

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Woking JOINT COMMITTEE**  
 held at 6.00 pm on 10 November 2021  
 at The Council Chamber, Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester  
 Square, Woking GU21 6YL.

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

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Ayesha Azad
- \* Liz Bowes (Vice-Chairman)
- Amanda Boote
- \* Saj Hussain
- \* Will Forster
- \* Riasat Khan
- \* Lance Spencer
- Matt Furniss

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Borough Councillor Simon Ashall
- \* Borough Councillor Tahir Aziz
- \* Borough Councillor Ann-Marie Barker
- Borough Councillor Colin Kemp (Chairman)
- \* Borough Councillor Josh Brown
- Borough Councillor Deborah Hughes
- \* Borough Councillor Ellen Nicholson
- \* Borough Councillor Steve Dorsett

\* In attendance

---

**14/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Councillors Colin Kemp, Amanda Booth, Deborah Hughes and Matt Furniss. Cllr Liz Bowes gave her apologies but managed to attend late, arriving during item 8.

As the Chair and Vice Chair were not present at the start of the meeting, Cllr Ayesha Azad was voted in as a temporary Chair for this meeting.

The Chair welcomed Cllr Steve Dorsett to his first meeting of the Committee and also welcomed the new Borough Commander.

**15/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the last meeting – held on 23 June 2021 were agreed.

**16/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**17/20 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Kevin Patching and Zena Curry, SCC Highways Officers

PETITION - PAVEMENTS & ROAD CONDITION SURFACE IN PYRFORD WOODS ESTATE

The Woking Joint Committee noted the report and the details of work to be undertaken. The petitioner was not present at the meeting.

Reason for decision:

The maintenance team aim to surface approximately 1120m<sup>2</sup> this financial year, funded by Cllr Liz Bowes.

PETITION - BEAUFORT ROAD GREEN, MAYBURY

The Committee noted the report and the response given. The petition was not present at the meeting.

The Joint Committee Woking noted that:

- (i) Providing parking is not a priority for Surrey County Council but we will work with Woking Borough Council if they wish to convert the verge in Beaufort Road.
- (ii) Consideration should be given to using CIL contributions to fund a more detailed feasibility and design that will allow a more accurate cost estimate to be determined which will allow a more informed decision to be made on whether to promote this scheme, or not.

Reason for decision:

To explore possible solutions to this long standing issue.

**18/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Questions:** Six written questions were received and the questions and answers given were circulated in the supplementary agenda pack:-

- 1 Keith Cresswell re A245 shared path proposal – Keith Cresswell was not present at the meeting but had asked for some further detail which would be dealt with outside the meeting.
- 2 Rachel Blumson re Old Woking Road
- 3 Robert Shatwell re Village Greens

- 4 Robert Shatwell re Rydens Way crossing – Members noted that this had not been assessed for the ITS list but could be considered.
- 5 Robert Shatwell re Westfield Ave crossing – Members noted that this was the highest scheme in Hoe Valley on the list and that an island might be provided as part of the development. Members also noted the urgency of both the schemes above as they involved crossing points used by school children.
- 6 Andy Grimshaw re Old Woking Road and Pyrford – Andy Grimshaw attended the meeting and noted that discussions had been held with the Police over average speed cameras and asked whether these reduced the speed of young drivers. He expressed an interest in figures and comparisons with other traffic calming methods.

#### **19/20 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Eight Member questions were received. The questions and answers were published in the supplementary agenda pack.

The questions were:-

- 1 Will Forster re Park Road / White Rose Lane – Cllr Forster noted that he and Cllr Liz Bowes wanted a consultation on a speed limit reduction and he recalled that this is what was asked for. He stated that Cllr Bowes would take this up with Highways.
- 2 Ellen Nicholson re Sewage / Waterways – a fairly comprehensive answer was provided by the Environment agency and will be sent to Cllr Nicholson outside the meeting.
- 3 Colin Kemp re Morton Road / Meadway Drive
- 4 Colin Kemp re speeds in Horsell
- 5 Rob Leach re bus shelters
- 6 Ann-Marie Barker re canal signage – Cllr Barker noted that this was a responsibility of the Basingstoke Canal Authority and Members on the BCA agreed to raise this with them
- 7 Ann-Marie Barker re parking enforcement
- 8 Ann-Marie Barker re Lakers Youth Centre site – Cllr Barker noted the answer given but stated that residents wanted to know what would be built on the site.

#### **20/20 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR BUS SHELTERS [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager,  
WBC

## ITEM 2

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

The Planning Policy Manager presented the report which requested funding for 2 bus shelters on Albert Drive at a cost of £25,000. The Divisional member noted that this was supported by himself and Members noted that it would be used by school children.

The Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Canalside Ward to install 2 bus shelters at Albert Drive in Sheerwater be approved;
- (ii) The Director of Planning be authorised to approve payment for the total cost of the project when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The total cost of the project is estimated at £25,000 and will be drawn from the total CIL income available for community infrastructure project in Canalside Ward, this currently stands at £203,466.50; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for the Canalside Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the project in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reason for decision:

The Committee agreed that the project was a good use of CIL money to promote sustainable travel.

### **21/20 FOOTPATH 94 - BYFLEET [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Catherine Valiant, Countryside Access Officer

**Public Speakers:** 6 people attended and spoke on this item

The Countryside Access Officer presented the report. The report sought a decision on whether to make a legal order to divert Footpath No. 94 (Byfleet). The officer's recommendation was that no order be made on the grounds that it was not expedient to divert the way in the interests of the public.

The following three residents spoke in favour of the footpath diversion, and made the following points:

Mike Forbes

- The proposed alternative footpath is only longer if going over the bridge to Old Wisley, otherwise it is a shorter route to get to the village and is a straight path
- The old route is longer, crosses an access road, has styles in place (making it less accessible) and you cannot see the historic property

Andrew Weiss

- Lives at Manor House cottage and the old footpath 94 crosses the frontage and is in the floodplain and subject to flooding
- The new path is easier to use, is lower maintenance and more accessible (the old path has 4 styles in place), with investment in the new path, tree planting and landscaping and gives a better view of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century Manor House, providing recreational enjoyment for more people as it is more inclusive

Mary Bridgeman

- Supports the new footpath which received more letters of support than there were objections
- The old path is boggy, floods and has styles in place so cannot be accessed by disabled people or parents with buggies. It also ran besides the listed property wall which blocked the view
- The new path gives a better view of the Manor House and the owner has invested in a new and more practical footpath away from traffic with kissing gates instead of styles.

The following two residents spoke against the footpath diversion and in support of the officer recommendation to not proceed, and made the following points:

Richard Lovell (Open Spaces Society)

- Has lived in Byfleet for 36 years. The Jacobean Manor House is a treasure and footpath 94 provides the best vista of the house. The footpath was a nice flat grassy track before and has not been maintained that way.
- The styles that are in place should not have been installed and should be removed.
- The footpath does not threaten security at the house and the revised route does not offer anything new. Ramblers use Footpath 94 regularly.

Brian Reader (Chair Footpath Society and Secretary of Ramblers Society)

- The permanent diversion of Footpath 94 is not in public interest and does not meet the criteria
- Application should be considered as path was before – open and grassy and not brambly and overgrown as the landowner has failed to maintain it.

## ITEM 2

- The styles do not have the right to remain and should be removed as they are illegal obstructions
- The Ramblers Society ask that the path is reopened, restored and styles removed

The Landowners agent then spoke in support of the diversion on behalf of their client. The following points were made:

- It was never the intention of the estate to remove the right of way but they wanted to improve the footpath for local people.
- The styles had been in place for 50 years and were not installed by the current landowner who brought the estate in 2019.
- Footpath 94 was covered in debris and was clogged up. The landowner wanted to provide a community facility and the previous path did not allow that. Kissing gates were installed to deter horse riders and to improve accessibility. The diverted footpath took an additional 1 min and 30 seconds to traverse.
- It was not the landowners proposal to make the path a hard surface – this was at the request of Surrey County Council and the landowner could make this a soft finish if SCC allowed and users would prefer this (it is believed that local dog walkers did not want a stone path)
- There was no proposal to plant trees and to block the view of the Manor House, but there would be a low metal fence of 1 metre installed. The gates and path would all be maintained at the estates expense.
- The estate wanted to make improvements for the community and the new footpath provided a better view of the historic walls, manor house and gardens

The Officer noted this was a difficult case with arguments on both sides which had been fully detailed in the report. The officer confirmed that the styles would be removed on the old path. She invited members to consider whether the permanent diversion of footpath 94 was in the public interest.

### **Member discussion: Key points**

The local ward member stated that they had visited the site and believed that the diversion was in the public interest as the surface had been improved, was less flooded and more accessible, especially to Mill Lane.

Other members stated that the argument was finely balanced but voiced their support due to accessibility.

### **Resolution:**

The matter was put to a vote with a show of hands. The vote showed unanimous support for the diversion.

### **The Local Committee (Woking) resolved that:**

**A diversion order is made under section 119 of the Highways Act 1980 to divert Public Footpath No. 94 (Byfleet) as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/179/H3A. If objections are made and maintained to the Order, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of State for determination.**

Reason for decision:

Having listened to the arguments both for and against, members took the view that the diversion was in the public interest as the new route was less flooded and more accessible. The vote for this was unanimous.

## **22/20 BUS STOP CLEARWAYS [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Ian Murdoch, Senior Transport Officer

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

The senior transport officer outlined the proposal to implement new / upgraded bus stop clearways at bus stops along several key bus routes in Woking. This was funded by the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership to increase the accessibility of bus services and encourage wider use. Clearways were required to ensure that buses could access the bus stop waiting area.

Members noted that only the West of Woking was covered at this stage and were pleased to hear that this might be extended in the future.

The Joint Committee (Woking) agreed that:

- (i) new / upgraded bus stop clearways along bus routes 34/35 and 91 in Woking (as shown in the Annexes to this report) are approved.
- (ii) following the approval of the clearways, SCC officers write to adjacent residents and businesses to advise that the bus stop clearways have been approved by the Joint Committee, and will therefore be able to be enforced.
- (iii) any objections from adjacent residents and businesses can be addressed by delegated authority by the Local Highways Manager, or other appropriate role within the Scheme of delegation, in consultation with the relevant County Councillor and the Chair / Vice-Chair of the Joint Committee.

Reason for decision:

## ITEM 2

The project supports sustainable transport and the climate change agenda.

### **23/20 HORSELL COMMON ROAD - PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT REDUCTION AND ONE-WAY (PART) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Kevin Patching, SCC Highways

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

The Highways Officer outlined the report for a 40mph speed limit to compliment the cycleway / footway between Chobham and Horsell. Part of the route in Woking Borough would need to be on-carriageway, along Horsell Common Road. The section of road between South Road and Littlewick Road could also be made one-way, northbound, for motorised vehicles which would reduce the amount of traffic on the road without causing too much inconvenience to road users.

Members noted that this would be a reduction to 40 mph and not 30, but supported the scheme.

The Joint Committee (Woking) agreed that:

- (i) The speed limit on D3643 Horsell Common Road, between its junctions with South Road and Littlewick Road and between its junctions with Littlewick Road and A3046 Chobham Road should be reduced to 40mph.
- (ii) The length of D3643 Horsell Common Road, between its junctions with South Road and Littlewick Road be made one-way in a northbound direction except for cycles, which will be permitted to travel in both directions.
- (iii) The speed limit change should be advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed change and revoke any existing traffic orders, as necessary;
- (iv) The proposed one-way should be advertised in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed change;
- (v) The Area Highways Manager (or the successor to that position in the Scheme of Delegation), in consultation with the Chairman of the Woking Joint Committee and the relevant Divisional Members, resolve any objections received in connection with these proposals.

Reasons for decision:

Members were very supportive of the reduction in speed limit in this area.

#### **24/20 COMMUNITY SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Camilla Edmiston, Community Safety Manager, WBC and Inspector Kit Moc, Borough Commander, Surrey Police

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

The Community Safety Manager outlined the activity and impact of the Safer Woking Partnership in the year 2020/2021, and reported on community safety budget spend.

Members noted the activity, despite the Covid situation, with Junior citizen programme in June instead of March, and the Lightbox gallery exhibition. Members welcomed the Borough Commander, who spoke about the issue of drug crime and the work to tackle this.

The Woking Joint Committee agreed to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report and progress made in 2020/2021
- (ii) Note the community safety budget spend during 2020/2021 (Annex 2)
- (iii) Note that the Community Safety Task Group receives updates on the project(s) funded, on behalf of the committee and provides information on those projects in the quarterly community safety reports circulated to councillors.

#### **25/20 TASK GROUPS - INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP (NEW DETAILS) & HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD (CHANGES TO TERMS OF REFERENCE) [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers attending:** Ernest Amaoko, Planning Policy Manager, WBC

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

Members discussed the membership of the Infrastructure group and the following 6 cross party members volunteered:-

Conservative – Ayesha Azad (SCC) & Simon Ashall (WBC)  
Lib Dems – Will Forster (SCC) & Ann-Marie Barker (WBC)

## ITEM 2

Independent - Amanda Boote (SCC) & Labour – Tahir Aziz (WBC)

The Working Joint Committee agreed the terms of reference and nominated the above representatives to the Infrastructure group.

The Working Joint Committee agreed the new terms of reference of the Health and Wellbeing group.

### **26/20 DECISION AND ACTION TRACKER [Item 13]**

The Action tracker was noted.

### **27/20 FORWARD PLAN [Item 14]**

The forward plan was noted. Members asked that the Electric Vehicles be prioritised for the March meeting.

Meeting ended at: 7.45 pm

---

**Chairman**