



# SURREY

## COUNTY COUNCIL

### **Minutes of meeting**

#### **LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**Date:** FRIDAY 13 OCTOBER 2006

**Time:** 2.00PM

**Place:** FARNHAM UNITED REFORMED CHURCH HALL

### **Members present:**

#### **Surrey County Council**

Dr A Povey (Waverley Eastern Villages) (Chairman)  
Mrs P Frost (Farnham Central) (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr C Baily (Cranleigh and Ewhurst)  
Mr J Farmer (Farnham North)  
Mr D Harmer (Waverley Western Villages)  
Mr P Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley)  
Mr D Munro (Farnham South)  
Mr C Slyfield (Godalming North)  
Mrs C Stevens (Haslemere)

#### **Waverley Borough Council**

Mr M Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)  
Mrs C Cockburn (Farnham Bourne)  
Mr B Ellis (Cranleigh West)  
Miss G Ferguson (Farnham Castle)  
Mr C Mansell (Farnham Shortheath and Boundstone)  
Mr A Rayner (Godalming Central and Ockford)  
Mr K Reed (Cranleigh East)

**All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.**

**59/06 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)**

No apologies had been received. Mr J Robini and Mr K Webster (who has tendered his apologies in retrospect) were absent.

**60/06 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 8 September 2006 (Item 2)**

The minutes were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

**61/06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Declarations of personal interest were made as follows: Mr M Byham, Mrs C Cockburn, Mr B Ellis, Ms G Ferguson, Mrs P Frost, Mr D Harmer, Mr C Mansell, Mr P Martin, Mr A Rayner, Mr K Reed, Mr C Slyfield in relation to Item 8 on the grounds of their membership of Waverley Borough Council; Mr P Martin in relation to Item 12 on the grounds of his role as a governor of one of the schools referred to in the report.

**62/06 PETITIONS (Item 4)**

The receipt of a petition requesting traffic calming in Upper Weybourne Lane, Farnham and the response reported at Item 14 were noted.

**63/06 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTION (Item 5)**

There was one public question: the text and response are set out in Appendix 1.

**64/06 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)**

There were three members' questions; the text and response are set out in Appendix 2.

**65/06 FARNHAM TOWN COUNCIL (Item 7)**

Mrs Susan Farrow (Chair of the Environment and Services Committee) addressed the meeting. She referred to the Town Council's attainment of Quality Council status and cited the completion of a Healthcheck as a significant success. The Council engages with partners, particularly in relation to transportation where congestion, road safety, the maintenance of roads and paths and the timescale in which improvements are delivered remain concerns. The Town Council is addressing other priorities identified in the Healthcheck, including entertainment, activities for young people, facilities for older people and tourism and continues to take the lead on a series of popular seasonal events. Mrs Farrow concluded by reflecting on the role of local councils, with the support of other tiers of local government, in delivering the neighbourhood agenda.

66/06 **TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS IN THE PLANNING PROCESS:  
THE ROLE OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY AS CONSULTEE TO THE  
PLANNING AUTHORITY (Item 8)**

The Committee noted the reduced capacity of the County Council's Transportation Development Control (TDC) operation and the possibility that the planning process for small-scale applications could be accelerated by the provision of standard advice to enable officers of the planning authority to assess transportation implications. TDC officers, however, will continue to advise when required and would aim to attend planning meetings where large-scale applications are under consideration.

The Committee was reminded that the ultimate responsibility for decision-making rests with the Borough Council as Planning Authority. Concerns continue to be expressed about the cumulative impact on certain neighbourhoods of successive individual applications for additional residential developments. In the current policy framework TDC can only consider each case on its merits, but the Committee was informed that the Borough Council has an opportunity to include policies and guidelines within its Local Development Framework (LDF) which could restrict developments in specified areas and support the Planning Authority's decisions at appeal. Members were referred to paragraph 30 of the report which reflected the current understanding that the Borough Council is not inclined to use the LDF in this way. In view of this a motion, proposed by Mr D Harmer and seconded by the Chairman, was agreed, as set out in resolution (ii) below.

It was confirmed that the County Council will now accept the Borough Council's invitation for a TDC officer to attend a meeting of the Environment and Planning Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Resolved:**

- (i) To note the contents of the report.
- (ii) To authorise the Chairman to write to Waverley Borough Council requesting that it should reconsider its position on the use of the Local Development Framework as a means of reducing the cumulative impact of multiple developments in certain areas.

***NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS***

67/06 **ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN FIRGROVE HILL AND  
WEYDON LANE, FARNHAM (Item 9)**

The safety implications of establishing a footpath along the route were noted and an additional recommendation (ii) was agreed.

**Resolved:**

- (i) That a process of committee resolution and recommendation is sufficient to add the route to the Definitive Map and Statement at the next legal event.

- (ii) To recommend that appropriate fencing should be resourced and installed by the end of December 2006.

**68/06 PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 149, CHIDDINGFOLD: PROPOSED DIVERSION (Item 10)**

**Resolved** to agree that the information and reasoning given in the application received from Dalton Warner Davies is not sufficient to demonstrate that it is, in the interests of the public or of the landowner, lessee or occupier, expedient to divert Public Footpath No. 140, Chiddingfold (as shown on Drawing Number 3/1/4/H21) and that for this reason an order, under Section 119 of the Highways Act 1980, should not be made.

***EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: TRANSPORTATION MATTERS***

**69/06 B2128 SHAMLEY GREEN AND WONERSH: PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT REDUCTIONS (Item 11)**

**Resolved** to confirm that the traffic order for lower speed limits on the B2128 at Wonersh, Shamley Green and Stroud Common should be made as advertised.

**70/06 MINOR HIGHWAYS AND LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN: SCHEME PROGRESS REPORT (Item 12)**

Amendments were made to the Annexe to the effect that: (i) the reference to work on the A287 in Churt village by the gas supplier was incorrect and that the scheme in Churt will start on 3 November 2006; (ii) the speed assessment scheduled for the A281 at Alfold should be extended to the stretch of the B2133 through the village.

Members commented on various aspects of the programme and noted with approval the prompt progress being made on schemes. The Committee agreed to request a report on Quality Bus Partnerships at a future meeting.

**Resolved** to note the contents of the report.

**71/06 COMMUNITY SPEED WATCH: UPDATE (Item 13)**

The Committee was informed that, in addition to the schemes listed in the report, Witley and Hambledon had recently expressed an interest in becoming involved. Members sought reassurance that sufficient resources were available to support the continued expansion of the initiative and the Area Director agreed to make enquiries with Surrey Police.

**Resolved** to note the progress made in implementing Community Speed Watch in Waverley.

**72/06 UPPER WEYBOURNE LANE: RESPONSE TO PETITION (Item 14)**

**Resolved** to note the contents of the report.

**73/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS: TERMS OF REFERENCE (Item 15)**

A correction was noted to the wording of Section 12, replacing the word “with” with “will”. The agreed text therefore reads:

Task Groups will consider the results of consultations and the outcome of this will either inform the Local Transport Manager’s implementation of an agreed scheme or, when required by the Local Committee, inform the Local Transport Manager’s recommendations for its decision.

**Resolved** to agree the Terms of Reference annexed to the report.

**74/06 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE DOWNSLINK LONG-DISTANCE BRIDLEWAY (Item 16)**

The Committee welcomed the proposals to enhance the Downslink in the Bramley and Shamley Green area. Reassurance was sought as to what level of legal protection applied to the Downslink and officers undertook to investigate this.

**Resolved** to note the progress report and support the work of Countryside Access staff in improving the route for cycling.

**75/06 IMPLEMENTATION OF 40 AND 50MPH SPEED LIMITS ON THE A281 BETWEEN BRAMLEY AND CRANLEIGH (Urgent Item)**

The Chairman had agreed to consider this item as a matter of urgency as it was necessary to complete the process of creating the limits before the next meeting.

**Resolved** that:

- (i) The speed limit order detailed in ANNEXE 1 and ANNEXE 2 be approved for advertising.
- (ii) A members’ working group be established, consisting of local elected members, the Chairman of the Local Committee and the Head of Transportation to resolve any objections received and to approve, if agreed, the making of the necessary speed limit order.

***EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: NON-TRANSPORTATION MATTERS***

**76/06 SELF-RELIANCE IN WAVERLEY (Item 17)**

Mrs C Stevens, as Executive Member for Safer and Stronger Communities, paid tribute to the progress made in promoting self-reliance both countywide and locally. She described work in hand to develop a comprehensive strategic framework for the definition and promotion of stronger communities, building on the successes achieved to date. Appropriate outcomes would be developed, but there would be a need to retain local flexibility. It was

envisaged that new contractual arrangements for the provision of adult learning would enable the existing successful projects to be continued.

Members commended the progress made at Ockford Ridge/Aarons Hill and the need to initiate work in Binscombe, subject to resources being available, was noted.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the recent progress made in promoting self-reliance/social inclusion in Waverley and its relevance to the neighbourhood agenda.
- (ii) Support the continued contribution of County Council services to promoting self-reliance in Waverley.

#### **77/06 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS (Item 18)**

An additional recommendation (iii) was tabled by officers and agreed.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the six applications annexed to the report.
- (ii) Agree the return of unspent funding as set out in the report.
- (iii) Agree that, subject to the County Council's approval at its meeting on 17 October 2006 of the proposed amendment to the Scheme of Delegation authorising Area Directors to approve grants from members' revenue allocations (under the criteria agreed by the Council), the Area Director (South West) should exercise this power with immediate effect.

#### **78/06 ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES FACING WAVERLEY (Item 19)**

In reflecting on the Committee's informal workshop members expressed a particular interest in pursuing further the implications of the three Air Quality Management Areas in Waverley. The actions set out in the report were also endorsed: encouraging local awareness of the "ecological footprint" and sustainability generally; the encouragement of small-scale domestic and business sustainability initiatives; promoting the County Council's potential role as an exemplar of good practice in sustainability.

**Resolved** to note the suggested actions and to take these forward, in discussion with the Chairman, as appropriate.

The Chairman drew the attention of the Committee to the imminent retirement of Mr Bob Moodie, Area Transportation Group Manager (West), and thanked him for his work in Waverley over many years.

**The meeting closed at 4.05 PM**

..... (Chairman)

**Contact:**

Dave Johnson (Area Director)  
01483 517301 [dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:dave.johnson@surreycc.gov.uk)  
David North (Local Committee and Partnership Officer)  
01483 517530 [d.north@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:d.north@surreycc.gov.uk)

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **ITEM 5: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

#### **From Bramley Parish Council**

Bramley Parish Council was invited to make a presentation at the recent Waverley Consultative Forum on Dunsfold Park. After due deliberation, this Council felt that the traffic situation in Bramley and surrounding settlements was worsening rapidly such that no further major developments in the eastern area of Waverley should be allowed, other than those already identified in the Local Plan, regardless of this anticipated application. There are now around 19,000 vehicles a day using the A281 running through the village, and saturation point has been reached at peak times in the village centre.

To address this problem, the Council concluded that Surrey County Council and other interested parties should be asked to take stock of the current load on the A281, and come up with feasible solutions for permanent relief. In the circumstances, would the Local Committee please consider promoting with partners and within the County Council the need for a comprehensive review of the forthcoming infrastructure demands facing the eastern villages of Waverley, and parts of Guildford, with particular reference to transportation and the impact on the road network.

#### **Response**

1. The County Council shares the concerns of the Parish Council regarding significant development proposals in this area of Waverley and would expect any proposals to be accompanied by substantial improvements to public transport. In some cases, proposed sites may be unsustainable in terms of their impact on the highway network.
2. Bramley cannot be taken in isolation from other roads and villages in the area. Solutions to be developed will have to be based on demand management principles, as expansion of road capacity through by-pass schemes, etc. is not an acceptable, or indeed fundable, option.
3. The County Council is concentrating on advancing a programme of transport improvements for accessibility into Guildford from all directions, through proposals for additional park and ride services and better bus services, including expansion of the Pegasus system. Funding for such improvements will be unlikely to be available until the 2011 to 2016 period. The Local Committee would support efforts to reduce the impact of home-school transport by car, for example through recommending extension of the Pegasus system to all schools in the area.
4. One short term improvement is the 2006/07 implementation of the extension of the Downslink cycle route from Shamley Green, through Bramley into Guildford. The installation of works on the Cranleigh section of the Downslink has seen peak cycle levels rise from 23 movements per day prior to the works, to 127 cycle movements per day after the installation of a finished surface. The continuation of this route into Guildford with the provision of safe crossing points is expected to see a comparative increase in cycle usage for commuter/utility trips that would otherwise be car trips and it is hoped that all relevant agencies



will encourage expanded use of this nature. (A comparable route – the Bristol-Bath railway – receives 469,000 annual cycle trips, of which 58% of users could have opted to use a car for their trip. (National Cycle Network Users Report 2005))

5. The traffic volumes at Bramley are symptomatic of many other locations in Surrey and reflect a high volume of demand for travel. There are simply no easy solutions to suppressing such demand in the short term. The Local Committee will be mindful of the concerns expressed when considering the allocation of its Local Transport Plan budget. Parish Councils, as consultees on planning applications in their areas, have a role in drawing attention to developments which might further increase road traffic and may wish to be particularly vigilant in this regard.

It was agreed that the Chairman to write to the relevant Executive Member to request the extension of the Pegasus scheme. The Chairman requested that the possibility of downgrading the A281 to B-road status should be investigated.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **ITEM 6: MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

#### **1. From Mr David Harmer**

An important element of the vitality of the villages of Surrey is the profusion of societies and clubs. A number of those organisations hold key events which provide a significant part of the glue which holds village communities together. Examples might include flower shows, fetes and the like.

Some Parish Councils have agreed with societies that, to avoid clutter in the village centres, notices advertising such events should be placed one at each entrance to the village. However, recently the County Council's Transportation Service has been removing such signs as a traffic hazard, as reported in the Surrey Advertiser.

Parish Councils are concerned that there is one law for those who are trying to sustain the fabric of rural society, and another for property developers who appear to have carte blanche to cover the county in advertisements placed on the highway.

Will the Chairman agree that this matter should be placed on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting of the Local Committee, with a view to agreeing an equitable set of rules for all concerned ?

#### **Chairman's response**

It is confirmed that discussions will take place with the relevant officers and a report brought to the next formal meeting of the Committee on 26 January 2007.

#### **2. From Mr David Munro**

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's house at Undershaw, hard by the Hindhead crossroads, is derelict and deteriorating badly. A planning application is currently being considered by Waverley Borough Council which, if accepted, will lead to the house being subdivided into flats and further houses being built in the grounds.

Given that the house is Grade 2 listed and that it is of immense historical and literary significance to the area, can urgent representations be made by the Local Committee and Surrey County Council's Arts and Heritage service to enforce the owner's duty to prevent further deterioration and to ensure that Undershaw can remain as a fitting memorial to one of England's best-known writers ?

#### **Response**

Monitoring of listed buildings and any enforcement action to maintain their condition is the responsibility of the Borough Council following advice from its Historic Buildings Officer. The County Council's Historic Buildings Officer is able to become involved if invited to do so by the Borough Council. The

Chairman of the Local Committee is prepared to write to the Borough Council to register the concern expressed and to request that the necessary steps be taken to maintain the condition and integrity of the building commensurate with its listed status.

### **3. From Miss Gillian Ferguson**

How many staff are employed by Surrey County Council to deal with highways matters for Waverley; broken down between engineers, inspectors and other managers, and how does this compare (on the same basis) with staff employed before the County Council's Reviews of Policy and Productivity and Business Delivery ?

#### **Response**

Prior to the reviews the following staff were dedicated to managing highways in Waverley:

- Local Transportation Director
- Principal Engineer (Maintenance)
  - 3 Senior Engineers (Maintenance)
  - 3 Highway Stewards
  - Clerk of Works NRSWA
- Principal Engineer (Improvements and Traffic)
  - Senior Engineer (Improvements and Traffic)
  - 3 Assistant Engineers (Improvements and Traffic)

The current position is:

Area-wide (West Surrey)

- Group Manager
- Area Maintenance Manager
- Area Contracts Manager with a team of 6

Specific to Waverley:

- Senior Maintenance Engineer
- Senior Steward (also covering Guildford)
- Highway Steward
- Local Transportation Manager
- Principal Engineer (Improvements and Traffic)
  - Engineer (Improvements and Traffic)
  - Technician

The new structure is backed up by a central Business Support Team

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **INFORMAL QUESTION TIME**

The formal meeting was preceded by an informal open question time at which the following matters were raised:

- **The status of the Farnham Transportation Consultative Group**

The question concerned the current status of this group, which had been put on hold in February 2006. It was suggested that, in the light of the forthcoming major development in Farnham, the opportunity to consult with the many organisations represented on the Group would be valuable.

The Chairman of the Farnham Transportation Task Group, Mrs P Frost, replied that she intended to begin exploring the possibility of reforming the Consultative Group in the near future.

- **Dropped kerbs**

The cost to householders of arranging with the County Council to create a dropped kerb, along with the associated works, was raised. Information was requested on the specification and basis of the pricing and concern was expressed that householders are not permitted to secure a competitive quotation on their own account.

Full details on the specification and pricing would be provided outside of the meeting. On the general point it was explained that highway works of this kind are best undertaken by the County Council's term contractor to ensure that the relevant legislation and risks were taken into account. The prices charged are based on those quoted competitively by sub-contractors.

- **East Street, Farnham: condition of pavements**

The question concerned the condition of paving stones and tarmacked areas in East Street and referred also to areas susceptible to the accumulation of rainwater.

In response it was confirmed that town centre pavements are inspected for safety on a regular basis and repairs to dangerous areas are carried out as soon as possible. Repairs which are less urgent but desirable are carried out when priorities and funding allow. Members of the public are encouraged to report problems via the County Council's web-site or Call Centre (08456 009 009).