

**DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY AGREED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE**



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 14 DECEMBER 2007

Time: 2.00PM

Place: HALE INSTITUTE, FARNHAM

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)
Mrs C Stevens (Haslemere)

Waverley Borough Council

Mr B A Ellis (Cranleigh West)
Mr V Duckett (Farnham Upper Hale)
Mr R D Frost (Farnham Firgrove)
Mr R J Gates (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)
Mr R A Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)
Mr B J Morgan (Elstead and Thursley)
Mr S N Reynolds (Godalming Charterhouse)
Mr R J Steel (Farnham Moor Park)
Mr K Webster (Milford)

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

58/07 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Mr C Slyfield and from Mr S O'Grady and Mr A Lovell, for whom Mr B Ellis and Mr V Duckett were respectively present as substitutes; Mr Duckett was absent at the beginning of the meeting.

59/07 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 14 September 2007 (Item 2)

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

60/07 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

None were received.

61/07 PETITIONS (Item 4)

Three petitions were received:

- From residents of Kings Road, Haslemere requesting a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The Local Highways Manager provided an immediate response, pointing out that Kings Road was a priority for the Haslemere and Western Villages Transportation Task Group and that consultation on changes to the parking arrangements would take place in early 2008. It would not be possible to implement a CPZ at this stage but every effort would be made to maximize residents' parking while maintaining a safe flow of traffic.
- From residents of Hale House Lane, Churt requesting an examination of speeding in this area and its impact on cyclists and pedestrians. A report will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.
- From residents of Brook requesting a zebra crossing across the A286 in the centre of the village. A report will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

62/07 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTION (Item 5)

One public question was received; this is set out with a response at Annex 1.

63/07 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

There were no members' questions.

**64/07 ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS LOCAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS:
CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE (Item 7)**

The Committee noted responses to correspondence following Committee decisions on (i) the use of Upper Hale Road, Farnham by Heavy Goods vehicles (HGVs) (from the Leader of the County Council) and (ii) the possible use of the Local Development Framework to reduce the cumulative impact of development in certain areas (from the Leader of Waverley Borough Council).

In respect of (i) the Committee welcomed the encouraging response. It was noted, however, that the problem of HGVs had an impact on other areas of Farnham.

The response to (ii) was also felt to be positive and some members hoped that a pro-active approach by the Borough Council would be helpful. The Borough Council's position was noted: the problem is widespread in the borough and the LDF indeed provides an opportunity to encompass all the cumulative impacts of successive local developments on the infrastructure, but the powers of the Highways Authority in relation to cumulative impact in the planning process remain constrained by legislation. The proposed framework for securing contributions from developers to mitigate the impact on services and infrastructure, to which both Councils are committed, was felt to be an encouraging development. It was agreed to continue discussions on the opportunities available.

Resolved to note the responses received.

Reason for decision:

The report was provided to update the Committee.

NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: RIGHTS OF WAY

65/07 PUBLIC BRIDLEWAYS NOS 529 AND 532 (TILFORD): PROPOSED DIVERSION AND EXTINGUISHMENT (Item 8)

The Committee was reminded of the options available to it: to (i) submit both Orders to the Secretary of State for determination, (ii) rescind both Orders or (iii) submit one of the Orders to the Secretary of State and rescind the other. Local members expressed concerns in principle about deforestation and the potential loss of footpaths. The recommendation was put to the vote and carried by nine votes to four.

Resolved that the Surrey County Council Bridleway No. 529 (Tilford) Public Path Diversion Order 2006 and the Surrey County Council Bridleway No. 532 (Tilford) Public Path Extinguishment Order 2006 be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination.

Reason for decision:

The application seeks to move the legal routes of the bridleways onto the routes used on the ground. Orders can be made where the County Council considers it is expedient to do so.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

66/07 HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT SCHEMES PROGRESS REPORT (Item 9)

Detailed questions on individual schemes were raised and answered. The work of the Local Transportation Team was commended but concerns were expressed at the continued shortfall of personnel and the Chairman agreed to raise the matter again. It was hoped that funds for schemes which are not completed in 2007-2008 will be carried forward into the new year.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

Reason for decision:

The report was provided to update the Committee only.

67/07 **‘WETSPOTS’: PROGRESS IN WAVERLEY (Item 10)**

The Committee welcomed the proposed work in the borough, noting that a significant share of the countywide budget had been allocated to Waverley. The Chairman agreed to write to the Leader of the County Council acknowledging this, but also pointing out that a large number of drainage problems remain to be addressed in the borough.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

Reason for decision:

The report was provided in response to a request from the Committee.

68/07 **NEW SPEED LIMITS: ELMBRIDGE ROAD AND ALFOLD ROAD, CRANLEIGH; DUNSFOLD ROAD, ALFOLD (Item 11)**

While recognising that the officers’ recommendation (i) in relation to the western limit of the proposed 30mph limit on the B2130 Elmbridge Road reflects the principles of the County Council’s Speed Management Policy, the following amendment was moved by Mr C Baily and seconded by Mr B Ellis:

“That, on grounds of road safety, a 30mph speed limit should be imposed from a suitable point in the vicinity of Nanhurst Crossroads to the junction with the B2128 Guildford Road, Cranleigh.”

The motion was lost by eleven votes to four and the officers’ original recommendations were agreed unamended.

Resolved that:

- (i) The intention of the County Council to make an Order under Sections 84, 85 & 86 and Part III and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose either a 30mph or 40mph speed limit on the following roads, subject to consultation with the Surrey Police, be advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the Order be made:

30mph Speed Limit

B2130 Elmbridge Road from a suitable point in the vicinity of the access road to the Cranleigh Purification Works to the junction with the B2128 Guildford Road (and that the signed 40mph limit between the Works and Nanhurst crossroads be retained).

D182 Alfold Road from its junction with Elmbridge Road to a suitable point in the vicinity of the access to West Cranleigh Nurseries.

D182 Elm Park (off Elmbridge Road)

D182 Wyndham Crescent (off Elmbridge Road)

D182 Stanton Close (off Elmbridge Road)

D182 Elm Grove (off Elmbridge Road)

D702 Westdene Meadows (off Elmbridge Road)

D683 Lashmere (off Elmbridge Road)

D696 Vine Works Road (off Alfold Road)

B2128 between its junction with Elmbridge Road and a point approximately 100 metres to the north west of the junction.

B2128 High Street from its junction with Elmbridge Road to a point approximately 80 metres to the south east of the junction (the location of the current 30mph limit).

40mph Speed Limit

C35 Dunsfold Road from its junction with Loxwood Road to a point approximately 70 metres to the west of its junction with Three Compasses Lane.

D181 Three Compasses Lane.

- (ii) The consideration and resolution of any objections or representations received as a result of advertising and consultation for the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in association with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and relevant local councillors.

Reason for decision:

The proposed limits comply with Surrey's Speed Management Policy.

[Mr V Duckett joined the meeting during this item.]

69/07 QUALITY BUS PARTNERSHIPS IN WAVERLEY (Item 12)

The Committee noted the encouraging progress of Quality Bus Partnerships (QBPs). There were some concerns about reliability: it was reported that monitoring of services shows better levels of punctuality on QBP routes when compared with routes not designated in this way, but members were invited to raise outside the meeting any concerns about regular breakdowns and cancellation of services due to staff shortages. The possibility of adjusting the 4/5 route in Farnham to serve The Chantrys was raised and would be investigated.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

Reason for decision:

The report was provided in response to a request from the Committee.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: NON-TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

70/07 PROMOTING STRONGER COMMUNITIES IN WAVERLEY (Item 13)

Mrs C Stevens, as Executive Member for Safer and Stronger Communities, welcomed the report, noting particularly the evidence presented which reflected the quiet progress made in Waverley to improve residents' lives and to support them in becoming involved in their communities. Recognising the value of preventative work, particularly with young people, Mrs Stevens outlined the challenge and opportunity open to all agencies – including the voluntary sector – to collaborate in integrating the “stronger communities” agenda into their objectives.

Members noted the progress made but felt that Surrey did not get a reasonable share of Government resources for social inclusion and that, as a consequence, projects often struggled with unsustainable short-term funding arrangements. Within the County Council investment in strengthening communities would have to compete with a number of other pressing priorities for the limited funding available. It was pointed out, however, that significant resources can be released by partnership working and mainstreaming initiatives within services.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the progress update on priority community projects in Waverley.
- (ii) Continue to use resources at its disposal to promote the development of stronger, more self-reliant communities in Waverley.
- (iii) Use its influence to promote a strategic approach to the creation of stronger communities by embedding relevant commitments in the objectives of the County Council, the Local Area Agreement and the new Sustainable Community Strategy for Waverley.

Reason for decisions:

The Committee was invited to note the reasons for promoting stronger, more inclusive and more self-reliant communities. In consequence it is asked to make a commitment to sustain the projects under way in Waverley, both in terms of resources and the activities of services, to use its influence to promote this locally and to endorse the adoption of a countywide strategic approach to the creation of stronger communities.

NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: NON-TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

71/07 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS (Item 14)

Resolved:

- (i) That the applications annexed to the report should be approved.
- (ii) That expenditure approved under delegated authority should be noted.

Reason for decision:

Applications have been assessed by the Area Director against the criteria contained in the financial framework for Local Committees and were recommended as appropriate use of the Committee's budgets.

The meeting closed at 4.05pm

..... (Chairman)

Contact:

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

ANNEX 1

Item 5: Public Question and Response

From Mr David Kirkham

I was pleased to read, in your response to the question Ms Rand asked at the last Local Committee meeting (14 September 2007), that Surrey County Council is committed to encouraging cycling. You then list a number of schemes which you claim assist cycling; unfortunately my experience of the schemes is that they all present problems:

- Green Lane, Binscombe

I used to cycle home from work along Green Lane, but after the traffic calming and 20mph zone were introduced I found I had to frequently take evasive action to avoid accidents. Motor vehicles were overtaking me and cutting in dangerously so that the speed cushions could be straddled. Motor vehicles were pulling out of Meades Park and other side roads without looking properly, as unfortunately when cycling to the left of the speed cushion I am in a less visible position. Motor vehicles were trying to overtake me as I approached the chicanes (in the 20mph zone) when I was travelling at 20mph. I now cycle along the B3000 where I've never needed to take evasive action (even when the speed limit was 60mph).

- Summers Road, Farncombe

In a question to the Local Committee in July 2006 Mr McCalden observed that the gap to the left of the speed cushions was so narrow that a cycle's handlebars were at risk of hitting pedestrians and causing an accident.

- Brighton Road, Busbridge

In June 2007 Mr Coombes asked the Committee a question about the positioning of the speed cushions at this location. In your response you stated that the scheme was not built as intended and that the contractor had been instructed to correct the installation. At the time of writing the cushions are still too close to the edge of the road and therefore present a danger to cyclists.

- A3100, Farncombe

In January 2007 I asked a question to the Committee about the shared use cycle path along the A3100. In your response you acknowledged that it didn't meet national recommended standards. Having read the Department for Transport's LTN 2/04 (para. 6.2.14) I would suggest that the majority of the path does not reach the absolute minimum width.

Cycling can, and does, benefit from well designed and built traffic calming and there is plenty of government-backed guidance on how to achieve this, but this guidance also observes that schemes can also create difficulties or even hazards, for cyclists.

Bearing all this in mind can you tell me:

1. Has there been any increase in cycling at these Schemes?

2. Has there been any improvement of cyclists' safety at these schemes?

Response

1. Has there been an increase in cycling at these (four) schemes?

The County Council does not undertake monitoring of cycle use of individual schemes; to do so would be costly and time consuming. Instead over 30 fixed cycle monitoring sites have been established equipped with automatic cycle counters. These sites are concentrated in Guildford, Runnymede and Woking, but there is no site in Waverley.

Surrey's target is to increase the number of cycle journeys being made by 20% between 2004 and 2011, and the fixed sites are used to measure progress. The latest figures for 2007 show a 10% increase since 2004, indicating that growth is on target.

2. Has there been an improvement of cyclist's safety at these (four) schemes?

Overall safety, or sense of security, is subjective. However, speed cushions and road tables do moderate vehicle speeds, as do reduced speed limits. In the case of the A3100, the shared footway surface in the northbound direction provides a facility for cyclists nervous about cycling on the road.

The following comments relate to the individual schemes mentioned in the question:

- Green Lane

It appears that motorists are driving without heed to cyclists: this will be brought to the attention of Surrey Police.

- Summers Road

The gaps between the speed cushions and the kerbs should be at least 750mm, and this will be checked in the near future.

- Brighton Road

We have reminded our contractor of the need to correct the installation of the speed cushions, and this is now expected to be completed as part of the work currently underway in Brighton Road in the Crownpits area.

- A3100

To repeat the reply given in January 2007: 'It is acknowledged that the cycle facility does not meet with national recommended standards, in that the width is less than 2 metres in places. This is because the route comprises an existing footway, which cyclists are now legally permitted to ride along. This footway is relatively lightly used by pedestrians, and on balance it was felt that allowing cyclists to use it would be of benefit, as

some find the A3100 intimidating if they are riding along the road itself... While the facility as it exists is a compromise, it does at least offer an alternative for cyclists which they can elect not to use, where previously it would have been illegal for them to ride a bicycle on this footway.'

ANNEX 2

The meeting was preceded by an informal public question time. The following is a summary of the matters raised.

1. From Mr M Murphy (Farnham Society)

Using Shortheath Road, Farnham as an example, Mr Murphy felt that the standard of highway maintenance in Farnham – both in terms of cleansing and drainage and preventative and remedial maintenance of roads and pavements – is at an unacceptable level and sought a response from the Committee.

Mr D Munro, as the relevant Executive Member, felt it realistic to point out that Surrey County Council does not receive a level of Government grant commensurate with the volume of traffic borne by the highway network. Nevertheless, more maintenance is being carried out by the Council's contractors. The lack of street-cleaning is being investigated.

The Local Highways Manager described enhanced arrangements to support the County Council in requiring improved reinstatement of road work carried out by, for example, utilities companies and would investigate the problems cited by Mr Murphy.

2. From Mr T Forrest (Chiddingfold)

Mr Forrest referred to a campaign, involving Parish Councils to reduce the impact of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on rural roads. He asked:

- How many environmental weight restrictions are in place in Surrey.
- What measures are in place to monitor compliance with the routes set out in the distributor map for Surrey.

The Local Highways Manager undertook to obtain responses to these questions.

Mr Munro confirmed that the need to update policies with respect to HGVs on rural and suburban roads was recognised by the County Council.

3. Mr V Steel (Upper Hale)

Mr Steel enquired what progress had been made in securing the satisfactory reinstatement of Upper Hale Road following the gas main work.

The Local Highways Manager stated that the original reinstatement had been assessed as defective and remedial work had been requested. The final inspection would fall due in January/February 2008 and, if not satisfactory, the County Council would continue to demand reinstatement to the required standard.

4. Ms P Pounall (South Farnham Residents' Association)

Mrs Pounall referred to the question she had asked at the 14 September 2007 meeting and asked why proposals for addressing parking and congestion in South Farnham were not on the agenda.

Mrs P Frost, as Chairman of the Farnham Transportation Task Group, repeated her appreciation of the work undertaken by the Association and confirmed that the Task Group would meet in January with a view to bidding for £30,000 for the scheme in 2008-2009.

The Local Highways Manager also thanked the Association for its work, which would accelerate the timescale for completing the scheme when agreed.

5. Mr Wallace (Upper Hale)

Mr Wallace asked if a weight restriction could be placed on Upper Hale Road to reduce the damage to property caused by HGVs.

The Local Highways Manager undertook to provide a written response.

6. Mr Sparrow (Upper Hale)

Mr Sparrow drew attention to a lack of street-cleaning in Alma Lane which had led to blocked drains.

As this work is undertaken by Waverley Borough Council the matter will be referred to the relevant officers.