

9 JANUARY 2017

## **BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD**

9 January 2017

- \* Councillor Jenny Wicks (Chairman)
- \* Councillor Liz Hogger (Vice-Chairman)

- |                                |                            |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Councillor Philip Brooker      | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Nils Christiansen | * Councillor Bob McShee    |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm       | * Councillor Mike Parsons  |
| Councillor Angela Goodwin      | Councillor Mike Piper      |
| * Councillor Nigel Kearse      | * Councillor Matthew Sarti |

\*Present

### **BEI48 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Councillors Philip Brooker and Angela Goodwin submitted apologies for absence.

In accordance with procedure rule 23(j), Councillor Colin Cross attended as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Angela Goodwin.

Councillor Matt Furniss, Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor David Quelch and Councillor Tony Phillips were also in attendance.

### **BEI49 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **BEI50 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 14 November 2016 were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

### **BEI51 M25 JUNCTION 10/A3 WISLEY INTERCHANGE CONSULTATION PRESENTATION**

The Board received a presentation from Hugh Coakley (Project Manager, Highways England) and Graham Bown (Atkins Global, consultant for Highways England) about the possible options for improving junction 10 of the M25.

The improvements proposed were driven by three main factors;

- congestion and delays; which will rise from 8 minutes to nearly 16 minutes in 2037.
- safety; given that the M25 junction 10 had the highest accident frequency nationally and;
- to facilitate growth of both regional and local jobs which would otherwise be constrained if major roads failed to cope with demand.

It was explained that the Department for Transport had announced plans to improve the Wisley interchange as part of its Road Investment Strategy in 2014 as well as undertake improvements to the Painshill interchange with a budget of between £100 to £250 million. It was noted that Highways England was currently undertaking a non-statutory public consultation and would make a preferred route announcement in August 2017. Following a statutory public consultation in October 2017 – February 2018, a Development Consent Order application was planned in July 2018, commencing with construction works in 2019-

9 JANUARY 2017

2020 with a view to completion of the improvements works by March 2023. A number of environmental constraints had been identified and two options shortlisted for consideration.

Option 9 comprised a four level flyover resulting in all left turns and two right turns being removed. This proposal outlines that the A3 will be increased to four lanes from three between junction 10 and Painshill. Traffic joining the M25 from the A3 will use free-flow slip roads, avoiding the roundabout while traffic joining the A3 from the M25 continues to use the existing roundabout. The A3 will be increased from three to four lanes between Ockham and junction 10. The existing pedestrian, cyclist and horse rider crossings will be maintained. Option 14 consisted of plans for an elongated roundabout and local access route improvements incorporating additional lanes to improve capacity and dedicated left turns. Vehicles turning left from the A3 or M25 would not have to stop at the roundabout. It would sit at the same level as the current roundabout while the existing roundabout would be retained for pedestrian, cyclist and horse rider crossings. The A3 would be increased to four lanes from three between junction 10 and both Painshill and Ockham. The design was constrained by bridges over the roundabout; only one additional lane could be accommodated on the A3 at this point. Access at Wisley Lane and Elm Lane would be closed and service roads introduced.

The Board noted the following comparisons between options 9 and 14:

- reduced journey times: option 9 would result in a decreased journey time by 8 minutes per mile versus a reduced journey time of 5 minutes per mile for option 14.
- accidents: Option 9 was predicted to save 15 injury accidents per year whilst option 14 would only save one injury accident per year.
- environmental Impact: option 9 required 17 hectares of land versus option 14 requiring around 8 hectares of land.
- costs: Option 9 would cost £214.7 million versus option 14 costing £152.2 million.

Highways England had considered a third option, to replicate junction 12 on the M25. This was rejected owing to the very large footprint and environmental impact, increased expense and limited additional benefits compared with option 9.

After a full discussion, the Board's unanimous view was that improvements must be made and members fully supported the priority assigned to such improvement.

The Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance commented that the Council had and would continue to work very closely with Highways England on trying to resolve ongoing issues in terms of potential environmental impact, congestions and safety impacts. The Board would submit their comments to the non-statutory consultation imminently and the Council would feed into the statutory consultation planned in August.

The Board agreed that significant concerns were raised on the following matters, which should be fully taken into account as the scheme progresses:

1. The lack of thorough investigation of the environmental impacts of each proposed scheme.
2. The lack of evidence on the land-take of land classified as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Protection Area (SPA).
3. The unsatisfactory nature of at least some of the proposed alternative routes for access to local houses and other locations which currently have access to the A3.

9 JANUARY 2017

4. In particular the effect on traffic through Ripley of possible alternative access to RHS Wisley, which has plans in train to substantially increase its visitor numbers.
5. The lack of improved, dedicated routes for cyclists at junction 10.
6. The Board noted that Highways England intended to upgrade the M25 west of junction 10 in roughly the same timescale as for the improvement of Junction 10. However, they were disappointed that improvements to the A3 at Guildford had no definite timescale and feared that existing levels of congestion there would be worsened when junction 10 was finished.

Without this level of detail and access to modelling data, the Board did not feel able to choose to recommend one of the schemes in preference to the other.

#### **BEI52 GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE WI-FI**

Chris Burchell, Local Economy Manager introduced the item and explained that the proposal to provide public Wi-Fi for Guildford town had been previously presented to the Board in September of this year.

The Board received a presentation from Mr Michael Snaith from Media Network Solutions on the work undertaken so far. A soft market testing exercise had been carried out and a number of options identified. Companies such as Vodafone, BT and Arqiva and others had expressed an interest to engage with Guildford Borough Council in utilising infrastructure owned by both Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council to support and enable the delivery of commercial wireless services including the provision of free Wi-Fi within Guildford town centre. This investment would also enhance mobile coverage across the Borough. Other recommendations, following the market test exercise included:

- Developing a Smart City Strategy to identify further investment and ways of attracting it;
- Ducting Infrastructure and its investment, providing innovative approaches to fibre and ducting installation so to be better able to support rural communities and businesses, new residential areas and business parks;
- Collaborative work with the 5G Innovation Centre so to aid rural connectivity and public space Wi-Fi;
- Aligning the findings with the Council's Digital Strategy;
- Encouraging private investment via businesses to improve connectivity for all via Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds and the marketing of development opportunities within Guildford;
- Ensuring that digital and telecom infrastructure including ducting and street furniture are included in any future regeneration projects.

The Board made the following comments:

- The Board fully supported the work being undertaken to introduce free Wi-Fi for Guildford town centre, and endorsed the innovative approach to seek funding through existing assets and infrastructure, rather than at cost to the Council.
- The Board also considered that the rural community would benefit greatly from Wi-Fi connectivity. The Norfolk diocese had for example, used their church spires to connect up to 50 villages locally with Wi-Fi.
- It was noted that a supplementary planning guidance note could be produced to specify the type of ducting and telecom infrastructure to be installed so that a consistent approach was adopted throughout Guildford and in the rural areas.

9 JANUARY 2017

- Any wireless concession implemented, stood alone and was not delivered on the back of Guildford Borough Council.
- The Board recommended that the Smart City Strategy should focus on the benefits afforded by Wi-Fi in assisting Guildford in tackling issues such as traffic congestion, flooding and air quality.
- The Board noted that the Wi-Fi network security was the responsibility of third parties that provided it. The Council was not liable.

The Board noted the update and fully supported the project moving forward.

**BEI53 UPDATE/PROGRESS WITH MATTERS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE - EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD**

The Board requested that it received further updates in relation to:

- The Future of Guildford Museum, particularly the proposal to develop a fundraising strategy and related fundraising committee with a view to identifying and securing external grants and funding for improvements to the Museum.
- Guildford Parking Strategy, in relation to the wider public consultation on the strategy.

The Board also noted that the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy was due to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 24 January 2017, should any members wish to make further comments.

**BEI54 EAB WORK PROGRAMME**

The Board noted that an update in relation to the Guildford Design Guide was scheduled for its next meeting on 20 February 2017. The Board was keen to be involved in the inception of the Guide, through the formation of a Working Group.

The meeting finished at 8.45 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....