

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Guildford JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 7.00 pm on 16 March 2022  
at Council Chamber, Guildford Borough Council, 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 John Rigg
  - \* Bo. Cllr Tony Rooth
  - Bo. Cllr Paul Spooner
  - Bo. Cllr. James Steel
  - Bo. Cllr. Cait Taylor
  - \* Co. Cllr. Keith Witham
  - \* In attendance
- 

**1/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Cross, Cllr Morson, Cllr Potter, Cllr Blow, Cllr D Goodwin, Cllr Harwood, Cllr Lee, Cllr Spooner, Cllr Steel and Cllr Taylor.

The vice-chairman thanked departing committee member Cllr Randall for her contributions over the years, and welcomed new member Cllr Taylor.

**2/21 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2021 were agreed.

**3/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4/21 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Chris Wheeler, Head of Operational & Technical Services, GBC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** One petition was received before the deadline. The full wording of the petition and officer response were available to view within the agenda.

The lead petitioner, Cllr Steel, did not attend the meeting but he had indicated beforehand that he was happy with the response prepared by the officer. Officers and ward members would work to reach a way forward on this issue.

Members noted the officer response.

**5/21 MEMBER WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

No questions were received.

**6/21 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Sustainable School Travel Team Manager, SCC

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** One question was received before the deadline. The full wording of the question and officer response was available to view within the supplementary agenda.

The vice-chairman apologised that co-questioner Mrs White's name had been omitted from the officer response.

Mrs White attended the meeting and asked the following supplementary question:

Residents are still concerned as to whether the road tables will be built in 22/23 as the scheme seems to have moved off the ITS list and over to the Road Safety list, with no prioritisation for funding. Berkeley Homes have been asked for £50,000 by the County Council towards traffic calming measures in relation to planned additional dwellings on Effingham Lodge Farm but this suggests that if this development does not go ahead then the road schemes might not be built. Can the committee confirm the road tables will be built?

The officer confirmed that the scheme in question is listed for action in Year 1 of the new three-year funding plan of £1m per year for road safety outside schools, subject to approval by the Cabinet member. If approval is granted, the scheme would not be reliant on the developer's contribution. He agreed to keep the Mrs White and Mrs Jones informed of progress.

**7/21 DECISION TRACKER [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 7]**

The contents of the tracker were noted, with the following comments.

Item 2. This item has been on the tracker since July 2019 with no progress indicated. An agreement would now only relate to High Street and Tunsgate.

The vice-chairman asked Cllr Rigg for GBC and Cllr Furniss for SCC to bring the relevant officers together to resolve the lack of progress.

## **8/21 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Zena Curry, Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager, SCC

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

### **Member Discussion – key points:**

The Engagement and Commissioning Manager outlined the draft budget report, the funds available for Members and the proposed ITS scheme list (Annex 1). The Local Engagement Officer had been in touch with County Members to gather their local priorities for expenditure. Additional funds had also been made available county-wide to cover road safety outside schools.

The officer undertook to provide the budget figure for 2021/22 (see below). The full ITS list (the 'running list') will be included as an annex to the minutes of this meeting.

There was discussion of the prioritisation process and in particular the inclusion of the level of public support for a proposed or requested scheme. The majority of schemes are included on the list as a result of a question or a petition, indicating public support. The current CASEE system is being reviewed, and in future public engagement sessions will be an important part of the overall process for selecting and prioritising schemes.

Cllr Witham (Worplesdon) suggested the possibility of sharing the costs of the proposed Pirbright arch scheme between Guildford and Woking joint committees given its proximity to the boundary between the two and the shared benefit the residents of both boroughs would receive. The Engagement and Commissioning Manager highlighted that an advantage under the new arrangement for prioritising schemes, which will take a county-wide approach rather than a borough or district-based approach, could well be that schemes like this near a border could be put forward for consideration more easily.

The recommendations proposed that a contribution of £5k from each Divisional Member's £7.5k allocation be put towards a maintenance gang. This happens each year and all members have agreed to it in the past. It is a more efficient process, taking less time to respond to local priorities, and more cost effective than the revenue maintenance gangs. Additional information would be circulated to members.

The Cabinet member referred members to the Cabinet report from 22 February 2022 for full details of the move to the new county-wide prioritisation approach.

The following information was provided after the meeting:

The budget for 2020/21 and 2021/22 are detailed on the link here: [Public Pack\)Agenda Document for Guildford Joint Committee, 17/03/2021 16:00 \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://public.pack.agenda.document.for.guildford-joint-committee,17/03/2021-16:00/surreycc.gov.uk)

The total budget delegated to the JC in 2020/21 was £454,456; in 2021/22 it was £903,286 (including additional amount for ITS); in 2022/23 it is £903,390 (with an increase in capital maintenance from £334,456 to £500,000).

**Resolved:**

The Joint Committee (Guildford):

General

- (i) Noted that, subject to approval by cabinet, the Joint Committee's devolved highways budget for capital works in 2022/23 is £828,390.
- (ii) Agreed that, subject to approval by cabinet, the devolved capital budget for highway works be used to progress both capital improvement schemes and member capital allocation as detailed in section 1.
- (iii) Authorised that the Highway Engagement & Commissioning Manager in consultation with county members to be able to reallocate budget to reserve schemes should there be a need to change the programme.
- (iv) Authorised that the Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager in consultation with county members, be able to allocate any additional funding for schemes, in accordance with any guidance issued surrounding that funding.

Capital Improvement Schemes

- (v) Agreed that, subject to approval by cabinet, the capital improvement schemes allocation for Guildford be used to progress the Major Integrated Transport Schemes programme set out in Annex 1.
- (vi) Authorised that the Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager be able to vire money between the schemes agreed in Annex 1, if required.
- (vii) Agreed that Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager, in line with the Scheme of Delegation, is able to progress any scheme from the Major Integrated Transport Schemes programme, including consultation and statutory advertisement that may be required under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, for completion of those schemes. Where it is agreed that a scheme will not be progressed, this will be reported back to the appropriate county member.

Member Capital Allocation

- (viii) Noted that, subject to approval by cabinet, £50,000 is allocated to each divisional member. Up to £15,000 of this could be allocated to minor ITS, or all £50,000 could be used on capital maintenance (recommended option). The schemes are to be proposed by county members in consultation with the Stakeholder Engagement Officer.

Revenue Maintenance

- (ix) Noted that the members, subject to approval by cabinet, will continue to receive a Member Local Highways Fund (revenue) allocation of

£7,500 per county member to address highway issues in their division;  
and

- (x) Agreed that each county member allocates £5,000 of their Member Local Highways Fund allocation to be pooled to commission a revenue maintenance gang.
- (xi) Agreed that revenue works are to be managed by the Highway Maintenance team on behalf of and in consultation with county members.

Reasons for recommendations:

To agree, subject to approval by cabinet, a programme of highways works in Guildford for 2022/23, funded from budgets available to enable schemes and works to progress.

### **Guildford ITS running list**

The running list is attached as an appendix to these minutes.

## **9/21 ON-STREET PARKING BUSINESS PLAN 2022-2023 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Andrew Harkin, Parking Lead, GBC

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

### **Member discussion – key points:**

The Parking Lead read out a statement concerning the government grant, in response to queries that were raised at the last joint committee meeting. The parking portion of the grant had been journaled incorrectly in the accounts, being put against the off-street service rather than the on-street service. This had since been corrected.

The length of time needed for the processing of a carer's parking permit was queried, to see if existing permits could be updated in a simpler way. This would be discussed with borough and county council officers.

There was discussion of the Park and Ride scheme. Consideration of plans to expand the scheme to the north of the town will continue. It was noted that a potential site in need of refurbishment exists that could replace the Spectrum site. Maintaining a difference between parking charges at Park and Ride sites and at car parks and on-street sites in Guildford centre is a key tool to encourage use of the Park and Ride.

Because there will be more electric vehicles in the future, the discounted prices they enjoyed for parking permits have been discontinued, along with those for smaller-engined vehicles, subject to the results of a public consultation on tariff changes for permits by the county council starting later in March. More detail would be provided on the arrangement regarding the discount for electric vehicles and the Parking Agreement between GBC and SCC.

The direct link between an increase in off-street parking charges and a corresponding increase in on-street charges was questioned, together with a query on the timing of the proposed increases given the progress still needed to return 'high street shopping' activity to pre-covid levels.

The recommendations were voted on individually with a show of hands.

- i) All agreed
- ii) In favour 5 – Against 4
- iii) In favour 5 – Against 4
- iv) In favour 5 – Against 4

**Resolved:**

The Joint Committee (Guildford):

- (i) noted the contents of Annexe 1, the Parking Annual Report for 2020-21 and the current and planned work associated with on street parking,
- (ii) agreed to increase the tariff in the 2-hour max. stay pay and display and pay and display dual-use spaces from 80 pence per half hour to 90 pence per half hour, to be introduced on 1 July 2022.
- (iii) agreed to increase the tariff in the 3-hour maximum stay pay and display dual-use spaces from 60 pence per half hour to 80 pence per half hour, to be introduced on 1 July 2022.
- (iv) noted that the existing tariff in the 30-minute maximum stay pay and display and pay and display dual-use spaces of £1 for the half hour will remain unchanged, although as part of the current parking review, the intention is to extend the maximum period of stay within these spaces to 1 hour, to meet the changing needs of the high street retailers and their customers.

Reasons for recommendations:

Town centre parking:

- is an enabler to around £150-200m of retail activity within the local economy, as well as supporting a wide variety of other business needs, and the needs of residents (*Systra Parking Study 2020*),
- pricing is the primary mechanism with which to modify user behaviour, and in line with the 2016 Sustainable Parking Strategy, encourage more sustainable transportation modes, such as the Park and Ride, public transport, cycling and walking,
- (normally) generates a significant surplus with which to invest in highway and transportation initiatives, such as Park and Ride.

Although pricing is the primary mechanism to modify behaviour, convenience is also a key factor in determining visitors' choice of transportation mode and parking location. Therefore, although price increases may be perceived as being harmful for the local economy, particularly at a time when it is recovering from the pandemic, the provision of convenient, easy to use and good quality parking facilities are more

important influencing factors.

This is supported by the fact that, in recent years, despite the incremental increases in the tariffs within the Guildford Borough Council's (GBC's) off-street public car parks, utilisation has not been greatly impacted. This is despite challenging conditions being experienced by the retail sector, even prior to the COVID pandemic.

However, by comparison, on-street parking has performed less well. This is despite the charges in the majority of paid-for spaces remaining static since 2014. There are a number of possible reasons for this. These include:

- The reduction in the number of spaces
- Changes in the nature of the businesses / vacant premises closest to the on-street spaces
- Limited payment options
- Restrictions on the flexibility of use (in relation to the 30min max stay bays)

In support of the "drive to and not through" philosophy, reinforced within the 2016 Sustainable Parking Strategy, the on-street parking charges have always been set at a premium rate above those in the off-street car parks, to reflect the greater convenience associated with the use of these spaces and to encourage turnover.

If the on-street spaces were cheaper than the off-street parking, then it may encourage motorists to circulate within the town centre, searching to find less-expensive on-street parking. This would be counter to both SCC and GBC's objectives in respect to the climate change emergency, air quality and congestion.

At its 25 January 2022 Executive meeting, GBC agreed to increase the parking charges within the car parks in 2022-23. The recommendations within this report are intended to encourage visitors to consider more sustainable transportation choices, maintain the differential between the on- and off-street charges in support of the "drive to and not through" philosophy, and improve the financial position of the Guildford on-street account, to assist in its support of the Park and Ride, and other local highway and transportation initiatives.

It is recommended that the introduction of the price increases comes into effect on 1 July 2022, in order support the local economy in the immediate aftermath of the pandemic and the lifting of restrictions.

Even with the recommended price increase, the on-street charges will remain consistent with those levied in nearby towns and cities (see Annexe 2).

## **10/21 RURAL SPEED LIMIT REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Duncan Knox, Road Safety and Sustainable School Travel Team Manager, SCC

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

**Member discussion – key points:**

Members welcomed the report and proposals. It was noted that officers working on introducing lorry restrictions in some rural roads would be consulted, with the two projects working in parallel.

**Resolved:**

The Joint Committee (Guildford):

- (i) Agreed that the speed limits be reduced on the roads as shown in Appendix B that are in the Guildford Joint Committee area. (Other roads within the Waverley and Mole Valley areas are also shown for information and are being presented to the Local/Joint Committees for those areas for approval separately).
- (ii) Authorised the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes, revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the change, and, subject to no objections being upheld, that the order be made.
- (iii) Noted that after 1 April the Highways Engagement and Commissioning Manager will be responsible for resolving any objections received in connection with the proposal in consultation with the relevant Divisional Member.
- (iv) Noted that if the reductions in speed limit have not been successful, then further supporting highway measures or a higher speed limit may be necessary.

Reasons for recommendations:

Reducing the speed limit on these roads will help to manage vehicle speeds to a level more appropriate to the use of road and will reduce the risk and severity of collisions. Lower speeds can also reduce air and noise pollution, and make it safer, easier and more pleasant to walk, cycle and ride horses.

**11/21 MEMBERSHIP OF THE PARKING & AIR QUALITY WORKING GROUP (FOR DECISION) [Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Gregory Yeoman, Partnership Committee Officer, SCC

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

**Member discussion – key points:**

The vice-chairman drew Members' attention to the supplementary paper that outlined the officer's view of why the report should be deferred.

**Resolved:**

The Joint Committee (Guildford) agreed:

- i) To defer the report pending more details about the implications for the Parking and Air Quality Working Group of the SCC Cabinet decision on 22 February 2022 to remove all executive highways functions from Local and Joint Committees.**

Reasons for recommendation:

Deferring the report will allow time to consider the implications of the Cabinet decision on the Joint Committee and what the ramifications would be for the Parking and Air Quality working group.

**12/21 FORWARD PLAN (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]**

The forward plan was noted.

There was no further information available on the future of the joint committee; the SCC Cabinet decision on 22 February 2022 only affected the executive highways functions.

**13/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]**

Wednesday 29 June 2022.

Meeting ended at: 8.30 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank