



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 12 MARCH 2010

Time: 2.00PM

Place: HASLEMERE EDUCATIONAL MUSEUM

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mrs P Frost (Farnham Central) (Chairman)
Mr D Harmer (Waverley Western Villages)
Ms D Le Gal (Farnham North)
Mr P Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley)
Mr D Munro (Farnham South)
Dr A Povey (Waverley Eastern Villages)
Mr S Renshaw (Haslemere)

Waverley Borough Council

Mr Maurice Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)
Mrs Elizabeth Cable (Witley and Hambledon)
Mr Brian Ellis (Cranleigh West)
Mr Tony Gordon-Smith (Godalming Charterhouse)
Mr Robert Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)
Mr Alan Lovell (Farnham Upper Hale)
Mr Keith Webster (Milford)

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

01/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Mr S Cosser, Mr J Lord and Mr S Hill; Mr J Ward was absent.

02/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 4 DECEMBER 2009 (Item 2)

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

03/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Declarations of personal interest were declared as follows:

- From Mrs E Cable and Mr K Webster in relation to Item 16 on the grounds that the named contact for Annex 1 is known to them.
- From Dr A Povey in relation to Item 16 on the grounds that he will be part of the panel which will assess applications to the Climate Change Fund.

04/10 PETITIONS (Item 4)

Two petitions were presented:

- Mr D O’Gorman presented a petition on behalf of residents of Frensham requesting the resurfacing of the A287 in Frensham, referring to concerns about the condition of the surface and its implications for safety and noise.
- Ms D James presented a petition on behalf of residents of Ewhurst, requesting, with respect to the B2127 Cranleigh Road, Ewhurst: the provision of anti-skid surface treatment; a maintenance programme to keep gulleys clear of debris, prevent blockages and stop water run-off; remedial work to the adverse camber; speed indicator equipment to warn drivers of excessive and unsafe speed.

The petitioners were advised that reports will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee by way of response.

05/10 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)

Four questions were presented and responses are set out at **Annex 1**.

06/10 MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS (Item 6)

One question was presented and responses are set out at **Annex 2**.

NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

07/10 PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 275A (BRAMLEY): PUBLIC PATH DIVERSION ORDER 2009 (Item 7)

As a formal objector to the order, Dr D M Osborne-Moss of Goose Green Cottage, Bramley exercised his right to address the Committee. He did not

oppose the proposed adjustment of the footpath between Goose Green and Tilsey Farm, but explained that his objection was based on the County Council's unwillingness to take the opportunity to amend the route immediately to the north to reflect the path taken by walkers in crossing Goose Green itself. He took issue with the County Council's position that, in order to achieve this, it would be necessary to first deregister the common land at this location.

There was a discussion about the date at which the definitive route across Goose Green may have become disused, but it was pointed out that members of the public may walk where they wish across common land. Mr M Byham proposed that the Committee should reject the officer recommendation, but this was not seconded. The matter was put to the vote and the recommendation was approved with eight votes in favour and four against; there were two abstentions.

Resolved that the Surrey County Council Footpath No. 275a (Bramley) Diversion Order 2009 be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination.

Reason for decision:

The diversion would result in an improvement to the rights of way network for walkers and avoid the need to relocate an existing footbridge.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

08/10 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009-2010: BUDGET MONITORING (Item 8)

Members questioned the status of the two schemes previously deferred by the Committee to 2010-2011 (pedestrian crossings in Weyhill, Haslemere and A325 Farnborough Road, Farnham) and expressed their expectation that the commitment to prioritise these for funding would be honoured. There was also disappointment that the implementation of the outcome of the Godalming Review of Civil Parking Enforcement had not yet taken place. Members received updates on individual schemes and reminded officers to ensure that relevant County and Borough Councillors are advised of implementation dates.

In general, however, the Committee expressed its appreciation of the successful delivery of a large programme during the year and thanked officers for their work in achieving this.

Resolved to note scheme progress and the forecast out-turns.

Reason for decision:

To enable the Committee to maintain an overview of progress and to ensure that expenditure remains within budget.

09/10 **CAPITAL MAINTENANCE SCHEMES COMPLETED IN 2009-2010 (Item 9)**

The Committee welcomed the extent of the programme delivered. In relation to individual pot-hole repairs, the process for dealing with high priority faults was explained and it was noted that gangs are requested to be flexible in attending to holes in the immediate vicinity. The need for members of the public to report faults, by the web-site or the Contact Centre, was reinforced.

An update on the temporary closure, owing to a landslip, of Deanery Road, Godalming was provided: it is likely that the closure will continue for some months before the major remedial works required are agreed and implemented.

Resolved to note that the listed schemes have been completed in 2009/10.

Reason for decision:

The Committee wishes to receive updates on progress.

10/10 **AMENDMENTS TO THE FARNHAM RAILWAY STATION CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (ZONE B) INCLUDING ST GEORGE'S ROAD: RESULT OF FORMAL CONSULTATION (Item 10)**

The Committee was advised that paragraph 2.7 in the published report (and the relevant Traffic Regulation Order) should be amended by deletion of the words in italics from the phrase "The visitor permit allocation limit of 30 per annum is in accordance with current County policy, where additional can be supplied to those who meet the exceptional circumstances (. . .) *to be defined in a policy statement to be issued by the County Council.*" The Committee expressed concern about the lack of clarity as to what might constitute exceptional circumstances. It was agreed that officers and relevant members would discuss the matter outside of the meeting so that reassurance as to the criteria involved might be provided.

It was felt that some displacement of parking into adjacent areas of south Farnham is taking place and the need for the promised annual review to encompass this was stressed.

Resolved:

- (i) To acknowledge the result of the formal consultation.
- (ii) That after full consideration of all objections received the amended Traffic Regulation Order be made.
- (iii) That the proposed on-street parking restrictions be implemented.

Reason for decision:

The advertised amendments are a significant improvement in both resident and visitor permit allocation.

11/10 **RESPONSE TO PETITION: SANDROCK HILL ROAD, FARNHAM (Item 11)**

The proposed actions were welcomed as a realistic response to the petitioners' reasonable requests.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the proposed response.
- (ii) Agree that any low cost measures considered appropriate should be funded from the 2010/11 Aids to Movement budget.

Reason for decision:

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

12/10 **DRIVE SMART ACTIVITIES IN WAVERLEY (Item 12)**

The activities detailed in the report were welcomed as a multi-agency approach to educating road-users and challenging anti-social driving behaviour. Particular attention was drawn to the effectiveness of School Speed watch events and Community Speed Watch schemes. It was noted that it is hard to recruit volunteers to the latter in some areas, despite training and equipment now being well resourced, and it was felt that improved publicity is needed. Locally funded initiatives, e.g. Godalming Town Council's contribution to the provision of highly visible tabards for primary school children, were commended. It was suggested that further attention be given to involving independent schools in road safety events.

The Committee thanked the officers from all relevant agencies who had been involved in delivering Drive Smart and requested regular updates on future activities.

Resolved to note the report.

Reason for decision:

The Committee had requested an update on the impact of the initiative.

13/10 **RIDGWAY ROAD, FARNHAM: PROPOSED LOADING RESTRICTIONS (Item 13)**

It was noted that similar problems of obstruction relating to deliveries at shops might exist in other areas and members were invited to notify the Local Highways Manager of any such locations.

Resolved that officers be asked to investigate the introduction of prohibitions on loading/unloading at busy times of the day as part of the annual review of parking restrictions for Waverley.

Reason for decision:

The Committee wishes to respond to a local concern.

[Mr K Webster was absent from the meeting during this item.]

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS: NON-TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

14/10 SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL DELIVERY PLAN (Item 14)

The Chairman invited Mrs C King (portfolio holder for Children and Young People and Community Safety at Waverley Borough Council) to join the Committee for this item.

Members were encouraged by the proposed direction of travel and stressed in particular that future arrangements should be needs- rather than asset-led, that stronger recognition should be given to the role of Waverley Borough Council, Town/Parish Councils and the voluntary sector in delivering services and that more attention should be given to the needs of rural areas and the difficulties of access experienced by, in particular, the more disadvantaged young people in these areas. There was a hope that longer term agreements (with due attention to performance) would support the sustainability of some voluntary sector projects. The importance of prevention (e.g. the projects staged by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and promoted by the Safer Waverley Partnership) was noted, with particular reference to young people below the age of 13. There was a discussion about the extent of the Service's focus on targeted activity with the most vulnerable young people and the relationship between this approach and the more general provision often offered by other agencies.

The Committee welcomed the proposed future framework through which it would be able to select from a menu of options the services it would wish to offer to communities in Waverley.

Resolved to:

- (i) Approve the Youth Development Service component of the Services for Young People Delivery Plan 2010/11.
- (ii) Note the transformation strategy for young people.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has the power to approve the Youth Development Service component of the Plan.

[Ms D Le Gal left the meeting during this item.]

15/10 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE: BOROUGH PLAN FOR 2010-2011 (Item 13)

In responding to questions on the plan, the Area Manager undertook to investigate the inspection regime for private residences in multiple occupation. Members were reassured as to the extent of activities to prevent heathland fires. The Committee commended in particular the activities undertaken in conjunction with the Safer Waverley Partnership to promote road safety, particularly for the benefit of young people.

Resolved to:

- (i) Recognise the achievements of the borough teams within Waverley and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Waverley safer through the delivery of the borough plan.
- (ii) Note the targets and initiatives set within the Waverley borough plan for 2010/11 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.
- (iii) Support the achievements of the retained duty personnel at Godalming, Cranleigh, Dunsfold and Haslemere and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

Reason for decision:

The Committee had an opportunity to comment on and show support for the borough plan, to encourage employers to release their personnel for retained duties and boost the retained workforce and to provide support for the personnel working in Waverley.

[Mr K Webster left the meeting at this point.]

16/10 CLIMATE CHANGE FUND (Item 16)

The Local Committee considered the two applications presented (Greening Godalming and loading restrictions in central Farnham), with particular reference to the wider funding implications and the extent to which the projects might be replicated.

It was agreed to reduce the application relating to loading restrictions in central Farnham (Annex 2) to £5000 and to provide match-funding if required from local budgets.

Resolved to submit both applications (valued at £5000 each) for consideration by the judging panel.

Reason for decision:

The Committee had an opportunity to submit applications to the countywide Climate Change Fund.

17/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2009-2010 (Item 17)

Resolved to:

- (i) Approve the applications for expenditure annexed to the report.
- (ii) Note the actions carried out under delegated authority since the last meeting.
- (iii) Agree that any revenue and capital sums remaining uncommitted at 31 March 2010 should be carried forward into the year 2010-2011.

Reason for decision:

The Committee is required to ensure the timely and appropriate deployment of its budgets.

18/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 18)

Members requested regular reports on road closures and major street-works and on major highways matters. It was noted that an annual report on Large Goods Vehicle Operator Licenses will be provided. The Chairman expressed her intention to pilot some enhanced partnership arrangements through the Local Committee as part of the “localism” agenda, e.g. extending of Borough Council involvement in Committee business.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the proposed contents of the Forward Programme.
- (ii) Request that the proposed additional topics be added to the plan.

Reason for decision:

To enable to Committee to plan its programme of reports.

The meeting closed at 5.25 pm

..... **(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: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1. From Mr N Lyons (Birtley Green, Bramley)

I have lived for the past 26 years at Birtley Green just south of Bramley, and my house fronts the heavily trafficked A281. It is many years since any form of road maintenance was effected between Birtley Green and Rushett Common. As can be seen from the circulated photographs taken in early February, the surface of this stretch of road has been seriously degrading and is now fragmenting over long sections. Substantial and lengthy cracks have also opened in the road-bed itself which are, of course, letting in water, leading to the inevitable effects of frost. Chippings are continually breaking away and spray onto pavements and driveways, mine included. The underlying road stone is becoming exposed. All this loose material forms an increasing hazard for vehicles and cyclists following the many heavy lorries on the A281 and for pedestrians walking along the narrow pathways.

I drew this matter to the attention of Bramley Parish Council in August 2009. Their office immediately contacted Surrey County Council Highways. As far as I am aware, no action has been taken towards any repair and the recent cold weather has, of course, exacerbated the situation. The photographs clearly indicate that the road surface has deteriorated to such an extent that surface dressing is no longer adequate. Large sections of this stretch of the road demand full resurfacing. Otherwise we shall find ourselves in a similar situation in a short period of time. From my personal observations, the condition of this section of the A281 is worse than any other for many miles in either direction.

Could this matter be investigated urgently and positive steps taken to rectify the situation without delay ?

Response

Nationally our roads suffered badly as a result of the unusually severe winter weather. In January Dr Andrew Povey, Leader of Surrey County Council, dedicated an additional £500,000 towards repair work in anticipation of the level of damage. This has been targeted at the most damaged roads and in the Bramley area an extensive area of the A281 has been re-surfaced leading towards the Guildford boundary (see Item 9). However, available funds limit the amount of surfacing work carried out each year, and the County Council Highways Service uses an assessment system to prioritise the order in which roads are surfaced. Over the coming months officers will be reviewing prioritisation in the light of winter damage, and the A281 between Birtley Green and Rushett Common will be included in this review, as will the entire A-road network. As always, pending any capital maintenance work (re-surfacing or surface dressing), Surrey's roads are kept safe by repairing potholes, etc, identified by cyclic inspections, or reported by the public (Contact Centre 0300 200 1003, Website www.surreycc.gov.uk).

[In a follow-up question Mr Lyons pointed out that his concerns pre-dated the recent severe weather and asked when resurfacing would take place. The

Local Highways Manager confirmed that the section of road will be included in the review referred to above and referred to the need to prioritise resources to maintain safety. Dr A Povey, as Leader of the County Council, described recent investment, but acknowledged the extent of the problem and referred to current efforts to secure additional funding.]

2. From Dr J Masding (Alfold Parish Council)

Alfold Parish Council would like to remind the Committee of the long promised road safety measures on the B2133 in the centre of Alfold village. It has long been accepted by County Council Highways engineers that some changes are necessary in this area, such as anti-skid surfacing, new signage at both ends to warn of hazard and possible white parking lines outside houses to emphasise legitimate parking areas – and we have this in writing. The funding for this was agreed in April 2007 and Highways asked us to make public the proposed changes in August 2007 which we did, BUT the funding went and residents' expectations and frustrations remain. The safety issues in the centre of the village are still a great concern to us and are in fact much worse due to the increase in very large HGVs now using this route south. We are aware of the financial issues facing Surrey County Council but we do stress that the worsening situation in the area needs urgent attention before a bad accident occurs between an HGV and car. There are reports of frequent 'near misses'. Would the Committee consider very seriously the need to allocate funding in the next financial year to safety measures in this location ?

Response

In the previous financial year, 2008/09, the Local Committee funded kerbing works and a footway extension at Alfold Crossways to improve safety and pedestrian amenity at this end of the village. The speed limit was also reduced on the A281 through the crossways and out towards the aerodrome, and new village gateways encouraging drivers to slow down were installed on the A281. Plans for relatively low-cost traffic calming measures on the Loxwood Road towards the village centre have been discussed by officers with the Parish Council, but no further funding has been allocated by the Committee at this point. The Cranleigh and Eastern Villages Transportation Task Group will shortly be considering priorities for the area, and will consider this request against others. However, given the Council-wide drive to reduce costs, funding available for highway improvement schemes is expected to be significantly reduced in 2010/11 in comparison to recent years. A report on the proposed 2010/11 improvement programme will be brought to the next meeting of this committee in June.

[In a follow-up question Dr Masding referred to raised expectations in the village following consultation in 2007 and the fact that pressure from Large Goods Vehicles through the village is increasing. It was confirmed that the Cranleigh and Eastern Villages Transportation Task Group would consider the case for safety measures in the village.]

3. From Mr Chris Meeks (Waverley and Guildford Friends of the Earth)

With the recent replacement of traffic lights in Godalming, many local people hoped for an improvement in the ability of pedestrians to cross the road. Is

the Local Committee aware of the astonishment felt locally at the failure to effect such improvement ? Why, for example, is there still a lack of pedestrian phasing in the traffic lights at the Flambard Way/Woolsack Way junction when large numbers of families from the Wharf Nursery School are traversing this junction ?

Will the Local Committee ensure a new policy is effected for the future so that whenever traffic lights are installed the presumption is in favour of pedestrian phasing on every arm of a junction unless there is good reason otherwise ?

Response

Traffic signals are maintained on a countywide basis by the Network Management Team based in Leatherhead. The Team controls a budget for routine maintenance and replacement of installations as they wear out. However, this covers like for like replacement only, with the exception of using more modern electronics and signal heads. The only County Council budget available for upgrading traffic signals, for instance the addition of pedestrian phases, is the Integrated Transport Scheme budget controlled by this Committee, although developer funding may also be directed to such improvements. It would be useful for members and local officers to be aware of the forward programme of signal replacement and the Local Highways Manager has asked the signals team for the programme for Waverley.

4. From Mrs J Nye (Witley)

During the last five years there has been difficulty for some parents in Witley in getting their children into any of the first choice local schools. In fact, despite being given three schools to choose from, these have all been unable to give the children a place, resulting in some parents having to take their small 4½ year-old child to a school some miles away. Could the Committee:

- reassure parents that the problem is being dealt with and that they will be given a place in their local school this year ?
- say whether other parishes have experienced the same situation ?

Response

Before addressing the detailed point around Witley, we would like to say a few words about the wider context of primary school admission in Surrey.

Since 2001 the number of births in the county has been rising. The effects vary in detail from area to area, but the broad consequence is that the County Council is increasing the number of places with each new year that starts school. What makes this particularly difficult is that capital funding is very difficult to raise: firstly because of the present attempts to reduce government spending; but also because Surrey has been placed in the most disadvantaged group of authorities for access to government funding for school places. We are therefore having to make our investment decisions extremely carefully, prioritising those areas where pupils would find it most difficult to obtain places without additional provision being opened.

For admissions across the county as a whole this year, some 83% of parents obtained their 1st ranked preference for their children with 96% being allocated one of their three preferences. At a Junior level 86% of first ranked preferences were met and 97% were allocated one of their three ranked preferences.

The Witley area has three primary age schools, namely Witley Infants, Milford Infants and The Chandler Junior School. First preferences were for the most part met in all three schools. At Witley there were 33 first preferences by parents for 30 places, at Milford there were 49 first preferences for 49 places and at The Chandler there were 79 first preferences for 84 places.

Witley Infants has had issues in the past but very nearly balanced first preferences versus places this year. Witley Infants is a small but very popular infant school recognised as an outstanding school by Ofsted. The pressure of applications varies considerably from year to year and in 2008 in particular many parents were disappointed and some had to travel considerable distances to alternative schools.

This year, as usual, Witley Infants offered 30 reception places. There were 33 first preference applications so we can broadly say that supply and demand aligned. Some 52 children lived closer to Witley than any other school, but of these 18 have been offered a place at a school of higher preference. This leaves four children for whom Witley is the closest school and who have been offered a place at a more distant school which they wanted less. Two have been offered Green Oak and two Grayswood, and we understand that the two who were offered Grayswood did have this school as a specified preference, albeit lower than Witley.

This is the situation in early March and of course there may be changes by September that mean that some who are disappointed now may still obtain the places they want. We have to say, though, that these late changes are less common here than in some other areas.

ANNEX 2: MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

From Mr David Munro (Farnham South)

At a seminar on highway matters in Farnham organised jointly by Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council on 26 January 2010, the issue of HGVs blighting the centre of Farnham was raised. At the time, Surrey County Council officers present said that they would investigate the matter urgently.

Subsequently, at the full Council meeting on 9 February, the three county councillors representing Farnham asked the Cabinet Member for Transport to confirm that 'the Highways Service are actively investigating the issue'. In his reply, Mr Ian Lake said, 'I have asked the Highways and Transport Services to make HGV issues a priority and to come forward with practical plans to address the problems at the earliest opportunity . . . '.

I have heard nothing further. Could the Local Highways Manager please give the Committee an update on what is happening ?

Response

Action is being taken as follows:

- New signs advising HGVs to use the A331 Blackwater Valley Route to reach the M3 and Odiham will be installed at the Shepherd and Flock roundabout. These will be placed to discourage use of both the Guildford Road (A325) into the town centre, and the Hale Road (A325) leading to Upper Hale. These signs are on order, and are being funded centrally from the Local Transport Plan capital budget for freight.
- A Freight Quality Partnership (FQP) for Farnham will be established, with the objective of minimising HGV movements in the town centre, and reducing the impact of HGVs. An officer meeting (Waverley Borough and Surrey County Councils) has been arranged for 1 April to instigate the FQP by agreeing who should be involved: typically retail and commerce groups, resident association representatives, the Town Council, the Freight Transport Association and the Road Haulage Association.
- At Item 16 on this agenda the Committee will consider an application for funding revisions to loading restrictions in the town centre under the County Council's Climate Change Fund.

[Mr D Munro strongly urged the development of a co-ordinated approach to the problems.]

ANNEX 3

INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The meeting was preceded by an informal public question time. The matters raised are summarised below. This summary does not form part of the formal minutes of the meeting.

1. From a representative of Churt Parish Council

There is a concern about the extent of rat-running in Churt, especially by vehicles wishing to avoid the Hindhead traffic lights, and a fear that this will increase if the Bordon-Whitehill eco-town goes ahead. Imminent calming measures in Hale House Lane should reduce speeds but not the volume of traffic. The Parish Council is requesting a count of traffic before and after the Hindhead Tunnel opens.

The Local Highways Manager (LHM) replied that counts would be undertaken in Hale House Lane and other local roads.

2. From Mr Tim Forrest (Chiddingfold)

Mr Forrest requested details of the process for initiating an investigation into the possibility of installing a pedestrian crossing at the southern end of Chiddingfold Green.

The LHM replied that the matter should be raised with the Cranleigh and Eastern Villages Transportation Task Group, a meeting of which would be arranged shortly.

3. From Mr J Sadler (Haslemere)

Mr Sadler requested a response to his enquiry about traffic-calming in Critchmere Lane, in the light of the future impact of the Hindhead Tunnel, and details of the decision on the current proposals for the lane.

The LHM referred to the decision of the Local Committee at its meeting on 11 September dealing with changes to the local road network in the vicinity of the Hindhead Tunnel. Residents will be notified and it is hoped that the work will be carried out in 2010.