



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 16 DECEMBER 2011

Time: 2.00PM

Place: GODALMING BAPTIST CHURCH, GODALMING

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)
Mr P Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley)
Mr D Munro (Farnham South)
Dr A Povey (Waverley Eastern Villages)
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 S Thornton (Godalming Central and Ockford)
Mr B Vorley (Cranleigh East)

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

47/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Ms D Le Gal, Mr D Leigh and Mr J Ward; Mr B Morgan's apologies were received after the meeting. Mr M Byham attended as substitute for Mr Ward.

48/11 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 16 September 2011 (Item 2)

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

49/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Declarations of personal interests were made as follows:

- Item 11: Dr A Povey on the grounds that he is a resident of Cranleigh and a company of which he is a director trades in the village; Mr R Knowles on the grounds that he is a resident of Beech Road, Haslemere.
- Item 12: Mr S Cosser on the grounds that his son and family live in Canada Copse, Milford which would be affected by the proposal contained in the report.

50/11 PETITIONS (Item 4)

A petition was presented by Mrs Celia Sandars, the text of which is set out at **Annex 1**. The Chairman undertook to provide a response at the meeting to be held on 16 March 2012.

51/11 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)

The responses to public questions received are set out at **Annex 2**.

52/11 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

The responses to members' questions received are set out at **Annex 3**.

53/11 LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS: TERMS OF REFERENCE (Item 7)

It was suggested that arrangements needed to be put in place to ensure the proper recording of actions agreed at Task Group meetings and the Chairman undertook to pursue this.

Resolved to agree:

- (i) To adopt the revised Terms of Reference for Task Groups contained in Annex 1 of the report.
- (ii) To request that each Task Group note these at its next meeting.
- (iii) That partner councils be notified of the revised Terms of Reference.

Reason for decision:

The Terms of Reference are strengthened, particularly with regard to the Code of Conduct for members.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

54/11 SUPERFAST BROADBAND: UPDATE (Item 8)

The Committee was referred to the response to a related public question (Item 5: Question 3) which provided some additional information. The Committee noted that the responses to date from Waverley to the resident and business surveys undertaken by the County Council had been useful in informing discussions with the industry. Members expressed concerns about provision in those areas which are covered by exchanges receiving the BT Openreach service but which would not themselves be able to receive this level of access. The Committee was informed that the Rural Community Broadband Fund might support such areas, although it is not yet clear how far BT would extent its infrastructure in these cases. The need, especially by businesses, for high upload speeds was noted and understood. The County Council's role in enabling residents and businesses to purchase superfast broadband access was supported, as it formed part of a "social infrastructure".

Resolved to agree:

- (i) To take note of the areas of Waverley that will not be covered by BT Openreach
- (ii) To support the project by encouraging residents and businesses to register their demand for a faster broadband service.

Reason for decision:

It is important that residents and businesses are made aware of the project and register their demand for faster broadband by completing the surveys.

55/11 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE REPORT (Item 9)

It was confirmed that, in the event that any committed schemes are not delivered in the current financial year, the funding would be carried forward into 2012-13. Local Task Groups will meet in the near future to agree priorities for the coming year. It was agreed that an updated version of the schedule would be circulated when construction dates have been established.

Resolved to note progress on highway improvement schemes.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has requested regular updates on its programme.

56/11 **COMMUNITY PRIDE FUND (Item 10)**

It was noted that funds remaining uncommitted at the end of the financial year would be lost.

Resolved to note committed expenditure to date.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has requested regular updates.

57/11 **PROPOSED ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES IN WAVERLEY (Item 11)**

Members sought clarity about the proposal that parking enforcement in each area of the borough should not operate at a deficit and noted that effective enforcement would be a prerequisite in achieving this. In this respect it was hoped that there would be some flexibility in considering such matters, across the immediate boundaries of the Task Group areas.

In relation to Haslemere, the range of views was acknowledged. It was confirmed that the extent of any implemented scheme would be reviewed in the light of any future construction of a multi-storey car-park, which was seen as being in 2014 at the earliest. The continuing consideration of separate options for the area around Farncombe Station was noted. There were different views about the feasibility of on-street charging in Cranleigh, but the impact of charging across the borough would in any case be reviewed within a year of implementation.

The Chairman invited Mrs Carole King, Executive Member with responsibility for parking at Waverley Borough Council, to comment on the proposals. The need for effective enforcement was stressed, along with a hope that in due course synergy between the two councils in this respect may be achieved.

Officers were thanked for the quality of the report and for the local engagement that had taken place.

Officers tabled an additional recommendation (v: (f), below). It was proposed by Mr R Knowles and agreed that the word "effective" be inserted at (v: (b)), as set out below. Annexes referred to relate to the published report.

Resolved:

- (i) In Farnham:
 - a) To approve the statutory advertisement of the parking charges and waiting restrictions as shown on the plans in Annex A and B.
 - b) To agree that objections and comments to the proposals are reviewed by the Committee at a later date.

- (ii) In Haslemere:
 - a) To approve the statutory advertisement of the parking charges and waiting restrictions in locations shown on the plans in Annex A and C.
 - b) To agree that objections and comments to the proposals are reviewed by the Committee at a later date.

- (iii) In Godalming: To agree that no viable or supported proposal for on-street parking charges has been identified.
- (iv) In Cranleigh: To agree that no viable or supported proposal for on-street parking charges has been identified.
- (v) In general:
 - a) To agree in principle that parking enforcement in Waverley should not operate at a deficit
 - b) To agree that the four Local Committee task groups, if necessary, should develop solutions that prevent effective parking enforcement from operating at a deficit in their respective parts of the Borough.
 - c) To agree that, if parking charges are introduced in any parts of the Borough, then parking displacement issues are tackled during 2012/13.
 - d) To agree that, subject to agreement by the Cabinet, any surplus income is ring-fenced for use in the area in which it was derived.
 - e) To agree that Waverley Borough Council conservation officers are consulted about the locations of pay and display machines.
 - f) Agree that the Parking Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local member, resolve any minor details that may arise prior to advertising, such as the allocation of residents' permits in Haslemere.

Reason for decision:

Charging for parking helps the County and Borough Council effectively and efficiently manage on-street parking in Surrey.

58/11 **B3001 OLD ELSTEAD ROAD, MILFORD: SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT (Item 12)**

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessment.
- (ii) Agree that a 30mph speed limit be introduced on the B3001 Old Elstead Road, Milford.
- (iii) Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit, change and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes and, subject to no objections being upheld, the make the Order.
- (iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local Divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

Reason for decision:

The results of the speed assessment and survey support a reduced speed limit.

59/11 **RESPONSE TO PETITION: WILLOW WAY, HALE (Item 13)**

Resolved to note the action taken in response to the petition.

Reason for decision:

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

60/11 **PROGRESS IN PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS (Item 14)**

Members welcomed the report, noting the valuable work and outcomes that the Committee had been able to support with its partners. While recognizing the significant contribution made by County Councillors through their local grants, it was nevertheless felt that a more sustainable way of supporting the projects might be needed. Recognition was also given to the extent to which community safety and relationships with Surrey Police are enhanced by preventative work and the promotion of community strength.

Members shared a concern that the implications of the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010 suggested an entrenchment of disadvantage and poverty in the borough and requested further investigation into the apparently severe increase in poverty amongst older residents in certain areas.

Resolved to agree to:

- (i) Note and endorse the progress made in the priority communities in Waverley.
- (ii) Continue to use the 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 its influence where appropriate to advocate the needs of disadvantaged communities in Waverley.
- (iv) Note the implications of the data presented and consider any actions it might wish to take in response.

61/11 **LOCAL PREVENTION FRAMEWORK: UPDATE FROM THE WAVERLEY YOUTH SERVICES TASK GROUP (Item 15)**

Attention was drawn to the repetition of paragraphs 2.8 and 2.9 in the report; the second set should be renumbered as 2.10 and 2.11. The reference to paragraph 2.9 in resolution (iii) below relates to this amended sequence.

The report was introduced by Mr D Munro as Chairman of the Youth Services Task Group. In discussion members reinforced the need for very early and sustained intervention. Initial views were given on arrangements for administering the Small Grants Fund which will be given further consideration by the Task Group. The Committee considered the options presented by the Task Group in relation to the focus of the Local Prevention Framework: whether the resource should be focused exclusively on Farnham and Godalming, where the highest risks are concentrated, or whether a small

measure of this resource should be made available additionally to all other areas of the borough (officer recommendation (ii)). Some members felt that the data justified an undiluted effort in the most concentrated areas of risk; others believed that the over-arching objective is to ensure that all young people are in education, employment or training and that reduced effort in peripheral areas might result in disproportionate increases in young people not achieving this aim.

When put to the vote a majority of County Councillors supported the more flexible approach, reflected in resolution (ii).

Resolved to:

- (i) Agree that the Local Prevention Framework (LPF) priority for Waverley is to prevent NEET across the borough, but with a particular focus on areas of need identified as Farnham and Godalming and that the commissioning budget is deployed to commission outcomes in accordance with this prioritisation.
- (ii) Agree that the LPF resource available to the Committee should be focused on Farnham and Godalming, but that a small measure of this resource should be made available additionally to all other areas of the borough.
- (iii) Request that the evaluation of tenders received from potential providers reflect the concerns set out at paragraph 2.9 in the report and that weighting should be given to those proposals which address them.
- (iv) Note that the allocation of SOLD resources to young people will be delegated to officers in the Youth Support Service to arrange provision that addresses the identified risk factors and areas of geographical priority.
- (v) Note that the committee has a Small Grants allocation of £27,000 for the year commencing 1.April 2012 and that this will be available to support small voluntary youth organisations with grants of £500 to £1,000 and exceptionally up to £5,000.

Reason for decision:

The decisions 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; support the Council's priority that more young people are safe from crime and anti-social behaviour.

[Mr D Harmer left the meeting during this item prior to the vote being taken.]

62/11 **LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2011-2012 (Item 16)**

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 agree arrangements for the allocation of its budgets.

63/11 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 17)

The Chairman noted that, following a discussion with the Leader of Waverley Borough Council, she would endeavour to schedule items in such a way as to allow Borough Councillors time to consider the matter.

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 4.45 pm

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

Contact:

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

ANNEX 1

A petition was presented by Mrs Celia Sandars on behalf of the Farnham Air Quality Campaign and introduced as follows:

Farnham town centre has suffered from traffic congestion for many years. The result has been sub-standard air quality from NO₂ pollution pumped out by vehicle exhausts. People have been breathing in noxious fumes, extremely harmful to health.

A report released on 14 November from the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee says “the government’s failure to meet EU standards on air pollution is putting the health of UK residents at risk”. It says the costs to society from poor air quality are on a par with those from smoking and obesity but the government has consistently downplayed the health impacts of air pollution. Quotes from the current UK Air Quality Strategy include: “99% of the UK meets European air quality standards”. That statistic is for geographical area, not the proportion of the population affected. The 1% below standards includes some of our most densely populated urban areas, whilst much of the 99% that is ‘clean’ is sparsely populated countryside.

Another misleading statistic is that “air pollution is currently estimated to reduce the life expectancy of every person in the UK by an average of 7-8 months”. In fact the impacts are concentrated in particular areas and the health impacts for those that live and work there are severe. The EA Committee report states that for people most directly affected the shortfall in life expectancy is two years.

Farnham is one of the most severely affected areas. Those with health problems, the elderly and the very young, whose lung development is affected by pollution, are most at risk. A recent report by the OECD into international health care tells us “there were more avoidable hospital admissions for asthma in the UK than the average”. 52 out of 100,000 adults in OECD countries are admitted to hospital for asthma each year. The UK’s figure is 74. The report’s author says this could be put down to “poor air quality”. I am told that asthma is rife amongst Farnham schoolchildren.

Waverley Borough Council declared most of Farnham’s town centre an Air Quality Management Area in 2005. Three years later the Council agreed an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP). Three years later again there is no evidence of improvement; pollution levels remain stubbornly high, according to Waverley’s 2011 Air Progress Report. The AQAP has been ineffective. Nothing has been done to reduce the huge volume of traffic through Farnham.

This autumn a group of concerned residents set up the Farnham Air Quality Campaign. More than 1000 town centre residents and visitors and over 100 businesses signed the petition we are presenting today. We are confident these numbers are representative of the concerns of the whole town. Workers in the polluted town centre are rightly worried about their health.

I ask this Committee to please take our petition very seriously and urge our local councils to do the work required to reduce congestion and air pollution in Farnham now and for the future. You need to know that local authorities are soon likely to risk fines if they don’t deal with these problems.

ANNEX 2: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1. From Mr David Kirkham (Godalming)

Almost 11 years have passed since the Public Inquiry into the Godalming High Street Pedestrian Priority Scheme. The inspector's report supported the principle of two-way cycling in the High Street, recommending an extended trial and adding that such a trial appears long overdue anyway. In 2009 the Godalming Healthcheck report also recommended the introduction of two-way cycling in the High Street. The Environmental Report for the Surrey Transport Plan specifically recommended implementation of contra-flow cycling on one-way streets as one of the measures to increase the use of cycling as a means of travelling in preference to the car. Nationally, the Department for Transport, following the "Signing the Way" Review, is introducing new signing to encourage greater use of contra-flow cycling.

With local and national support for two-way cycling when can we hope to see the trial of two-way cycling in Godalming High Street ?

Committee response

Initiatives such as this are funded from the capital allocation to this committee. The 2011/12 allocation of £267,000 is fully committed (see Item 9). The 2012/13 allocation will be announced in March and is expected to be at around the same level. There are many demands on the use of this funding, and the committee has established four task groups to consider requests and prioritise schemes within their respective areas. The Godalming, Witley and Milford Task Group meets in January and will consider this request alongside others when deciding which schemes should be included in the 2012/13 programme.

2. From Dr Jenny Masding (Alfold Parish Council)

The Alfold village centre highway improvement scheme was accepted and budgeted for in April 2011 and I met a County Council highways engineer on site in the late summer to discuss actual plans. We have not had any action or indeed seen the proposed plans which we were promised: could the Committee provide an update on progress ?

Committee response

A general update on improvement schemes is provided at Item 9. In common with almost the entire programme, installation of the Alfold village measures, which will consist of road markings, signs and village gateways, is planned for the end of the financial year. Highways officers will be in touch with the Parish Council in January to agree the proposals.

3. From Ms Diane James (Ewhurst)

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 will the Local Committee add 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 ?

Committee response

Following BT Openreach's inclusion of the Cranleigh exchange (which serves Ewhurst), in their national fibre upgrade programme, the £180,000 of funding being referred to was withheld, as EU State Aid regulations do not allow public funding to be spent in areas that are included in BT Openreach's fibre upgrade areas.

SEEDA has now been abolished and officers have spoken to colleagues in DEFRA who were previously involved with Ewhurst's bid at SEEDA. The funding stream that is being referred to is no longer in place and the £180,000 cannot be accessed.

DEFRA now has a Rural Community Broadband Fund (RCBF) as part of its Rural Development Programme for England, which targets communities in hard to reach areas. DEFRA and BDUK (the government's body for national broadband policy and funding) are working together on this funding stream to ensure that the RCBF applications are tied into, and complement, each county's own broadband plan. Surrey County Council has been liaising with BDUK and DEFRA to explore if and how Ewhurst can make an application through this fund, without falling foul of State Aid regulations that saw their previous funding withdrawn. DEFRA advised that State Aid will be looked at on a case by case basis, so the Ewhurst Broadband Group can submit an Expression of Interest (EoI) for this funding. The finer details of the RCBF have been made available in December and there are two rounds for submitting an EoI. These are 31 January 2012, with a second round expected in April 2012. Details of the fund are available on DEFRA's RDPE website.

The Committee will bear this question and response in mind in its consideration of the report at Item 8 on this agenda.

4. Questions relating to on-street parking in Haslemere:

(i) From Mrs B Badger (Haslemere)

Courts Hill Road residents are greatly concerned about the increasing number of vehicles that speed along this road and are seriously disturbed about the inconsiderate and inconvenient commuter parking. We should like to know what solutions Surrey County Council proposes for the mitigation of these problems.

Committee response

Commuter parking has been an on-going issue near Haslemere rail station for many years. Surrey Highways receive reports and complaints about obstructive parking quite regularly and over the years have introduced waiting restrictions in a piecemeal way to improve safety in specific locations. It is now planned to introduce a more comprehensive parking management scheme that will improve safety and make it easier for residents to park near

their homes. The proposals for Courts Hill Road are set out in the report at Item 11 on the agenda of this meeting. In Courts Hill Road, following site meetings with the committee appointed by the residents, it is planned to retain some on-street parking as this helps reduce traffic speeds. The parking spaces will, however, be positioned to make it easier and safer for residents to access their properties. It is also planned to place 'SLOW' road marking in some locations to help reduce traffic speeds in this road.

(ii) From Mr Andrew Johnston (Haslemere)

I have lived in Courts Hill Road, Haslemere for twenty years. Over recent years there has been a substantial increase in both:

- (1) Parking by commuters who use the station and show little or no consideration for residents and other users of the road; and
- (2) Traffic flowing along the road to and from the station or as a 'short-cut' from the Midhurst road to the B2131 at the station.

The parking has made access to properties and navigation along the road very difficult, and at times impossible. I believe the road is markedly less safe as a result. Residents have suffered a significant loss of amenity.

I am strongly in favour of the introduction of on-street parking charges and the proposals developed and agreed in September for Courts Hill Road as set out in Annex C Haslemere 2 attached to the paper for consideration under item 11.

Is it not time action was taken to implement these proposals, and as soon as possible, to alleviate the current barely tolerable free-for-all ?

Committee response

Commuter parking has been an on-going issue near Haslemere rail station for many years. Surrey Highways receive reports and complaints about obstructive parking regularly and over the years have introduced waiting restrictions in a piecemeal way to improve safety in specific locations. It is now planned to introduce a more comprehensive parking management scheme that will improve safety and make it easier for residents to park near their homes. The proposals for Courts Hill Road are set out in the report at Item 11 on the agenda of this meeting. In Courts Hill Road it is planned to retain some on-street parking as this helps reduce traffic speeds. The parking spaces will, however, be positioned to make it easier and safer for residents to access their properties. It is also planned to place 'SLOW' road marking in some locations to help reduce traffic speeds in this road.

(iii) From Mr Andrew Cundy (Haslemere)

I live in Courts Hill Road and following a meeting of residents in early August to discuss traffic management in the road, we established a small committee to represent the residents interests. After numerous e-mail exchanges and site meetings with our County Councillor (Steve Renshaw) and subsequently some officers, we reached an agreement with the County Council that the majority of residents of the road accepted.

I have now been made aware of a claim by a resident that the Department for Transport (DfT) has stated that Courts Hill Road is too narrow for the agreement reached to be implemented.

Can you please confirm to me that either:

- 1) Surrey County Council is correct in that the agreement reached with the majority of the residents can indeed be implemented and that the claims about the view of the DfT are incorrect, OR
- 2) The claims about the DfT are correct, so can you then please explain why the County Council has raised the expectations of residents in Courts Hill Road, that the agreed scheme could be implemented, when it was never deliverable?

Committee response

It is confirmed that the Department for Transport (DfT) **has not** made any statements whatsoever about the suitability of any road in Haslemere for parking. It is not their responsibility or duty to do so. Surrey County Council is the Highway Authority in Surrey and responsible for the management of the highway network (this means all public highways except motorways and trunk roads). The DfT issues directions, guidelines and good practice in relation to traffic management and the Council follows this where applicable. The Council's Parking Team has drawn up the parking management proposals in Haslemere following accepted good practice in terms of the provision of on-street parking and also in consultation with local councillors and residents. If agreed by the Local Committee on the 16th December, there will be a more formal public consultation on the proposals to more comprehensively seek the public view. This will help refine any proposals that are introduced in the best interests of residents and highway users.

(iv) From Mr Alan Blinder (Haslemere)

I understand that Waverley Borough Council has recently announced that they intend to remove the ability to park for free in the Weyhill Fairground car park in Haslemere. Due to pressure from commuters, it is very unusual for me to be able to park near my house on St Christopher's Green so I tend to have to park across the road at the Fairground; however, in the near future I will not be able to afford to do so due to the plan to introduce a charging regime. Because of these plans, I fully support the suggestions to introduce a residents' permit scheme which at £50 per annum represents very good value, charging for commuters to park on the road and to improve the levels of enforcement. This is also a view shared by the majority of those on St Christopher's Green who attended a meeting to discuss the matter. I would be grateful if you would advise me as to when this agreed scheme for St Christopher's Green will be introduced ?

Committee response

On-street commuter parking has been an on-going issue near Haslemere rail station for many years. During this time Surrey Highways have had many reports and complaints about parking in the area and have implemented

waiting restrictions in a piecemeal way to tackle safety and obstruction issues. It is now planned to introduce a more comprehensive parking management scheme in the town that will better manage parking to improve safety, reduce obstruction and make it easier for residents to park near their homes. Item 11 on the agenda proposes a public consultation about parking management proposals in Haslemere. If agreed, following the consultation, a residents' parking scheme around St Christopher's Green, as discussed with the residents, could be introduced in the summer of 2012.

(v) From Ms Clare Loosley (Haslemere)

The proposals for the inclusion of the spaces in front of garages/ parking spaces in the residents' parking bays on Longdene Road has raised a number of queries. We have been advised that it is only possible to have either (a) these spaces included in the bays or (b) double yellow lines in front of these spaces [if the majority do not agree to option (a)]. Several residents are concerned that option (a) will result in their driveways being blocked, or cause other issues such as making it difficult to get in/out of driveways. Others would prefer to have white lines outside their properties as are currently available. Would the Committee be able to provide some more detail as to how the inclusion of these spaces in the planned bays would work, the advantages/disadvantages thereof, and explain why it is not possible to allow residents some degree of flexibility in their choice of whether: (a) the space is included in a bay, (b) has double yellow or (c) white lines ?

Committee response

There are a number of options available to residents in Longdene Road in terms of parking in front of, or keeping their driveways clear. These are:

- Run parking bays in front of the driveways to allow residents with a permit to block their own drives. This is proposed for consultation as it maintains the maximum amount of parking space for residents and has worked well elsewhere.
- Mark a double yellow line to keep the access clear at all times
- Mark a single yellow line that prohibits parking during the prescribed time (eg 8.30 –7pm). This would need a sign showing the times and it may not be physically possible to put one in without blocking the access.
- Mark a white 'access protection' marking. This may not be enforceable in some circumstances and has the highest probability of being ignored.

It should be possible to determine the best solution for residents of Longdene Road as part of the consultation process and incorporate the preferred solution (as long as it is practicable) in the final scheme. There are also proposals to formalise existing footway parking arrangements on some parts of Longdene Road. Again this is part of the consultation process and the Council will not make a final decision until residents' views have been considered.

(vi) From Ms Fiona Attrell (Haslemere)

I have been a resident of Popes Mead in the centre of Haslemere since 2000, and in recent years, particularly since Waitrose has opened, the issue of residents' parking (and congestion in West Street) has become an escalating problem, in part because of shop workers seeking free parking close to their place of work. To this problem must be added commuters from Haslemere Station seeking free spaces within walking distance of the station. Furthermore, the news that the King Edward hospital in Midhurst will be the site of over 400 dwellings, as well as the potential of a few hundred more homes at the Syngenta site in Fernhurst, add up to a massive existing and future traffic problem for Haslemere, which is no longer the sleepy bucolic town of a few years ago. It is marvellous that the town centre is so vibrant, but the growth has in turn created traffic problems, in common with many towns of similar size, and this escalating problem needs urgent redress for all concerned.

We, and many of our neighbours, support the notion of one parking bay per household (where there isn't already off-street parking), and, can you please assure us, on behalf of our neighbours and the majority of households in nearby streets, that fair provision will be made for residents' parking as part of the new proposals, as well as an affordable scheme for shop workers, and that, if carried, the proposals will be enacted as speedily as possible ?

Committee response

The proposals in Item 11 for residents' parking schemes in Haslemere will make it considerably more convenient for residents without off-street parking to park near their homes. It is planned to allocate parking space to residents as fairly as possible and this will take into account off-street parking availability and the road space available. The Council will listen to residents' comments about their parking needs and requirements for residents' permits during the consultation before deciding the fairest method of allocating them. It may be possible to allocate parking provision for local workers on streets around the town centre as a future development of the proposals. This would need to take into account the views of residents and the availability of off-street car parks.

(vii) From Mr Jim Edwards (on behalf of Haslemere Town Council)

It should be understood that Haslemere Town Council's (HTC) opposition to the principle of all-day on-street commuter parking is based on a Multi-Storey Car Park ("MSCP") being constructed in the short to medium term at Haslemere Station. If it were to turn out that there is no prospect of this happening, HTC's opposition would cease. It should also be understood that HTC has no comment on the details of the on-street parking proposals agreed with the residents of the affected roads.

1. Background

Haslemere Station attracts a large daily commuting population which currently requires parking for 800-850 cars. Current car park capacity is just over 500 spaces (Station car park 250, Weydown Road car park 140, Weyhill car park 90 and Tanners Lane car park 40). The remaining 300-350 cars park in the residential roads nearest the station and in some roads cause considerable inconvenience to residents and the emergency services. HTC considers that

the construction of a MSCP at Haslemere Station represents the best means of alleviating the problems associated with commuter on-street parking in the residential roads near the Station. To put it at its simplest, the right place for all commuters' cars is in car parks and not in residential roads.

2. Role of Network Rail and South West Trains

HTC is aware of and welcomes the recently renewed interest by Network Rail, either alone or in partnership with South West Trains, to construct a MSCP at the station, either offering 463 spaces (as permitted by the existing conditional permission for a three-deck MSCP granted to SWT in May 2009) or for 550-563 spaces (as contemplated by the addition of a further deck over half the area which has been discussed with the Waverley Borough Council Planning Department). HTC is aware that Network Rail's recent bids for Department for Transport funding have been unsuccessful to date but, based on information from Network Rail, remains hopeful that the project will still proceed, with an expected completion date in 2014.

3. HTC's reservations

HTC is also aware of Surrey County Council's wish to implement on-street charging in residential roads near the Station and has two significant reservations.

First, while HTC recognises that organised commuter parking in wide roads such as Derby Road and Weydown Road has the potential to offer an improved experience for residents compared to the current, unregulated situation, HTC believes that the situation in the narrower roads (e.g. Longdene Road, Courts Hill Road, Kings Road, Bunch Lane, Church Road, Tanners Lane (north of the railway bridge), Beech Road, Three Gates Lane) will only be really improved by prohibiting all-day commuter parking completely. This can only be achieved if alternative parking provision at a MSCP exists. Accordingly, HTC does not support formalising all-day parking in the narrower residential roads other than as a temporary measure until a MSCP is constructed.

Second, HTC is seriously concerned that the provision of formalised all-day parking in residential roads may weaken the business case for constructing a MSCP at the Station and thereby lead to the abandonment of the MSCP project by Network Rail. This is why HTC asks that Surrey County Council should consult with Network Rail and South West Trains as soon as possible to establish their reaction to SCC's plans and should be willing to undertake that commuter parking on the narrower residential roads will be prohibited in time for the opening of a MSCP at Haslemere Station. This is necessary to ensure that the MSCP owners can expect to fill the extra spaces almost immediately after opening and hence provide support for the revenue assumptions in the business case underpinning the MSCP project. HTC recognises that providing charged on-street parking in Derby Road and Weydown Road will offer a useful overflow facility when the MSCP is full.

Will Surrey County Council undertake:

- (1) To discuss with Network Rail and South West Trains its proposals to introduce charging for all-day on-street parking in residential roads near Haslemere Station; and

- (2) To prohibit all-day commuter parking in residential roads in Haslemere (other than in Derby Road and Weydown Road) as soon as a Multi-Storey Car Park at Haslemere Station is open for business ?

Committee response

The County Council will notify Network Rail of our proposed parking management scheme in Haslemere and listen to their comments as part of the consultation process. Surrey Highways and the County Councillor for Haslemere, Steve Renshaw support in principle the construction of the 453 space station car park, for which outline permission has been extant for 3 years next February and agree that the preferred location for vehicles is off the road. Unfortunately funding for the enlarged station car park has so far not been agreed and it is unlikely that, if all the obstacles were resolved, it could be implemented before 2014. Even a larger car park may not be able to cope with the demand by station users so it seems reasonable to wait until details are clear before planning further changes to parking controls on streets around the station. There is no reason why any parking restrictions implemented in Haslemere as part of the current proposals could not be amended in the future if circumstances at the station change, as proposed by the question. In any case it seems that the proposal for an enlarged station car park would not be viable with so much free on-street parking around the station as is currently the case.

(viii) From Ms Julianne Evans (Haslemere Chamber of Trade)

Annex E of Item 11 in the Committee papers for December 16th shows the installation cost, maintenance cost and possible income per year of on-street parking charges but appears not to show enforcement costs. It is therefore impossible for anybody reading these to make a judgement about the financial viability of the project, especially as the proposal suggests that enforcement costs will increase, particularly in Haslemere. What are they now and what will they increase to ?

Committee response

Annex E of Item 11 shows estimated income and costs associated with the parking management proposals. At this stage Surrey Highways are confident that the cost of additional enforcement associated with the proposals could be covered by the additional income from parking charges. The current proposals are for consultation and consequently some aspects may change. The Committee will be asked to review the consultation response in March 2012 and when the proposals have been refined in response to this, it will be possible to indicate enforcement costs.

(ix) From Mr John Greer (Haslemere Society)

In relation to the proposed on-street parking charges in Haslemere:

The introduction of pay and display street parking has been rejected by several Local Committees in Surrey. There is also very considerable public opposition to these proposals in Haslemere which was clearly demonstrated at a very full public meeting in the Haslemere Hall on 27 September. Why has the Local Committee not cancelled its pay and display street parking proposals in Haslemere ? The very severe and increasing commuter parking

problems around the station in Haslemere make an off-street multi-level car park essential. For this to be commercially feasible it is also essential that a parking exclusion zone is established in streets around the station. Does the Committee realise that the pay and display parking proposals are in direct conflict with this and could jeopardise the building of an off-street multi-level car park ?

Committee response

Surrey Highways and the County Councillor for Haslemere, Steve Renshaw support in principle the construction of the 453 space station car park, for which outline permission has been extant for 3 years next February and agree that the preferred location for vehicles is off the road. Unfortunately funding for the enlarged station car park has so far not been agreed and it is unlikely that, if all the obstacles were resolved, it could be implemented before 2014. Even a larger car park may not be able to cope with the demand by station users so it seems reasonable to wait until details are clear before planning further changes to parking controls on streets around the station. There is no reason why any parking restrictions implemented in Haslemere as part of the current proposals could not be amended in the future if circumstances at the station change, as proposed by the question. In any case it seems that the proposal for an enlarged station car park would not be viable with so much free on-street parking around the station, as is currently the case, and weakens the financial case for an enlarged station car park.

In response to a **supplementary question** as to whether a public meeting would take place to discuss the implications of the proposals for parking in the vicinity of Haslemere railway station and in the surrounding residential roads, the Chairman explained that members of the public would have an opportunity to comment when the proposals are formally advertised.

ANNEX 3: MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

1. From Mr David Munro

Many people in Farnham are in favour of officially rerouting the A325 away from Farnham Town Centre and on to the roads to the South, East and North of the town. In this way through traffic, especially HGVs, would have a greater incentive to avoid the congested town centre.

What is the procedure for doing this, how much would it cost, and what, in officers' opinion, are the advantages and disadvantages ?

Committee response

The A325 through the centre of Farnham is an east-west route linking the A325 Farnborough Road (Shepherd and Flock) to the A325 Wrecclesham Road (Coxbridge Roundabout). In the centre of the town the A325 meets the A287, the major north-south route through Farnham. On the face of it, the A325 could be signed to follow the A31 Farnham Bypass between the two roundabouts to the east and west of the town. The question is whether this would reduce traffic in the town centre. This could be assessed fully using the Farnham Traffic model, which has recently been re-validated and which closely reflects real-life traffic movements, speeds and volumes in and around the town at present.

The Area Highways Manager is of the opinion that signing the A325 via the A31 would have little effect on traffic, including HGVs. The A31 Farnham Bypass certainly provides a quicker east-west route for through traffic than does the A325 through the town at off-peak times, and probably at peak hours as well, with through traffic only electing to use the town centre when there are the most severe delays on the bypass. This behaviour is unlikely to be influenced by a change in the designated route of the A325.

Through traffic entering the town on the A287 from the south across Firgrove Hill Bridge will currently use West Street (A325) if it wishes to travel west, and East Street (A325) if it wishes to travel east, and changing road designation is unlikely to influence this.

Through traffic entering the town on the A287 from the north via Castle Street will currently use South Street if it wishes to travel west (turning right onto the A31 at Hickley's Corner) and either East Street (A325) or South Street to turn left onto the A31 if it wishes to travel east, and again changing road designations is unlikely to influence this routing.

It is worth noting that existing road signs do not encourage the use of the A325 through the town centre as a through route. The advance direction sign on the A31 westbound approach to the Shepherd and Flock shows the Guildford Road (A325) arm as 'Central Farnham', with no road number and no other destination. Similarly the advance direction signs on both the A31 Alton Road and A325 Wrecclesham Road approaches to Coxbridge Roundabout show the West Street (A325) arm as 'Central Farnham A325' with no other destination.

The above comments are the opinions of an individual officer, and it is suggested that there should be a fuller discussion of this issue at the next meeting of the Farnham Task Group, which reports to this committee.

The procedure for re-classifying a road, say from A to B status, is that member (Local Committee) approval would be required for a case to be submitted to the Department for Transport, with the final decision made by the Secretary of State for Transport. Installation costs would be relatively modest, involving changing road signs.

2. From Mr Robert Knowles

What plans have Highways to alleviate the serious congestion caused by the frequent closures of the A3 Hindhead Tunnel, such as the total gridlock on Thursday 8th December, when both tunnels were closed for three hours ?

Committee response

Planned closure of the A3 at Hindhead will be necessary periodically to allow the Highways Agency (HA) to carry out cyclic maintenance and repair work. These will always be following advance notice to the public and be carried out overnight between the hours of 8pm and 6am, when traffic flows are at their lightest, and are expected to result in no congestion on the Surrey road network. There will inevitably be occasions when the tunnel has to be closed in an emergency, and the closure of 8 December was just such an instance. When daytime trunk road traffic is diverted onto the local road network severe congestion is unavoidable, and no alterations to Surrey's roads could obviate this. Surrey Highways will lend support to any measures the HA deem necessary to reduce the risk of an emergency closure of the tunnel.

In a **supplementary question** Mr Knowles expressed his concern at the lack of signage to guide motorists taking alternative routes back onto the A3.

Mr D Harmer, on behalf of Surrey Police Authority, reported that the Highway Agency and Surrey Police have set up a working group to look at such matters and that Surrey County Council will become involved when the transfer of roads is complete.

ANNEX 4

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 G Hodgson (Broadwater School, Godalming)

Mr Hodgson referred to the consultation on on-street parking arrangements in vicinity of Farncombe Station and the fact that the section of Summers Road adjacent to Broadwater School had not as yet been included or the school consulted. What assurances could the Committee give that approaches would be made to the school to discuss the proposals in sufficient time to provide a response ?

The Chairman replied that the Parking Team had been made aware of the matter.

2. Mr T Forrest (Chiddingfold Parish Council)

Mr Forrest noted the recent remarking of white lines on roads in the village and expressed the view that these were unsightly. Since the location falls within a conservation area, could the Committee explain why no consultation had taken place with the Parish Council or with Waverley Borough Council's Conservation Officer ?

The Area Team Manager (Highways) explained that the recent exercise amounted to a refreshment of lines already in place which had become faded. The markings had been installed some years ago, along with other measures on the A283 to reduce vehicle speeds, following consultation with Chiddingfold Parish Council.

3. An unnamed member of the public

The questioner sought information on the membership of the Waverley Youth Services Task Group.

The Chairman explained that the Task Group had been formally established by the Local Committee on 17 June 2011 (membership subsequently amended on 16 September) and contained two County Councillors and two Waverley Borough Councillors, plus some young people from the borough. [The councillor membership is currently Mr David Munro (Chairman), Mr Steve Cosser, Mrs Carole King, Mr Elliot Nichols.]

4. Mr Nicholls (Farncombe)

Mr Nicholls asked if the consultation on parking in Farncombe had taken into account the construction of the new leisure centre in Summers Road.

The Chairman referred to her response to question 1. Mr S Cosser, as local County Councillor, acknowledged the complexity of the situation in Summers Road.

5. Two residents of Farncombe

The questions related to the reinstatement and landscaping of the leisure centre site in Summers Road.

The Chairman explained that the matter fell within the responsibility of Waverley Borough Council and that officers would obtain a response.

6. Ms J Evans (Haslemere Chamber of Trade)

Referring to the recent report by Mary Portas on the commercial viability of high streets, Ms Evans felt that the proposed parking charges (Item 11) may have a negative impact on the local economy and asked if the Committee would on these grounds exclude the proposal.

The Chairman referred to the report at Item 11 at which point the decision would be made.

7. Mr J Hyman (Farnham)

Mr Hyman asked:

- If the Committee would confirm whether the County Council has modelled the proposed reconfiguration of the Royal Deer junction.
- If the Committee would confirm that the County Council has modelled and assessed the alternative proposal made by Mr Jeremy Hunt MP and, if so, when the results would be released – also whether it retains the Royal Deer reconfiguration and whether the Section 106 agreement can be altered.
- Whether the Committee is willing to disclose the route that the diverted southbound A287 traffic would take (after Upper Hale Road, Shepherd and Flock and Station Hill) in order to rejoin the A287 and the existence of the assessments of the effects on the network.

The Chairman undertook to provide a written response.

8. Mr A Jones (Elstead Parish Council)

Mr Jones asked whether the funding for the pedestrian crossing over the B3001 in Elstead is secure and whether a starting date is available.

The Area Team Manager (Highways) referred to Item 9 where the programme is set out in detail. It was confirmed that the funding has been allocated and the scheme designed for construction in February/March 2012. The Chairman confirmed that, if construction were to be delayed, the committed funding would be carried forward into the new financial year for completion in 2012/13.

9. Mr J Edwards (Haslemere Town Council)

Mr Edwards referred to the possibility of a multi-storey car-park being built at Haslemere Station and felt that some of the proposals contained in the report at Item 11 may be premature. Would the Committee bear these concerns in mind when considering the matter ?

The Chairman confirmed that the Committee would do so.