

Meeting started approx 7:30 and introduced by Cllr Pauline Searle (PS).

SCC Local director Dave Johnson (DJ) explained correspondence from SCC that the Grange School site is surplus to requirement and SCC has already invested monies, based upon the anticipated sale, into North Guildford schools. SCC therefore has a duty to acquire the best price possible and as there have been no proposed changes put forward for planning permission, the future will depend entirely upon whichever developers purchase the site. The site has been placed in the hands of agents and it is likely to come onto the market within a couple of months.

John Hamilton-Williams (JH-W) indicated that he is already in contact with the agents who have advised he will be given an indication of price at that time.

Meeting split into two topic groups similar to previous meeting:

- Community Centre
- Traffic

Community Centre Group

Chair – Dave Johnson (DJ). Note takers – Cllr Jayne Marks (JM), Maureen Bell (MB)

1. Cllr Jayne Marks (JM) listed action points from last meeting:
 - Review of options for hard play area.
 - Funding arrangements for the community centre.
 - Investigate possible use of Stoughton Grange School.
 - Consult with young people about what they want.
2. The group discussed the youth requirements for (1) and (4) and were advised that when asked informally the teenagers said they wanted a skateboard park.
3. Peter Gunner (PG) pointed out that the usual complaint for such facilities was the very high noise level.
4. JM advised that the police will work with a youth panel and are taking a special interest in the QEP area.
5. It was agreed that whatever is proposed will need to be achieved through consultation and agreement with the youth.
6. JM mentioned the patch of land close to Northmead School as a possible site but was advised [by ??] this unlikely as Northmead is unhappy about the vandalism to their nearby pavilion.
7. PG gave his experiences as project manager for Basingstoke and Dean community centres and suggested a kick wall rather than a pitch.
8. 'Shelters' for the teenagers were proposed [by ?] (usually provided by GBC)
9. JH-W recommended that the LEAP and the hard-court should not be in close proximity and expressed his wish for the leap to proceed on the village green. He wanted to know how it would work and how to ensure the two areas are kept apart.
10. JH-W suggested the developers should build 12 flats (instead of the proposed community centre combined with flats) and the proceeds from such a scheme would allow them to purchase Grange School and to give it 'a lick of paint'. As 1.27 acres would not be required the developers could either sell off the excess land or develop it.
11. JH-W stated that QEP RA hope to meet the developers and it is their opinion that L & L are interested in the suggested proposal for the community centre.
12. QEP residents would like to arrange a visit to the school and the site. DJ said he would try to arrange an informal visit.
13. It was also proposed that a meeting should be arranged for the councillors, DEPS, QEP RA, SCA/SCCP and the agents.

14. The following action points were agreed:
- Ask Paul West/Sheila Willis to report back the next meeting on the youth panel.
 - Explore options for the children's play area and hard play with parks and countryside staff at GBC.
 - A small group consisting of Teresa Ward, Robin Clinch, Bill Perkins and Jayne Marks will progress this. Pauline Searle will set up the play area meeting for us.
 - Councillors will report back on a meeting with GBC planners which will discuss planning options for the community centre.
 - Dave Johnson will try to arrange for a small group to view the school site to see if it would be suitable.
 - John Hamilton-Williams will follow up with agents to ensure that we have all the information we need to assess the site.
 - QEP Residents' Association will float the idea of the school site with the QEP developers.

Community Centre Group Report

1. Jayne Marks (JM): presented a brief summary. Four issues discussed:
 - options for hard play areas,
 - consultation with young residents to discuss what is needed,
 - funding arrangements for community centre and
 - options for Stoughton Grange School
 2. JM: suggested a group present a plan to GBC similar to what the Spike Project did.
 3. JH: asked whether everyone agreed that a CC is important for Stoughton? All agreed.
-

Traffic Group

Chair – Cllr Fiona White (FW). Note takers - Ian Godfrey (IG) and Nigel Horton (NH)

IG was asked to summarise the groups recommendations to the combined meeting afterwards and these are shown at the end.

Present: Phil Knapp (PK), Wyn Knapp (WK), Roger Legassick (RL), Stephen Ball (SB1), Sharon Ball (SB2) Alan Noakes (AN), June Noakes (JN), Pat Woolven (PW), Sheila Willis (SW), Stuart Hammond (SH), Penny Alder (PA), Fiona White (FW), John Hobrough (JH), Nigel Horton (NH), Lady A (LA), Ian Godfrey (IG), Lady B (LB) *[apologies for not recording all names]*

1. FW: read out the notes from the previous meeting 6th
2. JH read out an email from Derek Lake (DL) who sent his apologies that he was unable to attend tonight to chair the Traffic Topic Group. DL stated that the Barrack Road and Manor Road problems were recognised by SCC but action has been deferred. This provides an opportunity now to have input into this process.
3. FW said that as consultation has not started, this group has time to register whatever views it wished on this aspect.
4. JH explained and defined the Guildford Local Committee – effectively budget holders and decision makers on traffic matters affecting Guildford, but can inform on schools and other topics.
5. FW added that the Local Committee grew out of the Guildford Partnership
6. JH said he was seeking a meeting of the Local Committee in Stoughton. Usually Guildford meetings are at Millmead although the Committee does go out to the villages.
7. PW: one item is missing from previous meetings notes, which is the suggestion of forcing people to stop at the first bend going south on Manor Road, with something like a white stop line.
8. RL: can't be done owing to traffic regulations
9. IG: compared PW's suggestion to the pinch point and priority direction often seen at narrow bridges such as Stoughton Road.
10. ??: Pinch points can have trees
11. SB: Manor road should be one-way

Minutes from Stoughton Community Action Plan Meeting, Monday 17th January 2005
Stoughton Community & Youth Centre, Stoughton Rec.

12. JH: Last survey showed 30% wanted the one-way in one direction, 30% in the other and 30% wanted two-way as at present
13. PW: should get rid of yellow lines
14. IG: asked if anyone minded their names being mentioned in the minutes, and if they could introduce themselves when they spoke.

15. RL: (a) reminded us all that at last meeting we asked for a full review and that SCC should take a strategic approach to the whole of Stoughton.
(b) Doesn't think its this group's job to come up with solutions, that is a highways responsibility
16. IG: interrupted to state that the point of this group was to do just that, identify traffic problems and suggest solutions.
17. RL continued:
 - (c) Traffic calming is cheap. The Rural England average for a traffic accident is £86K, and £86K buys a lot of traffic calming.
 - (d) RL works as a Road Traffic Engineer.
 - (e) All through traffic should be directed around Stoughton using existing A320, A322 and Saltbox Road.
 - (f) Within the Stoughton 'box' the speed limit should be 20mph. This would add about 7 seconds to a journey down the length of Manor Road.
 - (g) Pinch points are also a calming option.
 - (h) Drivers need to be educated.
18. PW: pinch points with trees may not be acceptable
19. FW: bollards are a good option
20. IG: do people park on this bend, and would they mind if their parking was replaced by a pinch point?
21. ??: Yes
22. IG: asks RL if he meant what he said in point (b) and if that meant he won't be making more suggestions and criticise others instead?
23. RL: said he was very keen to contribute to solutions for other areas, but knows a lot about Manor Road.
24. FW: RL's skills and knowledge of the area are invaluable.

25. SB: The problem of HGVs using Stoughton Road went away when the police (?) put in a temporary block while roadworks were being done
26. IG: This is because logistics software used by most big haulage firms informs drivers to use alternative routes if there are roadworks.
27. JH: stated there were two strategic problems, through flow of traffic and parking. Specific areas for off-street parking needed to be identified within Stoughton.
28. ??: raised a question about legality of parking across dropped curbs
29. PW: suggested changes to bus routes to include the railway station

30. PW: Stoughton Road bridge should be shut
31. JH: perhaps the project to widen it should be stopped and we just make it pedestrian only?
32. FW: surely we should find out who uses it first?
33. PW: OK, not shut it but only allow local people access ...
34. PK: Pillar can be used for buses, emergency vehicles
35. IG: Toll bridges such as one of the Severn bridges use transponders to allow access and automatically charge.
36. NH: what about charging non-locals for use of Stoughton Road Bridge?
37. FW: We can suggest that it is pillar operated.
38. LA: Doesn't want it shut or barred and looking forward to it being improved.

Minutes from Stoughton Community Action Plan Meeting, Monday 17th January 2005
Stoughton Community & Youth Centre, Stoughton Rec.

39. ??: Parking is a problem.
40. IG: Are 'home zones' just for town centres?
41. RL: can be any residential area
42. SW: Yellow lines are no longer under police jurisdiction responsibility of GBC
43. JH: Good. There have been more tickets since the change.
44. FW: Explains she needs to be careful what she says to avoid compromising what she can say on the planning committee. There is a planning policy that discourages provision of parking spaces in new developments. Borough policy is max. 1.5 spaces per house. County policy is max. 1 space, and zero is acceptable where there is a bus route.
45. SH: Stupid policy.
46. FW: It is not always possible to encourage developers to provide spaces at expense of other things.
47. NH: Something must be done. If there is no space now, then it will only get worse.
48. SH: There are so many old houses built before cars were in use and this is not taken into consideration. Most of these homes now require one or two parking spaces and there is nowhere. A proper review is required.
49. PA: When new houses are built, they must consider the number of dwellings in the area and not just parking for the new houses.
50. FW: Gave an example of a recent application in Barrack Road that was for a block of flats with no parking at all. This was approved by planning but rejected by committee and has now gone to appeal....
51. PA: Existing residents will suffer when new residents move in and park in existing spaces, this is no good for anyone.

52. IG: Started to explain the Travel Plan designed by the developers of QEP that only considered the traffic effect caused by the development and did not consider the wider impact.
53. JH: In summary, we want to maintain a through flow of traffic along main routes, and solve parking issues.
 - (a) example of communal car park used in Northern 'medieval' town that has no garages
 - (b) Residents only parking areas?
 - (c) Consider existing open space?
 - (d) Specific safety problem of parking on grass area outside Stoughton Infants
 - (e) Ardmore flats
54. IG: what was Stoughton Infants area like before Cardwells Keep? Wasn't it parking?
55. NH: It was fenced off and not available for parking.
56. PW: Need a bit of TLC when considering Ardmore as a possible residents parking area.
57. PK: What about using the proposed housing development in Waltham Ave/Grange Road as a residents parking area?
58. JH: Happy to consider that, if that is what residents living there would like.
59. FW: How do we proceed? We need to establish a principle.
60. PK: We can identify places where there are parking problems and where residents parking areas could be.
61. SW: Would people use them? Don't they need to be near people's homes, safe with lighting?
62. RL: they can be attractive, designed by street architects.
63. FW: Do we agree on principle we should have small home zone type parking areas?
64. ??
65. PW: We can charge for them?

At this point participants being informed that time was running short, eagerly contributed lots of different ideas which IG and NH were unable to capture on paper. FW referred to notes from last meeting.

Minutes from Stoughton Community Action Plan Meeting, Monday 17th January 2005
Stoughton Community & Youth Centre, Stoughton Rec.

66. FW: what did the last meeting mean by drop-kerbs?
67. ??: this is the problem of parking across other peoples drive-ways?
68. Various: nothing can be done
69. SB: it is against the law – I have given out lots of tickets for this.
70.
71. SB: Stoughton Residents Society will be upset [*about what?*]
72. SH: They can work very well – *city?*
73. ...
74. FW: Bus routes? Can bus routes stop at the railway station to encourage more use?
75. ...
76. IG: do we want a review sooner rather than wait for QEP to finish like Derek Lake suggests?
77. RL: yes
78. IG: Perhaps GBC and the developers can review the QEP travel plan? There is supposed to be £2Kpa to monitor this and the travel plan was already out of date when the development started.
79. FW: do we agree or shall we wait for QEP to finish?
80. Various: is it finished?
81. Various: Still got 45 houses in last phase, Budgens foodstore, 5 blocks of offices and the community centre. Don't know if offices will ever be fully occupied.
82.
83. RL: it is accepted in the industry that each dwelling typically generates 7 car trips. Traffic in Stoughton has increased 1.2% [*per annum, since ?*]
84. IG: the original QEP travel plan was and still is accepted therefore it can be used as basis for new review without having to wait until QEP is finished.
85. SW: We all spoke up during public meetings.
86. ??: rat-run ...
87. AN: The left turn into Slyfield needs a filter lane urgently because that is backing up all along Woking Road and Salt Box Road.
88. ...
89. PK: If we get ????? off the roads then we won't have a problem.
90. PW:
91. SH: Planning and traffic are linked and should be looked at together.
92. FW: the local development framework coming up in 200? Will be an opportunity to address that.
93. ...
94. RL: Strategic action plan should include rat-running
95. ...
96. PW: showed an A4 flyer and mentioned something about PC World.
97. ...
98. Traffic meeting adjourned to convene with other group and report back summaries of what had been said and agreed.

Traffic Group Report

1. IG presented the following summary:
 - The group discussed nearly all of the topics that came up at the last meeting and in particular **Manor Road**.
 - The group accepted RL's advice that this should be part of a **Stoughton-wide review**.
 - The group debated whether the **review should be done ASAP** or when QEP finishes, deciding it should be done ASAP because no one knows when QEP will ever finish.
 - **Home zones** are a good idea to encourage through traffic to use main routes and discourage driving through residential areas.
 - Residents need to identify where there are parking problems and locations for **residential parking areas**.
 - SCC should investigate whether **Stoughton Road railway bridge** could be a restricted thoroughway with controlled access for residents. Accepted there are a range of opinions about this bridge.
2. JH suggested we take up the matter of the Stoughton-wide review at the next Local Committee meeting on Thursday 20th, and explained that there is a half-hour question period from 7pm onwards prior to the main business.
3. RL expressed concern that more time was needed to prepare the proper question, but eventually agreed if a simple question could ask for a review in principle.
4. DJ suggested that if a question was to be 'posed' then it should be in a language that Highways are familiar with and more likely to agree to.
5. Resolved to pose a question to the Local Committee at its next meeting asking for '**a Stoughton Traffic Safety Scheme**' with a feasibility study. *[see below]*
6. JM suggested this could be treated as an update to the previous review. *[IG: this may be the previous study in 1995 for traffic calming in the Stoughton and Bellfields area, which may be the one that resulted in the speed-humps on Grange Road?]*
7. FW asked for a volunteer to pose the question on behalf of the meeting to the Local Committee at the Worplesdon Memorial meeting on Thurs 20th. PW and PS volunteered. *[Later it was agreed that NH would ask the question on behalf of the meeting and Stoughton Community Association, as it was felt that it would add more weight.]*

Question for Local Committee

[The question was later developed by RL and IG with help from JH]

Arising from concerns expressed at recent public workshops it is recognised there is an urgent need to commission an integrated traffic safety study for Stoughton. Such a study would identify and quantify traffic problems and develop proposals to deal with those problems. Specific issues to be considered are promoting road user safety, reducing traffic speed, reducing heavy goods vehicle traffic, preventing rat running and improving vehicle parking facilities in the area.

It is noted that minor studies are intended for Manor Road and Barrack Road on completion of QEP. The residents believe that a strategic view for the whole area is both urgent and necessary now since there are plans for further building in the area which has already one of the highest densities in Guildford.

Would the committee consider bringing such a study forward as a matter of urgency to coincide with the above Stoughton community workshops which expect to report to the Local Committee in the Summer?

Wrap up

1. IG asked everyone if they thought these meetings were worthwhile, and with general agreement suggested that the next meeting also consider Public Safety, which included neighbourhood watches.
2. DJ said he was also on the Safety (*Panel?*) which has a 3-year plan which should start in April and will be going out for consultation very shortly and results presented to the Local Committee on the 3rd March.
3. It was agreed the date for the next Stoughton Community Action Plan (SCAP) meeting should be Monday 28th February. [*PS to confirm.*]
4. JH explained dates for future meetings of the Guildford Local Committee to the full meeting:
 - Has regular meetings at different venues in the borough. Next is Thursday 20th at the Worplesdon Memorial Hall, and another at Millmead on 3rd March.
 - Hope to have a meeting in Stoughton sometime June/July.
5. The meeting closed with thanks to PS for organising it.