



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2010

Time: 2.00PM

Place: HALE INSTITUTE

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mrs P Frost (Farnham Central) (Chairman)
Mr S Renshaw (Haslemere) (Vice-Chairman)
Mr S Cosser (Godalming North)
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)

Waverley Borough Council

Mr Maurice Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)
Mr Brian Ellis (Cranleigh West)
Mr Tony Gordon-Smith (Godalming Charterhouse)
Mr Stephen Hill (Farnham Castle)
Mr Robert Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)
Mr Alan Lovell (Farnham Upper Hale)
Mr Bryn Morgan (Elstead and Thursley)
Mr John Ward (Farnham Shortheath and Boundstone)
Mr Keith Webster (Milford)

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

41/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Mr J Lord, Mrs E Cable and Mr K Webster; Mr B Morgan was present as substitute for Mr Webster; Dr A Povey was absent; Mr P Martin and Ms D Le Gal had indicated that they would be delayed.

42/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 18 June 2010 (Item 2)

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

43/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

No declarations of interest were received.

44/10 PETITIONS (Item 4)

A petition was presented on behalf of residents of St James's Place, Cranleigh who requested the establishment of a residents' only parking zone at this location. A formal response will be provided at the next meeting.

45/10 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)

There were no public questions.

46/10 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

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

In relation to **Question 1** Mr D Munro felt that concerns about the safety of children in Great Austins and Little Austins Road had not been adequately addresses in the response; he would pursue these outside of the meeting.

Mr A Lovell commented on the response to his questions (**Question 3**) as follows:

1. He wished to see a comprehensive strategy for Farnham, as previously agreed, which went beyond the air quality implications.
2. He believed that a commitment to promote the major highways schemes would enable preparatory work to be undertaken now to support future bids for funding.
3. In relation to the plans for East Street, he advocated a review of the existing Traffic Management Scheme to ensure a more integrated approach.
4. He felt that Farnham Town Council should be involved more formally in consultation on traffic matters.

[Ms D Le Gal joined the meeting at this point.]

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

47/10 LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN: TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL BUDGET 2010-2011 (Item 7)

Members regretted the County Council's decision not to allow the carry-forward of capital funds remaining unspent at the end of 2009-2010. In considering the arrangements for using the residual budget of £60,000 available in the current year, the Committee sought to balance the wish to respond to legitimate priorities with the understanding that work would need to be capable of completion before the outgoing contractor begins to scale down activities from the late autumn. Recognising that the flexibility to carry forward funding at year-end is desirable to allow for operational pressures, there was a wish to avoid an underspend in the current year. An alternative approach to that recommended by officers was proposed by Mr S Cosser and seconded by Mr T Gordon-Smith: that the remaining budget of £60,000 be retained as a contingency and that Transportation Task Groups be invited to submit a list of priorities to officers within the next month. When put to the vote the motion was defeated by nine votes to three.

Resolved that the residual budget of £60,000 be directed towards minor surfacing schemes as described in the report.

Reason for decision:

The Committee requires regular updates on progress; there is a need to complete capital expenditure by November, since the current contract with Ringway Highway Services is drawing to a close.

48/10 A3 HINDHEAD IMPROVEMENT: TRAFFIC CALMING IN HASLEMERE – OBJECTIONS TO NOTICE (Item 8)

Reassurance was provided that the proposed physical measures would be appropriate for the buses used on the route which follows the roads in question. There was a suggestion that, since it was difficult to predict the impact of the A3 tunnel at this stage, implementation should perhaps be delayed, but the Committee supported the officer recommendations (Mr A Lovell abstaining).

Resolved that:

- (i) The objections to the proposed traffic calming in Woolmer Hill Road, Critchmere Hill and Critchmere Lane, Haslemere be overruled.
- (ii) The County Council proceed under Section 90(a) to (i) (inclusive) of the Highways Act 1980 to introduce a series of physical measures in Woolmer Hill Road, Critchmere Hill and Critchmere Lane, Haslemere.

Reason for decision:

Committee approval to the recommendations would allow the previously approved proposals to be implemented.

[Mr P Martin joined the meeting during this item.]

49/10 **FARNHAM AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT (Item 9)**

Members welcomed the report and noted that there had been a small year-on-year improvement in air quality, although a trend cannot yet be established. It was pointed out that proposed out-of-county developments in Church Crookham and Farnborough would have an impact on traffic in Farnham and these should be taken into account. The continuing need to engage East Hampshire District Council in discussions on the Whitehill-Bordon development was stressed.

The intention to update the Farnham traffic model was also welcomed and it was confirmed that through traffic and the major approach routes are accommodated within this. Officers undertook to respond to the suggestion that new origin-destination survey data should be collected. It was also suggested that the traffic implications of the East Street development should be re-examined following the update of the model.

The Chairman reminded members that concerns relating to planning matters should be referred to Waverley Borough Council. It was noted that Variable Message Signs had been opposed locally, but that signs encouraging waiting drivers to turn off their engines at the level crossing had been installed. It was felt that the County Council should maintain its advocacy for the major schemes – Wrecclesham By-Pass and the Farnham Relief Road – which would have a substantial impact on air quality.

Resolved to agree the strategy comprising the proposed measures and implementation timetable set out in the report.

[Mr A Lovell abstained.]

Reason for decision:

The report enables the Committee to continue to monitor the response to its concerns on traffic-related air quality and related matters. The measures in tandem with the existing Air Quality Action Plan, should support improvements in air quality in Farnham. The joint approach between the County and Borough Councils ensures a joined-up approach and provides value for money to all participants.

50/10 **PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO LOADING RESTRICTIONS IN FARNHAM (Item 10)**

A correction to the published report was noted: the reference to “East Street” in the Summary was amended to read “The Borough”

The Committee welcomed the report and recommendations, while expressing some reservations about the impact on retailers. Members were reminded that the scheme would be experimental and a report brought to the Local Committee after the trial period, at which adjustments could be made. Members agreed that enforcement would be crucial to the success of the initiative.

In recognition of the terms of the Climate Change Fund grant which would fund this project, Mr S Renshaw (seconded by Mr S Cosser) proposed an additional resolution ([iii] below) which was agreed by the Committee.

Resolved to:

- (i) Advertise the introduction of an experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) under section 9 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) which has the effect of suspending the existing loading restrictions on The Borough and Downing Street (between Upper Church Lane / Ivy Lane and The Borough) and to introduce new loading restrictions on those lengths of roads between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday
- (ii) Consider any objections received and report these back to the Committee before any decision is made to make the experiment permanent.
- (iii) Review the effectiveness of the changes after six months' operation and consider whether any benefits might be extended elsewhere in Waverley.
- (iv) Agree to the establishment of a freight Quality Partnership for Farnham.

Reason for decision:

The proposed changes to the loading restrictions are targeted at what is seen as the worst locations for delivery related delays whilst avoiding changes to other locations where deliveries are being carried out with relatively little disruption.

51/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2010-2011 (Item 11)

Resolved to:

- (i) Approve the three applications for expenditure annexed to the report.
- (ii) Note the actions carried out under delegated authority since the last meeting.

Reason for decision:

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

[Mr A Lovell left the meeting during this item.]

52/10 COUNTY COUNCIL FUND FOR SMALL DISADVANTAGED AREAS (Item 12)

The Committee supported the Chairman's proposal that all four applications

reported should be endorsed and submitted for consideration by the countywide panel:

- Binscombe Project
- Haslemere Young Parents
- Opportunities Project (Sandy Hill and The Chantry)
- Change of Scene (Farnham)

Resolved to submit the four applications listed above for consideration by the countywide panel.

Reason for decision:

The Local Committee had an opportunity to support applications which would bring significant funding into the borough to enable some much-needed projects to be taken forward.

53/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 13)**

The Committee considered the forward plan of work.

Resolved to note the proposed contents of the Forward Programme.

Reason for decision:

To enable to Committee to plan its programme of reports.

The meeting closed at 4.00 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

POST-MEETING NOTE

49/10 The update of the Paramics traffic model for Farnham will involve traffic and turning counts, plus a software update, as stated in paragraph 2.1 of the officer report. Origin-destination surveys are not part of the current update. Any future test options for a Wrecclesham Bypass and a Farnham Bypass would use the County Council's strategic model, possibly in conjunction with the Paramics model. This strategic model includes LATS origin-destination survey data but it is likely that up-to-date origin-destination data would be required for such option tests. As set out in the committee response to Mr

Lovell's second question, it is not considered appropriate to commit resources to further development of these schemes at the present time.

The County Council confirms that a senior officer from Waverley Borough Council attended the April 2010 meeting with Hampshire County Council at which the potential impacts of the Whitehill Bordon Eco-town on Farnham were discussed.

ANNEX 1: MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. From Mr David Munro

Some residents in Great Austins and Little Austins Road in the Bourne, Farnham are increasingly concerned about parking by commuters and parents of South Farnham School pupils in the area. At a site meeting on 6 September attended by Mrs Pat Frost and myself, the County Council's central parking team, the Highways Service, the Police, the Headteacher of South Farnham School and of course by residents themselves, some forthright but nevertheless constructive views were expressed on how to deal with this acknowledged issue.

1. All-day Commuter Parking: Recognising that an area solution perhaps similar to that adopted last year in adjoining localities is required, could the Highways Service please outline their plans to progress the second stage of their promised review of parking in South Farnham?
2. 'School Run' Parking: Acknowledging that some short-term parking is inevitable and that the school tries hard to educate parents to park sensibly, there is nevertheless a particular safety issue at two junctions (Great Austins/Little Austins and Great Austins/Mavins Road) caused by short-term parking too close to the junction itself. Could measures to prohibit irresponsible parking such as yellow lines please be investigated as a matter of urgency, and could the Highways Service give an indication of when safety measures could be implemented, how much it would cost and from what potential funding sources ?

Committee Response

Following completion of the parking restrictions in the South Farnham area earlier this year, we will be assessing the displacement of commuters and school visitors to roads outside this restricted area, as part of the next Waverley Parking Review. This review is currently scheduled to take place during April and May 2011, with a report presented to this committee in September 2011. If we feel as though additional restrictions are required, and that there will be sufficient funding to proceed with such changes, then they will be progressed as part of this forthcoming review.

With regards to school run parking being a particular concern on the junctions of Great Austins with Little Austins and Mavins Road, if we were to progress with parking restrictions on these junctions as part of the Waverley Parking Review, the cost would be relatively minimal. However, to formally advertise and implement these restrictions in isolation, separate to the borough wide review, the costs involved would be significantly higher; up to £3,000. Introducing restrictions in isolation is rarely adopted by the County Council, as it does not tend to be a good 'value for money' approach.

As with all junction parking deemed to be of a hazardous nature, immediate action can be carried out by Surrey Police, until such time when parking restrictions are applied, so that enforcement can then be undertaken by local Civil Enforcement Officers.

2. From Mr David Munro

The provision of salt bins and the problems of keeping them filled was one of the main issues arising from the bad weather last winter. Since then, I (and no doubt other County Councillors) have received several requests from residents for additional salt bins and I have passed these on to the Highways Service for consideration.

Could I please be informed as a matter of urgency (given that these bins may well be needed in less than two months' time):

- Has the provision of salt bins been reviewed and, if so, with what result ?
- Have the many requests for additional bins been properly considered and, if not, when will this be done ?
- When will we know what additional bins have been approved ?
- Has there been a thorough audit of existing bins to check that they are in the right places and are in good repair ? If not, when will this be done ?
- What member participation in the process has happened or is envisaged ?
- Have orders for additional, and replacements for damaged, bins been submitted and, if so, when will they be installed ?
- What arrangements have been made for all bins to be filled at the start of winter and then monitored and replenished at regular intervals ?

Committee Response

The Committee notes the concerns set out in the question. A member task group has been reviewing winter maintenance arrangements countywide and members of the Local Committee will shortly be consulted on the initial findings and recommendations of this group. Mr Munro's questions will be considered at that point and a detailed response provided subsequently. The recommendations of the Task Group will be submitted to the Transportation Select Committee for discussion, prior to any decisions being made by the Cabinet, towards the end of this month.

3. From Mr Alan Lovell

I am pleased to see that there are two items on today's agenda which address certain aspects of the many traffic issues afflicting Farnham town centre (Items 9 and 10). This has enabled me to abbreviate the more extensive list of questions that I had prepared for the Committee. Nevertheless, there are still a number of related matters that I would like to raise:

1. The joint Surrey County Council/Waverley Borough Council meeting in September 2009 included a proposal for "*an overall transport strategy for the sub-regional area*" and "*a specific strategy for the Farnham area*". Both of these are important, both in their own right and so that infrastructure needs (particularly transport) can be related to the new Local Development Framework (LDF) which Waverley Borough

Council is developing. Whilst the two reports later on today's agenda address certain aspects of the current problems, they do not constitute a "strategy" as such. So when may we expect all of the elements of a strategy to be put together in such a way that meaningful consultation can be carried out ?

2. What is being done to investigate the feasibility of a new Wrecclesham Bypass/Farnham Relief Road, following the petition submitted last year, and could such a scheme be included in the new Local Transport Plan (LTP3) in replacement of the Hickleys Corner scheme ?
3. The April Surrey County Council/Waverley Borough Council meeting confirmed the principle that, whilst the developer is under no obligation to accept changes, it is possible to negotiate changes to the agreed S106 agreement for East Street. With this in mind I wish to ask whether alternatives to the traffic management scheme submitted by the developer and accepted by Surrey County Council could now be re-considered by the joint parties with a view to devising proposals which would complement a new strategy for the town.
4. In developing these new proposals can Farnham Town Council be involved at all stages and not just the Farnham Transportation Task Group as currently envisaged ?. This would allow the work to have proper public scrutiny and permit the involvement of a wider range of elected members' views for the benefit of the town.

Committee Response

1. The officer report to the Local Committee dated 17 September 2010 entitled 'Farnham Air Quality Improvements Project' (Item 9) sets out a transport based strategy to help mitigate air pollution in the Farnham Air Quality Management Area and to respond to a number of transport problems in and around the town. This report summarises progress since the September 2009 meeting referred to and sets out the recommended strategy for Farnham. As is stated in paragraph 1.11, an officer-level meeting with Hampshire County Council has been held at which the potential impacts of the Whitehall Bordon Eco-town on Farnham were discussed. A member-level meeting has been arranged for November 2010.
The present funding position, as reported in section 3 of the report, should be noted. Strategy development has taken place in this context.
2. Paragraph 2.3 of the officer report (Item 9) sets out the present position in relation to these proposed major schemes. It is not considered appropriate to commit resources to further development of these schemes at the present time.
3. As described in paragraph 2.1 of the report at Item 9, the traffic model is to be updated and used to test options for alternative traffic routing in and around the town. The Section 106 agreement forms the basis of the planning consent and it is unlikely that Waverley Borough Council and the developer would want to renegotiate this. However, any changes would be for Waverley Borough Council as the planning

authority to agree with the developer. In this situation, Surrey County Council as the local highway authority would provide advice to Waverley Borough Council.

4. Farnham Town Council is represented on the Farnham Traffic and Transport Task Group. The views of the Town Council can therefore be expressed. The Local Committee (Waverley) meets in public and is therefore subject to public scrutiny. It brings together elected members from Waverley Borough Council, the planning authority, and Surrey County Council, the highway authority. It is considered to be the appropriate committee to consider the officer report.

ANNEX 2

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. Ms Zofia Lovell (South Farnham Residents' Association)

Ms Lovell expressed a concern about the cumulative impact on traffic of residential redevelopment in certain areas and asked whether Transportation Development Control officers could be encouraged to give strengthened advice in these cases.

The Chairman reported that County Councillors receive details of those applications which are taken away for detailed consideration, but explained that questions about planning matters should be referred to Waverley Borough Council.

2. Mr David Seale (Bourne Community Speed Watch)

Mr Seale asked whether County Council Drive Smart funding could be allocated towards the purchase of additional speed watch equipment. The Chairman suggested an alternative approach to the relevant County Councillors for funding.

3. Mr Mannings (Park View Residents Association, Farnham)

The question concerned inappropriate use by good vehicles of Dukes Walk and Mr Mannings requested an update on what progress the County Council had made in revising routes with satellite navigation providers. Officers replied that work continues, but that new technology enables drivers to have access to relevant local information. Residents may report incidents on-line via the County Council web-site at:

http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Report+a+lorry+incident?opendocument

Mr Mannings also asked whether signed diversions are checked to ensure they make sense for drivers. It was confirmed that checks do take place but that officers respond to feedback from drivers.

4. Mr Mike Murphy (Farnham)

Mr Murphy asked if the deteriorating condition of certain footpaths, e.g in Cedarways, could be addressed. He was advised to provide details to the relevant County Councillor (Mr D Munro) who would arrange for inspection by the Community Highways Officer.

5. Mr Jeremy Hyman (Farnham)

Mr Hyman asked a series of questions with reference to Item 9 on the agenda, referring to a number of planning matters connected with the East

Street development. The Chairman advised that planning matters should be referred to Waverley Borough Council.

6. Ms Julia Parks and Mr K Morris (Upper Hale)

The questioners asked what progress had been made in addressing the practice of the operator of the "hail and ride" bus service in the Drovers Way/Trinity Hill area. It was explained that the County Council has no powers to police the activities of bus operators in this way. It was suggested that any evidence of poor practice should be submitted to officers for consideration by the County Council's Passenger Transport Group.

7. Mr J Sadler (Haslemere)

In relation to Item 8 on the agenda, Mr Sadler asked what evidence was available to support the introduction of traffic calming. The Local Highways Manager referred to evidence cited which demonstrates the effectiveness of such measures.

8. Ms Marianne O'Brien (Bus Users UK)

Ms O'Brien asked what the County Council is doing to encourage the use of public transport to reduce traffic congestion in Farnham. Officers referred to Item 9 and the Chairman agreed to arrange for a written reply to be provided.