

Minutes of the meeting of the
Guildford JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 7.00 pm on 21 October 2021
at Council Chamber, Millmead, Guildford.

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

Committee Members:

- * Bo. Cllr Jan Harwood (Chair)
 - * Co. Cllr. Fiona White (Vice-Chair)
 - * Bo. Cllr. Chris Blow
Co. Cllr. Colin Cross
 - * Co. Cllr. Fiona Davidson
 - * Co. Cllr. Matt Furniss
Co. Cllr. Angela Goodwin
 - * Bo. Cllr. David Goodwin
 - * Co. Cllr. Robert Hughes
Bo. Cllr. Steven Lee
 - * Co. Cllr. Julia McShane
 - * Co. Cllr. Carla Morson
 - * Bo. Cllr. Ramsey Nagaty
 - * Co. Cllr. George Potter
 - * Bo. Cllr Jo Randall
 - * Bo. Cllr John Rigg
Bo. Cllr Tony Rooth
 - * Bo. Cllr Paul Spooner
Bo. Cllr. James Steel
 - * Co. Cllr. Keith Witham
 - * In attendance
-

43/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllrs Cross, A Goodwin, Rooth and Steel.

44/20 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 17th March 2021 were approved as a correct record.

45/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interest.

46/20 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 4]

There were no petitions.

47/20 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer Attending: Andy Harkin, Parking Lead, GBC

Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: Two member questions were received before the deadline. The questions and officer responses were available to view within the agenda.

Cllr Seabrook did not attend the meeting but had sent the following comments to the chairman as a supplementary to her second question:

I appreciate bus operators set fares and on and off street parking are reviewed separately. Perhaps they should be considered at the same time. I also appreciate constraints on council finances, but can the committee lobby government to make it cost effective for people to 'do the right thing'? Cost is certainly mentioned frequently to me when discussing public transport with residents (along with frequency and reliability). Perhaps we need a publicity campaign to boost use of the P&R and promote the bundle fares. In view of climate change, air pollution and congestion on our roads, I would urge the committee to find ways of taking a more joined-up and holistic approach to our parking and travel policies.

Key points from discussion:

The Parking Lead officer from Guildford Borough Council outlined the split in responsibilities between the borough and county authorities regarding parking and bus operations, with decisions on on-street parking and Park & Ride resting with the joint committee and other aspects such as off-street parking being covered by the GBC Executive. Management of bus services and their promotion are for the bus operators and SCC Passenger Transport team; GBC is keen to work alongside partners to improve patronage and financial viabilities.

A written response to Cllr Seabrook's supplementary question would be prepared and circulated to members.

48/20 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were no public questions.

49/20 ON-STREET PARKING BUSINESS PLAN 2022-2023 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer attending: Andy Harkin, Parking Lead, GBC

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

There were concerns that the report lacked transparency in relation to figures showing a breakdown of the on-street parking income streams and the level of the government grant that had been received.

Members were frustrated that the Park & Ride scheme was still affected by the use of two sites for covid-related activity. The value of this work was recognised but it was felt that the sites could perhaps accommodate both P&R services and covid activity if planned carefully. The question of the charging model that applies to the P&R service was raised again (ie charging per passenger rather than per car), which reduces the competitiveness of P&R.

Comments were made about the condition and outmoded nature of the payment machines. The GBC Parking Lead stated that the new pay-by-phone technology was being installed in November, and there were also more up-to-date machines available from SCC that were being installed.

Cllr Furniss proposed a deferral of the report until the next meeting to allow more detail to be provided on the income streams and situation regarding the grant, and to provide more opportunity for involvement of SCC officers in the report production. Cllr Potter seconded. It was noted that deferral would not have an effect on the introduction of any new charging levels that might be agreed because these would not be introduced until the new financial year.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- (i) **To defer the report until the next formal meeting of the Joint Committee.**

Reasons for recommendation:

Further clarity and transparency of on-street parking income stream figures is needed and more detail on the level of Government grant that was received.

50/20 PIRBRIGHT BENDS, SPEED LIMIT CHANGES AND AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: **None**

Officer attending: **Duncan Knox, Road Safety & Sustainable School Travel Team Manager, Surrey County Council**

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: **None**

Member Discussion – key points:

The SCC officer introduced his report, stressing the high number of traffic accidents that have occurred on the roads in question.

The local Divisional member welcomed the report and its recommendations, thanking the officer and his team for the work involved. It was noted that the scheme crosses the border into Surrey Heath as well, for a short section of road.

In response to comments about the funding for this scheme, which came from Section 106 funding and the Drive SMART Partnership, the officer stated that the SCC cabinet had recently agreed a new policy on speed cameras that would cover areas with a history of speed-related incidents and also areas of community concern to tackle the nuisance effect of speeding traffic. The number of schemes developed would depend on the level of funding that could be achieved.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Agreed that, based upon the evidence, the speed limit be changed to 40mph in the section of the B3012 Gapemouth Road and D3455 Mytchett Place Road that are currently subject to a 30mph speed limit.
- (ii) Agreed that, based upon the evidence, the national speed limit in the B3405 Grange Road and Stanley Hill be reduced to 40mph.

- (iii) Agreed that, based upon the evidence, the start of the 30mph speed limit in Mytchett Place Road is moved from its current location (in Guildford) to a new location (in Surrey Heath) to include the bend at the Keogh Barracks access.
- (iv) Authorised delegation of authority to the Area Highway Manager (**or equivalent officer under the Scheme of Delegation**) in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee, and the local divisional member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals described above.
- (v) Noted that an average speed camera system will be installed to enforce the 40mph speed limit.
- (vi) Noted that bend warning sign improvements will be installed to complement the average speed camera system.

Reasons for recommendations:

A consistent 40mph speed limit will allow the introduction of average speed cameras which will help to reduce traffic speeds and therefore reduce risk and severity of collisions on the Pirbright Bends, where there has been a history of collisions including death and serious injury.

51/20 GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE, AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Gary Durrant, Senior Specialist - Environmental Protection, Justine Fuller, Head of Environment and Regulatory Services, Guildford Borough Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

The officer emphasised GBC's duty to designate an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) having breached air quality limits. There had been a delay in progressing the designation because of interruptions to work caused by covid-19. When considering the extent of the AQMA the air quality threshold had been reduced to 38 microgramme per litre (from 40) to ensure a more cautious approach.

The officer thanked the Transport Studies Team Manager at SCC, who had supplied a good deal of the data to the consultants, and noted that the report was the result of joint working between the two authorities.

The officer invited input from members on the development of the Air Quality Action Plan; the draft would be brought to this committee in spring 2022. The chairman commented that it would be an opportunity to consider bold solutions to the problem of air pollution, including clean air zones, congestion charges, electric vehicles and ways to encourage a modal shift to reduce the number of trips being made in petrol and diesel vehicles. Working with SCC, especially the Highways team, would be very important.

The gyratory in the town centre was highlighted as a well-known area of traffic congestion which could become more congested as traffic levels increase with new local housing developments unless behaviours are tackled.

There was a discussion about the completeness of the data that had been used to support the call for designation of the AQMA, with the view expressed that it did not cover the full five-year period required and only showed exceedances in a few discrete locations within the overall area of the proposed AQMA. Opinion was divided, with some members preferring to collect more data and others feeling that there was sufficient to support the designation. The officer commented that DEFRA would review everything in the documents carefully and would report if they felt unsupported conclusions had been reached. He added that there were locations where premises had had a change of use since the measurements had been taken, eg with business premises becoming residential, and this meant reviewing the significance of the results. There was a need to interpret the results cautiously as well because covid restrictions would have reduced measurements temporarily.

In response to a request from the Ward member for Onslow, the Cabinet Member for Highways said he would speak to National Highways about a local access route off the A3, adding that NH had commented previously that they would not want to have too many junctions in a short length of the A3.

The Head of Environment and Regulatory Services reminded members of the need to focus on measures that would be impactful and to come up with a useful suite of measures that would avoid resolving the issue in the town centre while causing another problem elsewhere nearby. She added that a draft air quality communication strategy had been prepared around health messages and it included a call to action for residents for them to get involved.

The officer recommendations were put to the members by the chairman for a vote by a show of hands.

Number of votes for recommendations (i) and (ii): 13
Number of votes against recommendations (i) and (ii): 0
Number of abstentions: 1

Resolved:

The Guildford Joint Committee:

- i. Agreed that Guildford Borough Council designate an Air Quality Management Area as identified within the bold purple area shown in Appendix 1.
- ii. Authorised the Director of Service Delivery, Guildford Borough Council, to make the Order required under Section 83 of the Environment Act 1995 to implement recommendation (i).

Reasons for recommendations:

To ensure the Council meets its statutory duties to designate an air quality management area and to improve air quality in an area of Guildford Town Centre.

**52/20 REVIEW OF JOINT COMMITTEE WORKING GROUPS (FOR DECISION)
[Item 10]**

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Gregory Yeoman, Partnerships Committee Officer,
Surrey County Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None

Member Discussion – key points:

Points made in the discussion included:

- Working group meetings were often long but without tangible results.
- It would be worth keeping working groups that covered specific, specialised topics such as air quality.
- Parking and air quality need not necessarily remain covered by the same group.
- Task and finish groups could be established where necessary.
- Committee informal meetings could be used to cover some topics such as the list of highways schemes.
- The officer reminded members that formal meetings of the committee were now concentrating on hearing decision items rather than updates and broad discussions.
- Whatever approach was adopted, changes could be made at a later date.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Guildford) considered the options set out in this report and:

- (i) Agreed that the remit and terms of reference of any working/task group convened by the Joint Committee be reviewed annually;
- (ii) Considered the options set out in this report and advised preferences for the way forward for the existing working groups;
- (iii) Included in the Terms of Reference a decision on the need and frequency for the working/task groups to present a public report to the Joint Committee so as to keep local residents informed of progress concerning the prioritised workstreams of both councils working in partnership.

In addition, committee agreed:

To disband the Infrastructure Delivery and Transportation working group.

Reasons for recommendations:

Working groups reporting to the main Committee should be regularly reviewed to ensure that the work remains on track and progress reported. It is in the interests of Guildford borough residents to receive updates on local priorities as agreed by the Joint Committee and to be able to comment on those updates at the publicly convened meetings.

53/20 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 11]

The recommendations in the decision tracker were agreed as described.

54/20 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]

The Forward Plan was noted.

An item updating on the operations on the Park & Ride scheme was included at a date to be confirmed.

A point of order was raised to highlight the description in the committee's constitution of the number of formal meetings that would be held each year, ie "between four and eight", compared with the three that are now planned. The chairman noted this and agreed to consider it.

55/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]

The provisional date for the next formal meeting is Wednesday 16th March 2022 at 7.00pm.

Meeting ended at: 8.50 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank