin stated that he supported the officer's report and that he would be discussing possible solutions in a meeting with the Traffic Engineer two days after this committee; the committee would be updated on progress.

Members noted the officer's response.

5c – Petition to: Increase the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on Quarry Street, Castle Street and Castle Hill by carrying out a traffic speed survey and introducing restrictions and/or limits for HGVs travelling on these roads. The lead petitioner, Mrs Liz Pomeroy, attended the meeting. She thanked the officers she had spoken to prior to the meeting and reiterated her sense of how Quarry Street has become busier with resident and visitor traffic especially as it is now part of the town's Heritage Quarter.

Members raised the following points:

- Pedestrians tend to walk off the pavements at the High Street end of Quarry Street as if it were pedestrianised.
- The area near the bend from the High Street is dangerous as vehicles come around.
- The possibility of a speed cushion near the Star Inn has been discussed with the Traffic Engineer.
- At the corner of Quarry Street and Castle Street it might be possible to change the kerb alignment and also to install a second bollard. Exactly what might be achievable would depend, among other things, on what utilities run under the site and where they are.

Members noted the officer's response.

36/20 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers Attending: Steve Howard, Transport Strategy Project Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: One member question was received before the deadline. The question and officer response were available to view within the agenda.

Cllr Angela Goodwin asked the following supplementary questions:
Will future plans include charging points at accessible (ie larger) bays?
Will the Joint Committee be included in discussions as part of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) process?

Key points from discussion:

The Transport Strategy Project Manager stated that most of the areas chosen for the installation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points do include one bay for larger cars. In future provision, if space allows then a larger bay will be included. He added that there would be further engagement on LTP4 following the forthcoming County Council elections in May.

Cooperation with the University of Surrey – and also the Research Park – is ongoing (the former project manager from the County Council had been a

speaker at a symposium on electric vehicles hosted by the University). A new Electric Vehicle Project Manager role has recently been created at the County Council to progress the delivery of the charging points and to oversee publicity to maintain the profile of the county's work on this project. Electric vehicles and the associated infrastructure are an important aspect of LTP4, and work will be progressing again fully once covid-related restrictions have been removed.

37/20 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers Attending: Steve Howard, Transport Strategy Project Manager, SCC

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: Two questions were received before the deadline. The full wording of the questions was available to view within the supplementary agenda.

Question 1 from Mr Carl Cookson, on public access to Ash Ranges.

Key points from discussion:

Members expressed support for the local residents whose access to the MOD-owned Ash Ranges has been restricted over the past year. The importance of access to open areas for exercise during the period of covid restrictions was emphasised. Although Ash is on the western boundary of the borough, it is the only urban area outside Guildford Town and represents a large proportion of our residential area. In addition, the large number of new housing developments that have received planning permission which will increase the pressure from local residents to find outdoor areas for exercise and recreation.

It was noted that while the majority of the Ash Ranges site (88%, 3027 acres) remains open to the public on days when the MOD is not training, the 12% (413 acres) making up the Ash Range Firing Complex (AFRC) has been permanently closed since April 2021. The AFRC area is the most accessible part of the site for people with reduced mobility as it is predominantly flat and has good surfaces. It is also the most straightforward route to reach to the larger area; its closure means residents need to follow the perimeter path, which is poor quality and hilly.

As the land-owner, the MOD is acting according to the bylaws, but despite the efforts of Ash Parish Council it has not provided clear evidence to support its decision to close the ARFC. Discussions are continuing to try and find a solution that both sides would be happy with, but progress is very slow; the local MP is also now involved.

The MOD had provided a statement to the committee outlining the current situation but as a response the committee felt it was unsatisfactory. Members felt that it would make a difference if the MOD and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) knew that the whole of Guildford borough is behind the local residents in their wish to have access to the whole Ash Ranges area again.

Mr Cookson stressed that the ARFC is the most important area, especially during this period of lockdown and the importance of outdoor exercise coupled with restrictions on wider travel; any pressure the Joint Committee could bring to bear would be welcome.

Question 2 from Dr Nigel Burke (GBUG), on possible funding for 'mini Holland' infrastructure.

Key points from discussion:

Dr Burke reminded the committee about the report that GBC had commissioned on cycle routes in Guildford town, and stated that although Low Traffic Neighbourhoods formed an important part of any plans it was also the connections over the A3, the railway, the river and main routes such as Ladymead, and through to the town centre that are important.

The Transport Strategy Project Manager responded to Dr Burke's question, acknowledging his suggestions; he said that SCC is prioritising active travel as part of its response to covid-19 and it will be an important element of LTP4, to which Dr Burke's suggestions would be taken. In addition, Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plans (LCWIPs) are being developed across the county, which would produce a network of routes between key destinations. These schemes would then provide the basis for funding applications. Guildford is in the second tranche for this (with Spelthorne, Surrey Heath and Mole Valley), which is scheduled for implementation in September.

Local interest and community groups (including GBUG), Resident Associations, parishes etc would be consulted as widely as possible in the preparation of the LCWIP plans. Ward councillors would be able to provide suggestions of contacts.

Cllr White left the meeting at this point.

The Cabinet Member for Highways confirmed that Atkins is doing all the work on LCWIPs across the county, which will promote consistency and cross-border continuity between boroughs. The first stage covers feasibility and design work, followed by submission of a business case and bids for funding. The Dept. for Transport has been clear that funding for future walking and cycling improvements would only be offered if an LCWIP is in place.

38/20 PARKING & AIR QUALITY WORKING GROUP – PARKING REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Andy Harkin, Parking Manager, Chris Wheeler, Head of Operational and Technical Services, Lisa Haydney, On-Street Parking Coordinator, Guildford Borough Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

The vice-chairman reminded the committee that the Parking & Air Quality working group had considered all the recommendations for new parking restrictions to arrive at those included in the report.

There was discussion about exactly which recommendations should be removed from the list, using combinations of score achieved and age. It was noted that any that were removed could be resubmitted by residents at a later date, which would allow them opportunities to engage at pre-covid levels to discuss which areas might benefit from changes in parking restrictions and why.

The On-Street Parking Coordinator stated that recommendations with a score of less than 5 would have reached this low score through a combination of accident history, proximity to schools, bus routes etc., as well as through the results of publicity. With a threshold for inclusion at the current level of 20, these schemes would be unlikely to be addressed over the coming reviews. The threshold might come down over subsequent reviews, but new higher-scoring recommendations might be introduced as well.

Cllr McShane left the meeting at this point.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Guildford) AGREED:

- (i) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals developed in respect to shown in annexe 1 (8 locations)
- (ii) to formally advertise Surrey County Council's (SCC's) intention to make an order for the proposals prioritised by the P&AQWG and shown in annexe 2, which include locations from the List of Requests that score 20 points or above (35 locations).
- (iii) that in respect to recommendations (i) and (ii), if no representations are received, the proposed controls be introduced, or if representations are received that these will be considered by the Parking Manager, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair, and respective ward and divisional members, and the way forward determined.
- (iv) in respect to the List of Requests shown in annexe 3, remove all requests that score 5 points or less (66 locations), or which score between 6-10 and have remained on the list for more than 5 years without being progressed (potentially up to 114 locations).
- (v) to an appraisal by officers of the methodology associated with parking reviews in preparation for the next review with a view to improving the transparency of the process.

Reasons for recommendations:

To:

- (i) assist with safety, access and traffic movement,
- (ii) increase the availability of parking space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities,
- (iii) make local parking improvements.

39/20 HIGHWAYS JOINT COMMITTEE BUDGET 21/22 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Frank Apicella, Area Highway Manager (SW), Surrey County Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

The Area Highway Manager outlined the additional funding that is available for 2021/22, amounting to a share of an extra £4 million, and this will enable 21 schemes on the ITS running list to be addressed in the coming financial year, rather than the original selection of just three schemes. The Chairman and other members welcomed this announcement, and thanked the Cabinet Member for his work.

Resolved:

The Guildford Joint Committee:

- (i) NOTED the committee approved allocations and works progressed during 2020/21
- (ii) AGREED the recommendations made in this report for utilising the available highways budget for 2021/22. (Paragraph 2.1.8 - 2.1.12 refers.)
- (iii) DELEGATED to the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member, the ability to resolve any problems encountered, to facilitate scheme delivery throughout the year.

Reasons for recommendations:

The committee is asked to agree the recommendations to enable progression of works orders and expenditure of the Committee budget.

40/20 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]

The Forward Plan was noted.

It was noted that a review of the Joint Committee's two working groups is planned, along with the review of the Parking Review process as agreed under Item 8.

41/20 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

The recommendations in the decision tracker were agreed as described. Item 10 was also marked as closed and removed from the list.

42/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 30th June 2021. Details on the format are to be confirmed.

Meeting ended at: 5.54 pm

Chairman