

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)****PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSES****16 SEPTEMBER 2011****1. From Mr James Streatfeild (Godalming)**

Apart from possible objections from local residents, are there any financial or legal reasons, why Surrey County Council cannot introduce a Controlled Parking Zone on the roads around Farncombe railway station in the near future ?

Committee response

Following formal advertisement of the proposed Farncombe Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), apart from any potentially upheld objections, there are no legal reasons why the scheme could not be progressed to the stage of implementation.

With regards to the financing, a commitment to fund parking restrictions in Godalming and Farncombe from the 2011/12 Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) budget was made by this committee on 17 March 2011, which will as a minimum meet the cost of formally advertising the scheme before the end of the financial year. Realistically, given the need for informal consultation prior to deciding to formally advertise, implementation will not take place until 2012/13, so funding would be subject to the allocation of the 2012/13 ITS budget which the committee will consider at its meeting on 16 March 2012.

2. From Mr Paul Charlton (Frith Hill Area Residents' Association, Godalming)

Later in this meeting there will be a discussion of revised winter gritting arrangements (Item 13). This is a matter of keen interest to this Association because the majority of the 700 or so dwellings in our area are atop or on the side of the steep hills to the north-west of Godalming and many residents were effectively stranded for several days after the 2009/2010 snowfalls. There is no public transport at the top of the hill. Thus mothers with young children and many more aged residents were unable to reach the town for essential shopping or to

reach medical facilities in Binscombe, Godalming or the Guildford hospitals: nor was safe access to the very busy commuter station at Farncombe available. A van turned over on Farncombe Hill in December 2010, it being a miracle that no-one was seriously hurt: the Police had to close the road for several days because of the dangerous conditions. Frith Hill Road also had to be closed a day or so later.

We would ideally wish to see both the steep Farncombe Hill/Twycross Road and Frith Hill Road/Deanery Road routes included in the gritting programme. We accept of course the necessity for first priority to be given to strategic routes and those that are difficult for public transport. However, the list submitted to this Committee gives us serious cause for concern. We are grateful that Farncombe Hill has been included, though as an inherently dangerous through route giving access to all essential services, we believe it should be P1. In the list we see several flat, purely residential non-through routes given priority presumably because they convey a bus route. Though I am sure this is not the intention, this seems to say that if an area has public transport, its roads will be cleared (thus allowing the use of cars also): if there is no public transport, then the area will be abandoned altogether. Can we therefore be assured that, as a P2, Farncombe Hill will be included in any event involving heavy snowfall? If not, we urge some reconsideration so that the definition of "strategic" might be stretched to include access to medical facilities, essential supplies and transport links, and that at least one of our steep descents will be given P1 treatment in future winter conditions.

Committee response

Gritting routes have been reviewed and extended as described at Item 13 on this agenda and Farncombe Hill/Twycross Road are for the first time included on the Priority 2 salting network due to the steep incline. This network is not routinely pre-treated unless snow is forecast. If snow settles, the P2 network will be treated, but only once the P1 network has been cleared.

In determining the criteria it was recognised that all of the P2 elements are important; hills, schools, stations, etc., and with the exception of hospitals, ambulance stations and special schools it would be difficult to prioritise. In developing the criteria the rationale has, therefore, been agreed that any P2 route that meets 2/3 of the criteria would be elevated to P1. In considering the various elements this would mean that a regular bus route with a school would be elevated over a residential road on a steep hill with no other attributes. Farncombe Hill falls into the latter category and would remain on the P2 network.

Within the overall length of the P1 network Local Committees have been invited to comment and suggest adjustments for improvement locally. Should they consider switching a road, this can be addressed in the future.

3. From Mr Richard Over (York Road, Farnham)

Despite a petition of 218 residents of York Road, Lancaster Avenue, Morley Road, Trebor Avenue and Fairholme Gardens, please can the Committee explain why York Road and Lancaster Avenue are being treated differently from other roads which are equidistant to the station e.g. Broomleaf Road, Lynch Road and Longley Road (see Item 11), and additionally can the residents be assured that

the review was not conducted during the summer holidays when the parking issues are considerably less severe than normal times ?

Committee response

York Road and Lancaster Avenue were assessed during April and May this year, using all information previously submitted to the Council, including the petition submitted by Susan Schonegevel.

As stated in the Committee report on this agenda, the safety concerns raised in the petition are being addressed as part of the proposed parking restrictions for this area. The request for single yellow lines and marked parking bays was assessed but not deemed necessary as part of this particular review.

When the existing restrictions within South Farnham (including Broomfield, Lynch Road, Waverley Lane, Old Compton Lane, etc.) were first consulted on, residents of York Road and Lancaster Avenue were asked if they would like to be included in the proposals. The majority response was that they did not want to be included in the scheme, which at the time had a large sum of funding allocated to it.

Subsequent parking reviews of Farnham have been part of a borough- wide parking review of Waverley, where we have had to prioritise requests and proposals to ensure that the most pressing issues get progressed with the limited funding that is now available.

4 (a) From Mr Giles Pattison (Godalming)

Would the Committee update me on any consultation with residents of Victoria Road in relation to your proposed permit holder scheme (illustrated in the meeting agenda: Item 11 Annexe A) ? To the best of my knowledge this is the first anybody in our road has heard of this and Victoria Road is missing from the list of street-specific proposals listed on the Parking News and Updates page of the Surrey County Council website.

4 (b) From Cllr Jane Thomson (Godalming)

In relation to Agenda Item 11: the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team, in a letter dated 10th May 2011, informed residents of their plan to put forward a proposal to remove restrictions from the three parking bays to the south side of Croft Road. Residents were invited to contact the team "if you have any thoughts or comments". I am not aware of the feedback received by officers but residents' comments to me are that it will just create more commuter parking spaces.

This is the common pattern of parking in Godalming town centre. Residents with no, or limited, off-street parking, have become increasingly concerned with the escalating level of commuter parking. In response, I have had a series of meetings with the Godalming Town Centre and Catteshall Area Residents Associations. Both organisations are keen to continue to work on proposals, with the help and advice of their local County Councillor, Steve Cosser. All parties recognise that any proposals will need to secure wide support, not only from residents but also shoppers and other town users.

Would the Committee therefore defer consideration of the proposals for Croft Road and Victoria Road and agree to formal discussions about a residents'

ITEM 5

parking scheme for Godalming town centre with a view to the matter being considered as part of next year's Annual Review of On-Street Parking ?

Committee response to Questions 4(a) and (b)

The existing proposals have been developed on the basis of information and requests received by the Council. The Committee is grateful for the additional perspectives contained in these questions and members may wish to have regard to these in their discussion of the proposals at Item 11.