



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 2011

Time: 2.00PM

Place: THE WINN HALL, DUNSFOLD

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)
Mr A Young (Cranleigh and Ewhurst)

Waverley Borough Council

Mr B Adams (Frensham, Dockenfield and Tilford)
Mr M Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)
Mrs C Cockburn (Farnham Bourne)
Mr B Ellis (Cranleigh West)
Mr R Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)
Mr D Leigh (Milford)
Mr B Morgan (Elstead and Thursley)
Mr S Thornton (Godalming Central and Ockford)
Mr B Vorley (Cranleigh East)

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

The Chairman welcomed Mr Alan Young to his first Local Committee meeting as the recently-elected County Councillor for Cranleigh and Ewhurst.

The Chairman also referred to the Committee's Local Task Groups, reminding members of the fact that, as set out in the Terms of Reference agreed at the meeting on 17 June 2011, their meetings are held in private.

31/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Dr A Povey and Mr J Ward; Mr M Byham was present as substitute for Mr Ward. Mr P Martin had indicated that he would be absent at the beginning of the meeting.

32/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 17 June 2011 (Item 2)

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

33/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Mrs P Frost declared a personal interest on the grounds that she is a member of Waverley Borough Council; she noted that she is not a member of either the Community or the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committees who discussed the proposed introduction of on-street parking charges in Waverley at a joint meeting on 30 August 2011, nor did she attend the meeting.

34/11 PETITIONS (Item 4)

A petition was received from Mr Clive Cook on behalf of residents of Willow Way, Hale, requesting the provision of up to four grit bins in Willow Way to allow residents to assist themselves in snowy and icy conditions. The petitioners suggested placing bins at either side of the square adjacent to the shops and one at each of the lower ends of Willow Way.

The Committee will receive a report in response to this request at its next meeting.

35/11 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)

Five questions were received, the responses to which are set out at **Annex 1**.

36/11 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

There were no members' questions.

NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

37/11 PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO. 81 (THURSLEY): DIVERSION ORDER APPLICATION (Item 7)

The following exercised their right to address the Committee:

- Mr D Beechey opposed the application, noting that the field in question is not currently used for livestock and citing the well-established historical status of the footpath.
- Mr N Tsiknas spoke on behalf of the applicants and commented on the points made by the objectors, suggesting that these contained some inaccuracies; the applicants feel that enjoyment of their property is adversely affected by walkers straying from the path, leaving litter and allowing dogs to foul the field; he believed that the proposed diversion would create a clearer and more concise route.

Mr D Harmer reported that Thursley Parish Council had, after discussion, concurred with the recommendation contained in the report.

Resolved to agree that the application from Mr and Mrs Broste to divert Public Footpath No. 81 Thursley as shown by Drawing No. 3/1/14/H47 be refused

Reason for decision:

The application received from Mr and Mrs Broste does not demonstrate that it is, an improvement to the existing network or in the interests of the public, expedient to divert Public Footpath No. 81 Thursley (as shown on Drawing Number 3/1/14/H47).

38/11 BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC 503 THURSLEY (D136): REQUEST TO CONSIDER A TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984) (Item 8)

Mr D Harmer reflected the views of Thursley Parish Council, which included concerns that damage caused by motor-cyclists might continue after the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order and that a number of alternative tracks are being created parallel to the designated route.

Resolved to agree that the grounds for making a Traffic Regulation Order as outlined are met, and a Notice of Intention to make an Order should be published for Byway Open to All Traffic 503 (Thursley) (D136) to prevent damage to the road, for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot and for conserving the natural beauty of the area, as shown on Drawing Number 3/1/20/H46 (Annex 1) and the results of the consultation reported back to a future meeting of the Committee for a decision.

Reason for decision:

A TRO would meet Surrey County Council policy and would protect the durability of the byway by preventing damage to the road and conserving the natural beauty of the area.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

39/11 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE REPORT (Item 9)

Members expressed some disappointment at the limited progress made since the previous report. The Area Team Manger envisaged that construction for most schemes would take place in the current financial year, although he reminded the Committee that, when costs are known, some schemes may need to be reprioritised by Local Task Groups to enable the programme to remain within budget. Reassurance was provided that the deferred A325 Farnborough Road scheme would be completed in the current financial year. Members requested additional information in future reports, relating to the envisaged dates for completion of design and construction.

Resolved to note progress on highway improvement schemes.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has requested regular updates on its programme.

40/11 PROPOSED ON-STREET 'PAY AND DISPLAY' PARKING CHARGES IN WAVERLEY (Item 10)

The Chairman announced her decision to withdraw this report. In view of the sensitivity of this topic, the Committee's discussion of the matter would be deferred to allow Waverley Borough Council members further opportunity to consider the proposals.

The Committee remains committed to making its decision as soon as possible but, if amended proposals are developed, Local Task Group chairmen would be consulted.

It was felt that certain of the proposals in the report which do not in themselves involve 'pay and display' arrangements could be extracted and considered along with the original proposals in the report presented at Item 11: 'Annual Review of On-Street Parking in Waverley'. The Chairman proposed (seconded by Ms D Le Gal) that the provision of 'permit holders only' bays in Castle Street, Farnham north of Park Row and in The Hart, West Street, Long Garden Way and Falkner Road (Drawing Nos 24017 and 24023) should be transferred in this way. Likewise Mr S Renshaw (seconded by Mr R Knowles) proposed that those elements of the proposals for Haslemere which contain the provision of 'permit holders only' bays (Drawing Nos 24050/3/4/7/8, 24118, 24126), along with road markings designed to allow safe access to driveways, should also be considered as part of Item 11.

Resolved that those proposals for Farnham and Haslemere set out above should be considered as part of Item 11: 'Annual Review of On-Street Parking in Waverley'

Reason for decision:

The Committee felt that it would be appropriate to consider certain of the proposals in Item 10 separately from those relating directly to 'pay and display' charging and that these could conveniently be included as additional proposals to those already contained in the report at Item 11.

41/11 **ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN WAVERLEY (Item 11)**

The Committee was reminded that those proposals extracted from the report at Item 10: 'Proposed On-Street 'Pay and Display' Parking Charges in Waverley' and set out in the relevant resolution (above) would be included in this item.

Ms D Le Gal proposed (seconded by the Chairman) an additional 'no waiting at any time' restriction to protect the entrances to Flats 26-51 Bankside, Farnham. Mr S Cosser (seconded by Mr S Thornton) proposed the withdrawal of the current proposals for Victoria Road and Croft Road, Godalming.

It was noted that it was not proposed to advertise the Farncombe Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) at this stage, but that informal consultation with residents would be undertaken to develop feasible proposals. Concerns remain that, despite some welcome proposals in the current review, displacement parking would continue to affect residential roads in South Farnham, also that there are inequities in the boundary of the current CPZ. There is felt to be a consensus that a comprehensive overview is now desired and reassurance was sought that these matters would be addressed in the next review.

It was suggested that a future review should also address parking pressures in villages, e.g. Springfield and The Green (Elstead), The Street and The Green (Tilford) and Tower Road, Hindhead.

It was proposed by Mr D Munro and seconded by the Chairman that recommendation (iv) be amended to ensure that the final proposals return to the Committee for approval.

The Committee considered and agreed the original officer recommendations (amended at (iv) as proposed above), the amendments proposed by Ms Le Gal and Mr Cosser, and those proposals transferred from Item 10.

Resolved to:

- (i) Agree the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings presented at this committee meeting as Annex A, along with those sections transferred from Item 10, an additional restriction in Bankside, Farnham and with the exclusion of Victoria Road and Croft Road, Godalming.

- (ii) Allocate funding as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) Agree that the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as shown on the drawings in Annex A, and as amended above, be advertised and that if no objections are maintained the Order made.
- (iv) Agree that the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and that a recommendation on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the relevant County Councillor, prior to the final proposals returning to the Local Committee for decision.

Reason for decision:

The proposals will make a positive impact towards: road safety; access for emergency vehicles; access for refuse vehicles; ease traffic congestion; better regulate parking.

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

42/11 **KING'S ROAD, HASLEMERE: PROHIBITION OF TURNING MOVEMENTS AT JUNCTION WITH WEY HILL (Item 12)**

The Committee was informed that Surrey Police, while supporting the proposals in principle, wished to review the implications of preventing the right turn from Wey Hill into King's Road. Subject to the Committee's decision, officers will therefore consult further with Surrey Police before proceeding. An amendment to recommendation (i) reflecting this was proposed by Mr S Renshaw, seconded by Mr D Harmer and agreed by the Committee.

Resolved to:

- (i) Agree that, subject to further consultation with Surrey Police, the intention of the County Council to make an Order under Sections 1, 2 and Part III of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to prohibit all vehicles from making a left turn movement from King's Road into Wey Hill and the right turn movement from Wey Hill into King's Road, Haslemere be advertised and that if no objections be maintained, the Order be made.
- (ii) Agree that, where significant objections are received to a made Traffic Regulation Order, the Area Team Manager in consultation with the divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman/ Vice Chairman should decide whether the Traffic Regulation Order may be confirmed.

Reason for decision:

To promote road safety at this location.

43/11 **UPDATE ON WINTER MAINTENANCE ARRANGEMENTS (Item 13)**

The Committee welcomed the improved provision described in the report and was reminded that adjustments to gritting routes could still be incorporated if agreed before October, provided that there is no increase in the total distance covered and that operational efficiencies are maintained.

The Committee was informed that the section of the former A3 south of Hindhead would pass into County Council control early in 2012 and would be designated the A333.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the revised winter maintenance arrangements for Waverley.
- (ii) Note arrangements for adjusting the proposed precautionary salting networks.
- (iii) Ensure that the information contained in the report is shared widely within the Borough.

Reason for decision:

Members are requested to familiarise themselves with the proposed gritting routes and help their residents prepare for bad weather. County Councillors are encouraged to share the information contained in the report with their residents and with their Borough and Parish Council colleagues.

44/11 **LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK: UPDATE FROM THE WAVERLEY YOUTH SERVICES TASK GROUP (Item 14)**

Mr D Munro, as Chairman of the Task Group, introduced the report and welcomed the confirmation that support for centre-based youth work would continue. Concerns about the status of management arrangements and of the proposed advisory group at the Wey Centre (Haslemere) remain to be resolved and, as reflected in amended resolution (iv), will be the subject of discussion between the local County Councillor and relevant officers.

Members drew attention to the success of existing preventative activities, e.g. in Cranleigh. While content with the current direction of travel, the Committee noted the needs of young people in rural areas and looked forward to attention being given to them in the future.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the establishment of the Youth Services Task Group and the needs assessment workshop which will be held on 21st September 2011.
- (ii) Confirm the appointment of Mr Elliot Nichols as a Waverley Borough Council representative on the Task Group, succeeding Mr Stephen O'Grady.

- (iii) Note that Surrey County Council will continue to support the centre-based youth work programme that is delivered from 40 Degreez, in Cranleigh and in Godalming/Farncombe..
- (iv) Note that the costs of delivery of Surrey County Council youth work from 40 Degreez, in Cranleigh and in Godalming/ Farncombe will now be met centrally and that the youth work will be supervised by the managing agent for the Wey Centre, subject to further discussion between local County Councillor and relevant officers.

Reason for decision:

The recommendations will support the council's priority to achieve "zero NEET" that is for 100% of young people aged 16 to 19 to be in education, training or employment.

45/11 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2011-2012 (Item 15)

Resolved to note the actions carried out under delegated authority since the last meeting.

Reason for decision:

The Committee is required to agree arrangements for the allocation of its budgets.

46/11 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 16)

It was noted that the Committee wished to receive regular reports on expenditure against the Community Fund.

Resolved to note the proposed contents of the Forward Programme.

Reason for decision:

To enable the Committee to plan its programme of reports.

The meeting closed at 4.00 pm

..... **(Chairman)**

Contact:

David North (Community Partnership and Committee Officer)
01483 517530 d.north@surreycc.gov.uk

ANNEX 1: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

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.

In a **supplementary question**, Mr Over sought further detail on the reassessment of York Road and Lancaster Avenue. In response, it was explained that the roads were reassessed as part of the current review which examined the principal safety concerns; additional restrictions elsewhere were not deemed necessary and less money is now available to fund restrictions. Nevertheless, there will be a further review when the currently proposed restrictions are in place and the matter can be re-examined at that time.

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'

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.

In a **supplementary** question Mr Pattison reinforced his view that residents of Victoria Road were not aware of the proposals and asked for further details and to understand what the next steps would be. In an officer response, it was explained that representations had been received from a small number of residents, but that all residents would be contacted during the statutory advertisement period and their views would determine whether or not the scheme would go ahead. Mr S Cosser, as the local County Councillor, accepted that officers had acted on the basis of representations received, but that it was now clear to him that most residents in Victoria Road and Croft Road were not comfortable with the proposals. Noting that there are active residents' associations in the area with whom he would consult further, Mr Cosser indicated that he was minded to propose the withdrawal of the published scheme.

ANNEX 2

INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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 David Munro (in his personal capacity)

Mr Munro referred to the provision of appropriate structures in conservation areas as part of the County Council's programme of replacing street lights. He asked whether the Chairman would agree to facilitate a meeting to reinvigorate discussions between the County Council and Waverley Borough Council on the topic.

The Chairman replied that she would do so.

2. Mrs S Badger (Courts Hill Road, Haslemere)

Mrs Badger reflected the opposition of a number of residents of Courts Hill Road to the current proposals for on-street parking in the road; she asked whether the County Council would be prepared to discuss alternative options with residents' representatives with a view to investigating a regime which is more acceptable to local people.

The Chairman replied that she would be happy for this to take place.

3. A resident of Victoria Road, Godalming

The questioner referred to a lack of support for the proposed on-street parking restrictions in the road and asked if consultation with the residents' association would take place before implementation of the scheme.

The Chairman explained that, subject to the Committee's decision, there would be a 28-day period during which the proposals would be advertised and comments invited. Mr S Cosser expressed his sympathy for the residents' position and indicated that he would make a relevant proposal in the Committee's formal debate at Item 11.

4. Ms Diane James (Ewhurst)

Ms James asked:

"Ewhurst and Surrey Hills Broadband Group successfully bid for, and was awarded, a grant of £180,000 only to see monies withheld, based on indications that BT/Openreach would be undertaking the necessary works and that independent action would be unnecessary. But it is clear that the BT/Openreach undertaking will not provide fibre to any premises or sufficient

service to Ewhurst's surrounding catchment area and on this basis Ewhurst and Surrey Hills Broadband Group requests that the Local Committee adds its support to the release of the £180,000 grant plus match-funding from Surrey County Council in line with the national finance policy for improving broadband service in rural areas. A written response to this question is requested prior to 28 September 2011."

The Chairman indicated that the Committee would endeavour to secure a response as soon as possible.

5. A resident of Courts Hill Road, Haslemere

The questioner referred to the proposed parking restrictions in Courts Hill Road and asked how the envisaged 20 parking bays would be accommodated.

Mr S Renshaw undertook to clarify the situation.