



WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 10 NOV 2021

SUBJECT: WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

DIVISION: WOKING

Question 1 – from County Councillor Will Forster

At the March meeting of the Woking Joint Committee, it was agreed to consult local people on designating Park Road and White Rose Lane as 20mph areas.

Please can the Committee confirm what progress has been made on this?

Answer

It is appreciated that the Joint Committee would like to consult local people on designating Park Road and White Rose Lane as 20mph areas or zone. Details of how to progress a request for changing a speed limit are set out in the Setting Local Speed Limits Policy. Further details of this can be found on our website here: [Setting local speed limits policy - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/setting-local-speed-limits-policy) .

The next step in this process is to undertake speed surveys along the roads and to analyse accident data to see if 20mph would be appropriate and meets the criteria set out in the policy.

Consequently, no consultation has yet been undertaken, although the speed surveys were carried out between 7th and 13th July this year. One of the criteria for a 20mph speed limit for a “signs alone” speed limit change is for the average mean speed to be 24mph or slower. Otherwise, supporting engineering measures would be required and these more expensive measures would have to be prioritised from the budgets available to the Joint Committee.

The results are set out in the tables below and where previous speed data has been collected, this is included for comparison.

ITEM 6

| PARK ROAD - speed surveys results | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Survey location | Date | Direction | Mean speed mph | 85th %ile mph |
| Park Road | Aug-20 | Eastbound | 29.9 | 35.2 |
| Lamp column 30, outside No 69 | Jul-21 | | 28.5 | 34 |
| | Aug-20 | Westbound | 28.3 | 34.4 |
| | Jul-21 | | 30.6 | 35.5 |
| Park Road | Jul-21 | Eastbound | 24 | 29 |
| Lamp column 23, at junct with Ivy Lane (no data from Aug 2020) | Jul-21 | Westbound | 25.1 | 29.7 |

| WHITE ROSE LANE - speed surveys results | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Survey location | Date | Direction | Mean speed mph | 85th %ile mph |
| White Rose Lane | Sep-14 | Eastbound | 29.5 | 34.3 |
| Railings between Knowl Hill and Clear Down | Jul-21 | | 29.4 | 34.2 |
| | Sep-14 | Westbound | 28.8 | 33.5 |
| | Jul-21 | | 28.5 | 33 |
| White Rose Lane | Sep-14 | Eastbound | 29.1 | 33.8 |
| Lamp column 45 nr Trevarno Lodge | Jul-21 | | 28.9 | 33.7 |
| | Sep-14 | Westbound | 29 | 33.9 |
| | Jul-21 | | 30.4 | 35.1 |
| White Rose Lane | Jul-21 | Eastbound | 26.7 | 31.1 |
| Lamp column 36 outside No 24, between Rosewood and Bylands (no data from 2014) | Jul-21 | Westbound | 25.2 | 30 |

The speeds that were recorded in Park Road indicate that in one location speeds are too high to permit a “signs-only” 20mph limit and at the other, the mean speeds were at, or very slightly above, the threshold for such a limit. The variance suggests that a 20mph limit would not be appropriate along the whole length of road.

The speeds that were recorded in White Rose Lane are very similar to those recorded in 2014 when this issue was raised before. These speeds are too high to permit a “signs-only” 20mph limit being introduced.

The request for the speed limit to be reduced to 20mph with supporting engineering measures has been noted for potential future prioritisation.

Question 2 – from Borough Councillor Ellen Nicholson, Mount Hermon Ward

A healthy river system is one with a rich diversity of species and habitats all co-existing in clean water. As well as being somewhere we like to spend time, a healthy river can provide us with clean drinking water, flood retention and many more services important in our day-to-day lives.

Recently there have been stories of sewage overflow – in Surrey raw sewage flowed into Surrey’s rivers for more than 19,800 hours last year.

There were almost 1,900 raw sewage overflow spills from treatment plants in the county during 2020, prompting campaigners to call for change and improvements to the sewage network. Last week a further story emerged of tap water in parts of Kent and Surrey potentially being contaminated with E-coli after the bacteria was found at one of its treatment works.

We know too that water companies have recently been authorised to reduce the amount of chemicals in waste water as a result of the ongoing delivery driver shortages.

The right to sanitation is an element of "the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family" (Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights or ICESCR). The UK considers that a right to sanitation entails achieving the outcome of providing a system for the treatment and disposal or re-use of human sewage and associated hygiene.

Can the chairman assure residents and members of Woking that the responsible officers within Public Health and the Environment Agency have undertaken an assessment of the water plants that supply Woking and the wider areas of Surrey to ensure that:

1. E-coli is not detected in the local treatment works and the testing regime has been reviewed to ensure this is robust

ITEM 6

2. That there are sufficient chemicals in stock, or a plan has been developed to procure sufficient chemicals to ensure adequate purification of the water and sewage.
3. That any sewage overspill into rivers is being monitored and agreed in advance, and no unauthorised overspill is contaminating the local rivers.

Gloucestershire County Council set up a group tasked with cleaning up the county's rivers as back in 2019 water companies were found to have discharged sewage into English Rivers for a combined 400,000 hours.

The task group has powers to hold the county's polluters to account, as well as:

- . Investigating the extent of pollution present in rivers
- . Investigating the extent of the damage the pollution is having on the ecosystems within rivers and the safety issue it poses.
- . Scrutinising the activities of water companies and other polluters, and to challenge them to change their behaviour.
- . Developing an action plan to create a series of designated bathing spots in some of Gloucestershire's rivers to make them safe for the public to enjoy.

Are Surrey County Council considering following this example?

Answer

Surrey County Council have no current plans to instigate a task group on this issue.

This question does not fall into the remit of the Woking Joint Committee, however, this has been passed to the Environment agency for their comments, which will be shared with Councillor Nicholson once received.

Question 3 - from Borough Councillor Colin Kemp

The junction of Morton Road, Meadway Drive and the ridgeway in a dangerous bend for cyclists especially at school finishing time as cyclists exiting from the schools come straight out on to this junction.

Highways officers have looked at putting railing at this location to direct the cyclists away from the road, but the footpath is not wide enough.

The solution that the highways officers suggested was to put a buildout adjacent to the school exit which would allow space to put barriers in front of the schools exit and direct the students on cycles to be directed left and to safely join the road.

I engaged with the deputy head at Woking High School prior to covid at they were fully supportive.

Would the highways officers continue to design this buildout and look for funding to deliver this scheme.

This would fit with the SCC and WBC priorities to encourage cycling.

Answer

Although the Chobham to Woking “Trackway” (cycle/walking route) essentially ends at the Morton Road / Meadway Drive bend with the junction of Ridgeway, the build-out referenced in the question is being included in the Trackway scheme. Realigning the kerb to construct the build-out will provide a larger area within which the existing cycle route signs can be repositioned to make them more visible as well as providing the benefits for Woking High School pupils that Councillor Kemp mentions.

Question 4 – from Borough Councillor Colin Kemp

Following on from the success of the 20mph speed limit along the centre part of Horsell High Street, could the officers continue this work and look at the speed of vehicle approaching the village.

I understand the SCC policy on speed limits will not allow 20 or even 30mph in all the approach roads but could we look at other reductions to aide safety in and around the village

- A. The stretch of Horsell Birch between Littlewick Road and the High Street is set at national speed limit(60mph) so we are asking driver to slow by 30mph in the blink of an eye before they enter a built up area and a 30mph limit.
- B. South Road has long been a speeding hot spots and resident have complained about vehicle approaching a residential area too fast. The section of South Road between Littlewick Road and the junction with Cheapside and South Road is a narrow country road and is set again at the national speed limit, after the junction with Cheapside it again slows to 30mph.

Could both the locations be looked at and depending on the speed measurements recorded at these locations, could both these lengths of roads be reduced to 40mph to give drivers a slower mean speed when approaching the residential areas. Also, both these locations do not have footpaths and are used by pedestrians and cyclists so this would make these roads feel safer for walking and cycling.

Answer

As Members will be aware, the first stage in any speed limit assessment is to undertake speed surveys to determine whether the existing vehicles speeds would permit a reduction in the limit. However, there are merits in assessing the speed limits on Horsell Birch and South Road.

ITEM 6

The national speed limit on Horsell Birch is, in some ways, anomalous, given that Carhouse Lane and Littlewick Road, west of the Horsell Birch roundabout are already set at 40mph. Although Horsell Birch is rural, with no properties alongside, a lower speed limit approaching before the 30mph could offer benefits, particularly given that immediately inside the 30mph limit, there is the crossroads junction with the unadopted sections of Horsell Birch and, a little further on, the busy Bullgeggars Lane junction.

On its own, the length of Horsell Birch under consideration would be significantly shorter than the 600m minimum length of speed limit that is generally desirable. However, if a 40mph limit is appropriate on this length of road, the Horsell Birch roundabout could also be included thereby making the limit on Horsell Birch an extension of the existing 40mph limits on Carhouse Lane and Littlewick Road (west). The 40mph limit would then commence to the east of the Horsell Birch roundabout with Littlewick Road (east) remaining as national speed limit. It might, however, be worthwhile undertaking speed surveys on Littlewick Road (east) at the same time, if only to collect speed data for that road.

Although South Road is entirely rural, the width of the road is not necessarily compatible with the national speed limit and if the limit in Horsell Common Road is reduced to 40mph, as per the separate report to this meeting of the Woking Joint Committee, there would be a consistency in speed limits on similar looking roads that should make sense to drivers and encourage greater compliance with the reduced limit.

These speed limit assessments could be added to the ITS work programme for Woking, although at this stage it cannot be said when they would be promoted. Members may consider it appropriate for the assessment, and any subsequent speed limit reduction, to be funded by CIL contributions.

Question 5 – from Borough Councillor Rob Leach, St Johns ward

I have had some discussion with an elderly disabled resident who asked me if I could do anything to have a bus shelter installed at the stop servicing the entrance to the Hermitage estate and the crematorium. I will prepare a CIL case in due course but my question is:

Given the urgency and importance of the green agenda, may we have a policy of installing bus shelters/ seating at all major bus stops to support public transport use, particularly for those who are infirm.

Answer from Ian Murdoch, Senior Transport Officer, Passenger Transport Projects Team, SCC, together with Geoff McManus, Director of Neighbourhood Services, WBC

Surrey County Council's Highways and Transport services are responsible for maintaining the public highway, delivering public transport services, working with

bus operators to manage bus routes and the provision / maintenance of public transport infrastructure including bus stops and bus shelters, in liaison with the Borough and District Councils.

Woking Borough Council have a contract with Clear Channel UK (CCUK) for the provision (loan) and maintenance of 88 bus shelters which runs until 31 August 2030. CCUK currently maintain 88 bus shelters, satisfying the maximum provision under the terms of the contract. CCUK financed their original investment for supplying these bus shelters through the sale of advertising over the term of the contract. A steady decline in the value and demand for traditional paper sheet bus shelter advertising means suppliers are now less able to recoup the capital investment required for bus shelter provision.

WBC is at the maximum provision under the terms of the contract and suppliers are less able to recover the capital investment from the sale of advertising, extending the number of shelters beyond 88 will require capital and revenue budgets for supply and maintenance. However, SCC has funding for the supply of additional new shelters, including funding secured through the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP), and a number of additional shelters are being implemented by SCC's bus shelter supplier Externiture in Woking in late 2021. For information, these shelters do not carry advertising.

Maximising the number of bus shelters across the Borough can help to encourage modal shift from private vehicles to public transport. Encouraging greater use of public transport reduces the number of cars on the road, meaning less traffic congestion and reduced air pollution. Typically, bus shelters do not require planning permission (advertising does), but as the structures are ordinarily located on highway land it is sensible to operate a process for considering requests.

In general SCC and WBC have similar processes to follow when requests for bus shelters are received, as follows:

Stage 1: Feasibility

- a. The Council will consider the proximity of proposed bus shelters to existing bus shelters
- b. SCC and WBC would take into account the level of support prior to any new shelter being considered e.g. a number of signatures or registered interest.
- c. If the location appears suitable SCC Highways will:
 - i. Consider any traffic management and road safety issues that may apply at the new shelter locations , which can include carrying out a highway safety audit, consulting with other relevant agencies as required e.g. Police.
 - ii. Detail and cost any additional highway works to support the installation with an indicative timeframe for delivery.
 - iii. Review the patronage information available from ticket machines and/or survey information to assess whether there is a genuine need for the bus shelter.

ITEM 6

- iv. Liaise with the bus companies and confirm they are willing to observe the proposed bus stop location (where requests for bus shelters require a new bus stop).

Stage 2: Funding

- d. Installations will be prioritised in relation to the feasibility works and available funds. No guarantee can be given to provide a bus shelter even if the criteria is met.

Stage 3: Consult and Conclude

- e. Although there is no legal obligation to consult on the installation of bus stops and bus shelters, residents immediately adjacent to the stop, typically 1 to 4 households/businesses, will be consulted in writing by the Council and invited to comment on the proposal.
- f. Any objections to the siting of the new shelter which are received within a 28 day consultation period will be considered by the Delegated Member/Officer, who will balance the needs of bus users against the objections received and decide whether the installation should proceed.
- g. Residents have no right to veto the Delegated Member/Officer's decision to place street furniture on the public highway and their decision will be final.

Questions 6, 7, & 8 – from Borough Councillor Ann-Marie Barker

Canal signage [see attached pictures]

The canal currently has a mish-mash of signs, including older dark blue iron WBC signs, Cycle Woking signs and new canal authority signs in turquoise which were put up very recently and are peeling away. What is the strategy for signage on the canal?





Answer from Geoff McManus, Director of Neighbourhood Services, Woking Borough Council

We understand it is both SCC and the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA). Paul Fishwick (former SCC) led on the Cycle Woking signage back in the day. We are chasing Neil McClure at SCC to ask who would be contact now and will let you know if we find anything further.

Parking restriction enforcement

If double yellow line restrictions are added at junctions, at the request of residents, will those restrictions be enforced?

Answer from Geoff McManus, Director of Neighbourhood Services, Woking Borough Council

We can enforce double yellow lines. If an officer sees a vehicle parked on them, they will need to give a minimum period of 5 minutes observation to ensure loading or unloading isn't taking place. This refers to goods or picking up or dropping off vulnerable people. Blue Badge holders would be allowed to park for up to 3 hours.

Lakers

The former Lakers youth centre is now being demolished. When will residents be updated on Surrey County Council's intentions for the site?

ITEM 6

**Answer from Graham Glenn, Head of Acquisitions and Disposals,
Land & Property, Surrey County Council.**

We anticipate confirming decisions in the early new year. Our due process is to ensure all vacant assets are tested with Council front line services, noting a number of those services are undertaking transformation programmes and still need to confirm whether such a site offers them operational potential. If we then formally declare a site surplus to operational uses, (which is a formal Cabinet Member decision), we would explore best value outcomes which could be retention of the asset for our own investment and housing activities, collaborative projects with key public sector partners, or market disposal.

In the case of Lakers, none of the above supported retention of the extant structure left after the fire.