



LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

16 MARCH 2012

1. Questions relating to parking in Wykeham Road (Farnham):

(i) From Ms Katrina Dunbar (Wykeham Road, Farnham)

Given that there are at least 23 cars owned by residents of Wykeham Road, how do you propose that the 13 Controlled Parking Zone spaces allocated in your proposal will give all residents access to a parking space when they need one ?

(ii) From Mr Julian Spickernell (Farnham)

Given the inaccuracy of the map of Wykeham Road included in Surrey County Council's letter of 12 January, can you confirm exactly where the parking restrictions would be, and, given the appalling impact a Controlled Parking Zone is going to have on the residents and their visitors, please would you seriously consider the implementation of delineated parking bays on either side of the road (i.e. partly on the road and partly on the pavements) or a strictly residents only parking zone in Wykeham Road ?

Committee response

It is correct that if 5 metres per vehicle are allowed, then the capacity within Wykeham Road will be 13 vehicles. However, under the advertised proposals a new parking bay will be installed south of property No.1, Wykeham Road in Beaufort Road where there is currently a single yellow line. This new bay will be 20 metres (capacity for 4 vehicles). South of property No.2 Wykeham Road also in Beaufort Road the existing single yellow line will also be revoked and a new bay of 25 metres will be installed (capacity for 5 vehicles). Together these two bays will raise the capacity to a potential 22 vehicles for Wykeham Road residents. Only one Beaufort Road property fronts on to these potential new parking bays, so

Wykeham Road residents will have a good chance of securing a parking space here if Wykeham Road itself is fully occupied. Although these two new parking bays are not directly outside of Wykeham Road residents' front doors they are less than a minute's walk away.

In addition residents will not have to compete for space with visitors and town centre workers.

Formalising footway parking would be possible with a Traffic Regulation Order, but this could require footway strengthening works and consultation with utility companies. Although the concerns about capacity are acknowledged, there is support for this proposal and it is recommended to proceed as advertised in the Parking Review Report.

2. Questions relating to parking in Haslemere

(i) From Mr J and Mrs N Barton (Haslemere)

On-street pay-and-display charging was so sensitive in September 2011 that the Chairman of the Local Committee withdrew the proposals from the Local Committee's agenda; in October 2011 Local Committees were given the "trust" of the Council "to make the right choice for their communities"; 4636 members of the Haslemere community signed a petition regarding the proposals opposing pay-and-display and confirming that the proposals "do not adequately address the parking issues in the town" (Local Committee minutes 24th February 2012 - Item 4), demonstrating that sensitivities have increased not diminished; and the revised proposals for pay-and-display in residential zones merely increase installation and maintenance costs, and therefore need for revenue, in a self-fulfilling prophecy when other wholly adequate means of controlling parking, with minimal enforcement costs, are readily available. Will the Committee members, with impartiality, respect, openness and accountability (according to your code of conduct) agree that the next steps should be to give more time for the community to work out more effective and efficient parking management arrangements than the half-finalised, disjointed and inefficient proposals tabled at Item 8 ?

Committee response

Changes to on-street parking restrictions have an impact on the use of the highway. A significant level of consultation is often required in order to best meet the needs of highway users, residents and businesses. A large consultation exercise was carried out in Waverley for the current parking review involving newspaper notices, street notices and letter drops. Information was available on the County Council website or via the Contact Centre and in libraries and the civic centre. The proposals were also publicised on TV, radio and in the local press helping to ensure wide publicity.

The recommendations in the Parking Review report take into account the consultation response, with changes to the original proposals and including further consultation where agreement has not been reached between affected groups, or new arrangements have been suggested. It

is proposed that the outcome of this additional consultation is reported to the Committee in June.

(ii) From Mr R Serman (Courts Mount Road West Residents' Association, Haslemere)

We learn that the proposals to paint double yellow lines down both sides of this quiet road are suddenly important as any parking would prevent fire engines and ambulances passing. We do not want the place disfigured in this unnecessary way. Refuse vehicles are the same width as fire engines, yet every week they manage with ease. In 28 years there has never been a problem (except with builders' oversize deliveries). Could the Committee explain what changed circumstances now justify the proposal to outlaw parking ?

As chairman of the Residents Association, I sent a unanimous objection from all the residents (with just one absent exception) of the western end of the road. Why has no notice been taken of this?

Committee response

Courts Mount Road varies between 4 and 4.5m in width so virtually any parking would be obstructive, particularly for emergency and public service vehicles. There is currently little or no parking along its length because it is obviously too narrow. As part of the on-street parking review proposals in Haslemere, it is proposed to introduce residents' parking schemes in the area around Courts Mount Road as well as other restrictions around the Station. This means that if there were no restrictions in Courts Mount Road some drivers might attempt to park along its length, particularly the upper end, with two wheels on the footway. This could cause access problems and mean pedestrian would have to walk on the road. Properties on this road have off-street parking so it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines to maintain access at all times. It is still possible to load and unload on double yellow lines as well as carry out maintenance work to adjoining property, etc.

(iii) From Mr John Greer (Haslemere)

In Item 8 (Waverley Parking Review 2011/2012 Annex 1 published on 7 March 2012) it is recommended that Pay and Display parking meters are installed in numerous roads in the vicinity of the Haslemere station where commuters park their cars. In the event of funding becoming available to permit the construction of a multi storey car park will the committee undertake to remove these meters and create a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the vicinity of the station to make the multi storey car park commercially viable ? Please answer simply yes or no.

Committee response

Yes, if necessary.

3. From Ms Vivien Williams

My question relates to the Officer Report issued on 7th March 2012, Item 8 of the Waverley Parking Review 2011/12, Summary of Objections, Annex 1 and the summaries of comment and objections to on street charging proposals for the individual roads. The Officer Report to the Local Committee (Waverley) refers in distinctly different ways to the number of objection letters that have been received as opposed to the number of support letters received. As a consequence of this seemingly inexplicable difference in treatment of the two sides, how can this Local Committee (Waverley) assure the public that it has been made fully aware of the number of objection letters that have been received ?

Committee response

The parking review report on the agenda at this meeting summarises as accurately as possible the objections made to the parking proposals in Waverley, and Committee members have been able to look at and discuss the comments sent in. The recommendations in the report are based on a wide range of factors such as safety and possible parking displacement as well as expressions of support and sometimes these have been judged to outweigh the objections received. In some cases the officer recommendation goes against the 'popular view', but it is up to the Committee to look at the information provided in the report and decide how to proceed.

4. From Ms Julianne Evans (Haslemere Chamber of Trade)

Section 4.1 of the Officers' Report states that: "An equality impact assessment has been undertaken. This has identified potential negative impacts for certain groups, especially those with a low household income. However, parking charges are small compared to the overall cost of running a motor vehicle". Is there any record of the form this impact assessment took and can the Committee provide details ?

Committee Response

An equalities impact assessment has been carried out for the introduction of parking charges.

Introducing on-street parking charges is consistent with the County Council's Parking Strategy in helping to operate on-street parking management efficiently, effectively and economically.

The Council adopted a new strategic transport plan in April 2011, of which the parking strategy is one strand. The plan includes commitments to tackle congestion, reduce carbon dioxide emissions and encourage parking off-street rather than on-street. Encouraging motorists to drive straight to car parks, and not drive around looking for a free on street parking space, should help with all these objectives.

The impact on minority, disadvantaged, vulnerable and socially excluded groups is likely to be minimal. Paying for parking on-street is not a new phenomenon (it is just not widespread in Surrey) and most drivers will have encountered it previously either at locations where it already exists in Surrey or at locations outside the county. Proposed tariffs are reasonable in comparison with off-street car parks and should contribute to only a relatively small rise in the overall costs

of running a motor vehicle. In Haslemere it is proposed to reduce the long-term tariff in locations furthest from the station (from £5 to £2.50/day) to minimise economic impact for some visitors or commuters, (and reduce displacement). The current tariff in the station car park is £7 per day.

The level of tariff has been considered to ensure it is reasonable, but there will still be a cost to the motorist. The County Council is entitled to impose a cost for parking in o- street parking bays by powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to help achieve improvements in terms of congestion, carbon dioxide emissions and efficiency of on street parking management.

Although some users may have issues with using the two available methods of paying to park (coin machine and pay by phone), the fact that there are two methods should minimise those issues, as should careful consideration of the structure and location of the pay and display machines.

5. From Mrs Betty Ames (Alfold Parish Council)

A preamble to this question is annexed at p.8 (below)

- (i) Relates to my question to the meeting on 14 June 2011, where in Annex 2 it is minuted that:

“She (the County Council Officer) is happy to liaise with the Borough Council on applications at Dunsfold Park. The Chairman undertook to discuss with the Leader of Waverley Borough Council opportunities for improving liaison on these matters”

May we please be advised of the outcomes of those discussions, and which Officers will be undertaking these specific duties in relation to the issuing of Licences by the Traffic Commissioner, recognising as statutory consultees our rights and obligations to respond in the required manner ?

- (ii) In relation to the Local Committee's anticipated response to Waverley Borough Council's consultation process on the Revised Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework (LDF):

How does the Committee anticipate responding within their statutory roles as consultees to ensure they embrace all relevant matters appertaining to HGVs; with particular reference as to how – by default – Dunsfold Park has now become the only major operation centre for HGVs in the County of Surrey – let alone in Waverley – and in the Parish of Alfold (which with the exception of a small area of undeveloped land contains the whole of the airfield, its runways and associated commercial buildings within its boundaries!) ?

Committee response

- (i) The County Council has appointed its Transport Development Planning Manager (East) as its point of contact in respect of this matter. The procedure at Waverley Borough Council (Planning) is that each application is notified to the Planning Enforcement Team where the relevant planning history is checked to establish whether there is any conflict with either existing enforcement action or planning conditions. If

none exist from a planning point of view, no objection would be raised. If officers are minded to raise objection, this needs to be subject to approval of ward members in accordance with our scheme of delegation. Licensing and Environmental Health Officers are also made aware of relevant applications. Officers of both councils liaise when appropriate. A report updating the Committee on Vehicle Operating Licenses and associated arrangements will be presented at the 22 June 2012 meeting.

- (ii) The County Council will continue to respond to applications for operators' licences in the same way as it does currently, notifying the relevant County Councillor and requesting that conditions limiting times of movement are attached to all applications. There are many large operating centres in Surrey. Few, if any, are as tightly controlled as Dunsfold Park. The County Council and its Local Committee members are currently developing a response to Waverley Borough Council's Revised Core Strategy of the LDF and the points raised in the question are noted.

6. From Mr P C Hunter (Thursley Parish Council)

Our council remains concerned about the slippery state of the road surface in parts of The Street, Thursley, particularly just outside Wheeler's Barn, and Highfield Lane just above the church. As previously reported, the condition of the road is causing horses, mounted or otherwise, to slip and fall even though they are fitted with studded shoes. One rider has sustained very serious injuries which will have a negative effect on her future life.

Thursley Parish Council would respectfully request information on Surrey County Council's plans to tackle this identified problem, both in the short term and long term.

Committee response

The Committee is saddened to hear of this accident and extends every sympathy to the injured rider.

In some areas of these roads bitumen has bled to the surface. Since this is causing particular concern to equestrians, County Council officers will shortly be carrying out a joint inspection with our contractor's surfacing specialists to assess what needs to be done to improve skid resistance.

7. From Mrs Celia Sandars (Farnham Air Quality Campaign)

As a result of correspondence with our MP, Jeremy Hunt, regarding the impact of large lorries in Farnham, I have advice from Mike Penning, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Transport. I quote from his letter:

"It would be for the local authority to determine if a formal freight diversionary route is needed to ensure heavy goods vehicles, which are not actually delivering to stores in Farnham, use the A31 Farnham bypass in order to travel between the M3 and A3, rather than travelling through the town centre."

In view of the air pollution problems caused by excessive traffic in Farnham's town centre, problems that the Committee were made aware of at its meeting on 16 December last year, will the County Council now act on that Department of Transport advice to put a formal freight diversionary route in place so that heavy goods vehicles that have no need to stop in the town, are re-routed along the A31 for the section of the A325 between the Coxbridge and Shepherd and Flock roundabouts ?

Committee response

Journey times for real life trips between the Shepherd and Flock Roundabout and Coxbridge Roundabout via both the A325 (town centre) and A31 (Farnham Bypass) are available from in-vehicle GPS (Satnav) companies. This recorded data has been obtained and analysed, and indicates that in both directions (eastbound and westbound) and for all time periods it is quicker to use the bypass rather than the town centre. For most of the day, including evening peak hours, it is three or four minutes quicker to use the bypass in either direction. The lowest difference is in the eastbound direction during the morning peak hour, when it is about half a minute quicker to use the A31.

Later in the year the County Council will undertake number-plate trace surveys on the main roads into central Farnham to establish the degree to which through traffic is using the town centre. The data will be unclassified (will not identify vehicle type) but will be provided to Waverley Borough Council who intend to obtain fleet composition and engine types from the DVLA to feed into their air quality assessment. This will quantify HGV and all other through traffic.

Once volumes of through traffic have been assessed control measures can be considered.

Preamble to Question 5

My questions on this occasion come in two parts, the first part in relation to the “outcomes” of the meeting of this Committee from its meeting on 14 June 2011 – Item 12 – relating to “Annual Review of Monitoring of Applications for Goods Vehicle Operators Licences”; - where it was confirmed that the only major operation site for Heavy Goods Vehicles was located at Dunsfold Park in Waverley. I had put a question to the Committee in the Informed Public Session, and the response was minuted at Annex 2.

The second part of my question arises directly from the recently published Waverley Borough Council document –

Local Development Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options and Draft Policies February 2012 -- which includes matters of particular concern to Alfold Parish Council relating to Dunsfold Park, the location of the major operation centre for HGVs, as fully considered in your report above of 14 June 2011 in the revised and updated Section 10 “Employment and Economy” pages 101-113 inclusive, with specific reference to “Dunsfold Park” p 111 paras 10.48 onwards;

- para 10.52, p 112 which sets out for the first time an “outline” plan for their consideration of the “principles” which will guide the framework of their “Policy CS10: Employment Development at Dunsfold Park” and at the foot of page 112:-
- leading to – in due course – as stated under Delivery to:-
- detailed policies in the Development Management and Site Allocations DPD and a “Dunsfold Park Master Plan”

The Committee is asked to note the following specific references important to this consultation process in the Revised LDF document as follows:-

- 1) In Section 2 “The Spatial Portrait”
on p 16 under Roads and Transport
at para 2.18 – the last 2 sentences – are the only references to Heavy Goods Vehicles in the whole of the Consultation document where it is stated that:

“Much of Waverley’s road network is rural and narrow and therefore unsuitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles. The safe accommodation of heavy traffic on the principal through routes (the A31, A281, A283, A286, A287 and A325) and its impact on communities through which these roads pass is a challenge”

While this statement highlights concerns for all rural communities and villages, where there are numbers of roads designated as “unsuitable for HGVs”, you are asked to note that:

- the A281 (which relates to Alfold and therefore Dunsfold Park) is the only major route in the eastern end of the Borough, as is clearly demonstrated in the Core Strategy – Key Diagram of Waverley Borough (Draft) attached at the end of the LDF Core Strategy

- 2) In Section 7 – “Sustainable Transport”
on p 63 para 7.1 Introduction it states:

7.1 “The purpose of this policy is to promote sustainable modes of transport in the Borough and minimise the negative environmental and economic impacts of congestion

Surrey County Council is the Highway Authority within Waverley. Waverley can contribute towards re-balancing the transport system by influencing the location of development”

- 3) Under the heading "Policy Context"
on p 65 para 7.14 is stated:

7.14 In line with PPS12, the Council is preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will set out what transport infrastructure is required to enable the amount of development proposed for the area

Note: In a previous consultation process relating to the development of the "Surrey Transport Plan 2011-2026 – Freight Strategy" under the heading "Delivery in Partnership" it was stated that

"Partners will include: Borough, District, Town and Parish Councils and concluded that

"Local freight-related issues will typically be considered in the forum of a Council Council and Borough or District Council joint Local Committee"

Question: May we urge that this proposal will apply in this instance?

- 4) Also under the heading "Policy Context"
on p 65 para 7.17 includes the statement:

7.17 line 3 onwards – "The Council will work with the County Council to ensure that Borough's needs are reflected in future Local Transport Plans"

Conclusion

I make no apology for this longer than usual presentation of the "context" leading up to my questions, as due to the "format" under which these consultation processes are carried out – and the way these important matters to us at least – are buried in the text, this could be our only opportunity to raise such matters at a time when we may be able to influence the final outcomes in the developing strategy.