

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



**Minutes of meeting**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**Date:** FRIDAY 17 DECEMBER 2010

**Time:** 2.00PM

**Place:** GODALMING BAPTIST CHURCH

**Members present:**

**Surrey County Council**

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

**Waverley Borough Council**

Mr M Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)  
Mrs E Cable (Witley and Hambledon)  
Mr B Ellis (Cranleigh West)  
Mr T Gordon-Smith (Godalming Charterhouse)  
Mr R Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)  
Mr K Webster (Milford)

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

**62/10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mr D Harmer and Mr J Lord; Mr S Hill, Mr A Lovell and Mr J Ward were absent.

**63/10 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 22 October 2010 (Item 2)**

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

**64/10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Dr A Povey declared a prejudicial interest in Item 11 on the grounds that he is a director of a company which owns property in St James's Place, Cranleigh.

**65/10 PETITIONS (Item 4)**

No petitions were received.

**66/10 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)**

Two public questions were received: the Committee's responses and a record of the supplementary questions are set out in **Annex 1**.

**67/10 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)**

There were no members' questions.

***NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS***

**68/10 PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 233 CHIDDINGFOLD – PROPOSED DIVERSION (Item 7)**

Mrs Edgar and Mrs Wright spoke in support of the proposal, each stating that, in their experience, the definitive route had never been used but that the alternative now proposed had been regularly walked.

Additional information relating to a recent planning decision by Waverley Borough Council was tabled.

**Resolved** that the Surrey County Council Footpath No. 233 (Chiddingfold) Public Path Diversion Order 2010 is made and, if one or more objections are received and maintained, the order be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination.

**Reason for decision:**

The proposed diversion meets the tests set out under the Act, is expedient and will not be substantially less convenient to the public. The Parish Council supports the proposal. The surface of the path is not envisaged to be an issue and will be monitored. If the order is confirmed encroaching vegetation will be cleared and the path will be included in the council's maintenance

programme. The Council does not have power to require landowners to landscape sites and the stiles Mr Holmes objects to are outside the scope of the order. If no objections are made, the Order can be confirmed under officers' delegated powers.

### **EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS**

#### **69/10 ADDITIONAL CAPITAL FUNDING FOR HIGHWAYS 2010-2011 (Item 8)**

The importance of ensuring that all available funds are spent by the end of the financial year was noted.

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

#### **Reason for decision:**

The Committee requires regular updates on the progress of the budget and of projects which it has agreed to fund.

#### **70/10 EXPERIMENTAL SPEED LIMIT: B2133 LOXWOOD ROAD, ALFOLD TO COUNTY BOUNDARY (Item 9)**

Some members regretted the absence of discussions with West Sussex County Council and expressed a concern that the Local Committee was being pressed to support the proposal purely to manage the implications in Alfold of a temporary scheme on the Loxwood side of the boundary; it was noted that neither Police force had endorsed the proposed limit. There was a concern that, if made permanent in the future, traffic calming measures may be necessary. Other members, however – including Dr A Povey who, as the relevant County Councillor, offered to meet the costs of advertising the experimental limit from his local allocation – reflected the strong support locally for the proposed 40mph speed limit and felt that this should be paramount.

The Chairman recommended that any future cross-boundary changes should be the subject of formal consultation between the relevant authorities in advance of a proposal being developed.

When put to the vote the proposal was carried by nine votes to three with one abstention.

**Resolved** to agree to the introduction of an experimental 40mph speed limit for a period of six months on the B2133 Loxwood Road between the boundary with West Sussex and the existing 30mph speed limit at Alfold village.

#### **Reason for decision:**

The Committee was recommended to trial an appropriate speed limit which would reflect an experimental 40mph limit be imposed on the West Sussex side of the boundary.

71/10 **RESPONSE TO PETITION: ST JAMES'S PLACE, CRANLEIGH (Item 11)**

**Resolved** to note the proposed response.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

72/10 **PROGRESS IN PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS (Item 12)**

Members welcomed the report, noting the significant progress made in Waverley in engaging residents and addressing some of the key aspects of disadvantage; the empowerment of residents reflects current thinking on the "Big Society". The contribution of County and Borough Council members and officers and that of other partners was noted, including those staff employed specifically to support and co-ordinate work in the priority neighbourhoods. A good start had been made in Wrecclesham and it was hoped that attention could also now be given to neighbourhoods where levels of disadvantage, while not as high as those recorded in the priority neighbourhoods, are nevertheless of local concern (e.g. in Haslemere). It was anticipated that the proposed launch of a Credit Union would make a valued contribution to addressing financial exclusion.

The Chairman proposed an amended recommendation which was agreed as (ii) below.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note and endorse the progress made in the priority communities in Waverley.
- (ii) Continue to identify appropriate resources at its disposal to promote the development of stronger, more self-reliant communities in Waverley, especially those which it has identified as priorities.
- (iii) Use the Committee's influence where appropriate to advocate the needs of disadvantaged communities in Waverley.

**Reason for decision:**

The County Council, other public sector agencies and, increasingly the voluntary and faith sector, are seeking to reduce inequalities and empower individuals and communities to develop local solutions to the problems which face them.

73/10 **LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2010-2011 (Item 13)**

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the applications for expenditure annexed to the report and the return of a grant reported at 1.2.

- (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.

**74/10 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME**

Members requested that a discussion on the implications of the Localism Bill should be scheduled into the programme.

**Resolved** to note the proposed programme and requested a report on the implications of the Localism Bill.

**Reason for decision:**

To enable the Committee to plan its programme of reports.

**The meeting closed at 3.20 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)

## ANNEX 1: PUBLIC QUESTIONS

### 1. From Mr James Streatfeild (Farncombe)

My wife and I are residents of Gray's Road, Farncombe who struggle to park our car each day. The area around Farncombe railway station is of a medium to high population density and so parking is bound to be an issue, but the problem is compounded by the railway commuters who dominate the roadside spaces. No-one has a right to park in front of one's house, but at the moment the balance is in the favour of the commuters, following the parking restrictions being lifted earlier in April.

Currently, commuters are parking their vehicles for long periods of time on the local roads to Farncombe railway station, often from 5.50 until 22.00, and this is no doubt the result of parking in and around the neighbouring railway stations (Guildford and Godalming) being either restricted, expensive, or non-existent. When I return from work in the evening, nine or sometimes ten vehicles out of thirteen on Gray's Rd. are taken up by non-residents.

Would it be possible to introduce a **Residents' Parking Scheme** in the area around Farncombe Railway Station, but one that would also allow **anyone to park for a maximum of two hours** ? Assuming such a scheme was effectively enforced by the wardens, it would ease the parking for local residents (who incidentally do not have any off-road parking), but also allow people to park and use the local shops / facilities. Such a scheme could be introduced for:

- Station Rd
- Gray's Rd
- George Rd
- Elizabeth Rd
- Summer's Rd

The scheme could well be introduced for a larger area as this would help dissipate the parking problems, particularly as properties further from the station have off-road parking. Clearly, there is an imbalance with respects to the parking around Farncombe, and I feel this needs to be addressed.

#### **Committee Response**

Surrey County Council's Parking Strategy and Implementation Team (Parking Team) will be assessing the Farncombe area for a possible residents' parking scheme/Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) during the next Waverley Parking Review due to begin in April 2011, with all recommendations presented to this committee in September 2011.

However, there are feasibility issues in terms of providing such a scheme in this area which are explained below.

Firstly, as mentioned in the submitted question, a residents' scheme in Farncombe would have to incorporate a number of roads covering a fairly significant area around the railway station. This would be necessary in order to minimise potential parking conflicts being relocated to streets immediately adjacent to any new zone. The area that would need to be included in any CPZ scheme would cost in the region of £50,000 to implement. This area

would include the roads listed in the submitted question but also a number of streets to the south of the railway station.

Due to the nature of the streets in Farncombe, and the large number of terraced properties without off-street parking which front them, there may still be competition for on-street parking places in some roads. Not all streets in the area fully comply with the Traffic Regulations in terms of having sufficient road widths and suitable road layouts for formal on-street parking bays to be provided. As a result, these particular roads are going to struggle to accommodate enough formal parking bays to meet residents' expectations.

Bearing in mind this issue, the Parking Team will assess all existing parking bays in the area, including all potential locations for new parking spaces to be provided, in order to maximise on street capacity without compromising road safety or access.

### **Supplementary question**

Mr Streatfeild made a detailed proposal and asked whether the geography of the area was sufficiently different from other similar locations, e.g. in Guildford, to prevent the introduction of on-street parking bays. In response the Area Team Manager (Highways) undertook to consider any proposals which residents may wish to submit.

## **2. From Mr Stewart Payne (Hambleton Parish Council)**

The small rural parish of Hambleton suffered badly because of severe weather earlier this year, with the village effectively cut off for a week with no gritting or snow ploughing and a three-day power failure. The Parish Council determined to be better prepared in future and, encouraged by Surrey County Council (SCC) and Waverley Borough Council, put in place an emergency plan.

As part of this process the parish was told by SCC back in the spring that it would be provided with a snow plough to be used by a local farmer. It was also told that the main route through the village, Hambleton Road, was on the Priority 1 gritting network. As a result a grit bin on this road was deliberately left empty by SCC "because it would not be needed".

Despite repeated pressure from the Parish Council the snow plough blade did not arrive until just before the recent heavy snowfall. It required further work to adapt it for use on the farmer's tractor which was to be carried out "within days" by SCC. This never happened.

So when the snow came our farmer could not use the snow plough. Matters were made worse by the failure of SCC to grit Hambleton Road before the widely-forecast snow. When gritters did finally arrive, it was too late. And, on the day, the Waverley emergency planner failed to get into work...because of the snow. None of this fills us with any confidence.

Why was the plough delivered so late and not put into working order ? And why was Hambleton Road not gritted at the appropriate time ?

### **Committee response**

Since the beginning of the year, Surrey County Council (SCC) has enlisted 27 new farmers to assist with snow operations, bringing the total that can be called on to 35. Work on fitting snow plough blades to individual tractors started in September, once fitters had completed servicing the front line fleet of 40 gritters. Some plough blades required refurbishment, and there have been complications with adapting them to tractors. All blades have now been fitted, with the exception of the farmer in Hambledon, but SCC's fleet contractor has been asked to ensure that this final blade is fitted as a matter of urgency. Other SCC enlisted farmers have ploughed minor roads in the Hambledon/Hydestyle area.

Over the summer SCC carried out an audit of gritting routes across the whole county. Hambledon Road is included on the P1 Cranleigh route operating out of our Witley depot, treated at the same time as major roads such as the nearby A283.

With respect to the snow that started to fall on Tuesday 30 November, SCC records for treating the P1 network in West Surrey are shown in the table below (9 runs between 26 November and 2 December). Note that until a road carries a certain level of traffic, which emulsifies the salt and accelerates its melting effect, it may not be apparent to the eye that treatment has taken place.

### **Supplementary question**

Mr Payne asked for reassurance that the snowplough blade in question would be operational as soon as possible. The Area Team Manager (Highways) indicated that this would happen within two days.



Date	Ringway		No. Runs - Rate of Spread			
	Climate Zone B/C	Time Pre-salt Commenced	10g/m2	15g/m2	20g/m2	
26th Nov	Red	19:00	1			PRESALT PRIMARY ROUTES 19:00HRS @ 10GRMS. HOGS BACK AND BVR 15GRMS. HOAR FROST EXPECTED FROM 21:00HRS. POSSIBLE LIGHT SNOW FLURRIES TOMORROW AROUND NOON.
27th Nov	Red	19:00	1			PRIMARY ROUTES FROM 19:00HRS @ 10GRMS. MIN RST'S - 6/5. HOAR FROST EXPECTED WITH POSSIBLE LIGHT SNOW FLURRIES.
28th Nov	Red	19:00	1			RESALT PRIMARY ROUTES FROM 19:00HRS @ 10GRMS. BVR AND HOGS BACK 15GRMS. MIN RST'S - 5. HOAR FROST EXPECTED WITH POSSIBLE LIGHT SNOW FLURRIES BTWN 18:00HRS-02:00HRS.
29th Nov	Red	15:00	1			SECONDRY ROUTES FROM 15:00HRS @ 10GRMS.
29th Nov	Red	19:30		1		PRESALT PRIMARY ROUTES FROM 19:30HRS @ 15GRMS. RST'S TO FALL TO MS02. POSSIBLITY OF SNOW FROM 21:00HRS.
30th Nov	Red	13:00		1		PRIMARY ROUTES FROM 13:00HRS @
30th Nov	Red	15:30		1		PRESALT SECONDRY ROUTES FROM 15:30HRS @ 15GRMS. POSSIBLE RUN THIS EVENING WILL UPDATE HAVING CONSULTED FORECAST.
30th Nov		20:00			1	P1
1st Dec		10:00			1	P2
1st Dec		14:00	1			P1
1st Dec	Red	19:00		1		P1
2nd Dec		Day		1		P2
2nd Dec	Red	19:00	1			P1

## **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. Mr Kevin Garvey (Shamley Green)**

Mr Garvey referred to the recent letter from the Leader of the County Council to Town and Parish Councils on his Council's budget settlement and the possible implications for towns and parishes in taking on services and in setting their precept. No indication has been given as to which services Town and Parish Councils might be invited to take on and Mr Garvey asked what is anticipated in this regard.

The Chairman undertook to ask Dr Povey to provide a written response setting out his further thinking on this matter.

#### **2. Ms Jean Shepherd (Godalming)**

The question referred to the County Council's approach to landowners' obstruction of rights of way and Ms Shepherd's observation that these are often legalised by the issue of a diversion order. Ms Shepherd asked why the County Council did not in these circumstances insist on the clearance of the definitive route.

Ms Shepherd was advised to raise the matter informally with the Rights of Way officer who was due to attend for Item 7 on the formal agenda.

#### **3. Mr Graham Hodgson (Godalming)**

Mr Hodgson sought reassurance that, under the County Council's new contractual arrangements for highways maintenance, monitoring and budgetary control would remain with County Council officers with an understanding of highways.

The Area Team Manager (Highways) replied that more detail would be available in the coming months but that work under the new contracts would be priced against scheduled rates before being committed.

#### **4. Mr Chris Meeks (Godalming)**

Mr Meeks asked how the County Council was responding to the reduction in its grant from central government and whether it would review the fees charged for services, e.g. applications for diversion orders, to ensure that these remain reasonable and realistic.

Dr A Povey replied that the reduction had been anticipated and the level of the settlement was within the range for which the County Council had been planning. The Council would look at the value of services and charges and some rebalancing may be necessary.

**5. Mr Ralph Holmes (Cranleigh)**

Mr Holmes asked what the quorum for formal Local Committee meetings is, whether this applies to informal sessions, and what is done to encourage members to attend this.

The Area Director replied that the quorum for highways matters is five and the Chairman added that the informal question time is not part of the formal proceedings and there is therefore no quorum, However, the Chairman and relevant officers are always in attendance and County Councillors make every effort to be present.