



**Minutes of meeting**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**Date:** FRIDAY 16 MARCH 2012

**Time:** 2.00PM

**Place:** CHICHESTER HALL, WITLEY

**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)  
Dr A Povey (Waverley Eastern Villages)  
Mr A Young (Cranleigh and Ewhurst)

**Waverley Borough Council**

Mr B Adams (Frensham, Docketfield and Tilford)  
Mrs C Cockburn (Farnham Bourne)  
Mr M Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)  
Mr B Ellis (Cranleigh West)  
Ms L Graffham (Milford)  
Mr R Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)  
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.**

**13/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mr J Ward and Mr D Leigh: Mr M Byham and Ms L Graffham were present as substitutes.

**14/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 24 February 2012 (Item 2)**

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

**15/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Declarations of personal interest were made as follows in relation to Item 8 and on the grounds stated:

- By Mr R Knowles: he is a resident of Beech Road, Haslemere
- By Mr A Young: he is a commuter on the London-Portsmouth railway
- Dr A Povey: he is a resident and owns a business in Cranleigh
- Mr M Byham: members of his family live in Haslemere
- Mrs P Frost: she is a resident of Burnt Hill Road, Farnham
- Mr S Renshaw (at Item 8): he is a resident of Farnham Lane, Haslemere

In relation to Item 14 Mr B Morgan declared a personal interest on the grounds that he is Portfolio Holder for the Environment at Waverley Borough Council and chairs the Farnham Air Quality Joint Committee.

**16/12 PETITIONS (Item 4)**

The Committee noted the receipt of an e-petition from residents of Sandrock, Haslemere requesting the rejection of the proposed residents' parking scheme in this road. The petition had not attracted sufficient signatures to allow formal presentation at Committee, but its contents had been noted as part of the consultation on parking restrictions in Haslemere.

Three petitions were presented formally:

1. By Mr Graham Precious on behalf of residents in Rowledge (e-petition)
2. My Ms Julianne Evans on behalf of the Haslemere Chamber of Trade (e-petition)
3. By Mr John Hurst on behalf of the Park View Residents' Association, Farnham

Details of these petitions are set out at **Annex 1**.

The Chairman undertook to provide responses to these petitions at the next meeting.

**17/12 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)**

The responses to public questions received are set out at **Annex 2**, along with details of supplementary questions.

18/12 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)**

The response to the member's question received is set out at **Annex 3**.

**NON-EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS**

19/12 **BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC 503 THURSLEY (D136): REQUEST TO CONSIDER A TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984) (Item 7)**

It was reported that Thursley Parish Council supports the proposed Order. It was clarified that the repairs referred to at 5.1 in the report would be funded in the financial year 2012-13.

**Resolved that** the grounds for making a TRO as outlined are met, and a Order should be made 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

**Reason for decision:**

Officers do not have delegated powers to make or advertise TROs. Officers support the decision to make a TRO because it 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**

20/12 **ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW IN WAVERLEY 2011/12: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSE (Item 8)**

The Chairman drew attention to the fact that both "Pay and Display" proposals and the outcome of the annual review of on-street parking were under consideration. She announced that proposals for the introduction of "Pay and Display" parking in Haslemere – in both retail and residential areas – would be withdrawn. The opposition of many residents in Haslemere to these proposals, as reflected in petitions and questions to the Committee and in correspondence, had been noted. It may be appropriate in due course to revisit the topic in the vicinity of the station. Officers were thanked for their work in developing proposals.

Officers described the consultation process and summarised the response that had been received. It was explained that proposals for residents' only parking schemes had been developed in roads in Haslemere with little off-street parking and members expressed a wish to respond to the needs of people living in roads subject to heavy all-day parking by non-residents. A request to defer all proposals in Haslemere to a future meeting was not accepted and the proposals for individual roads were described and discussed. Certain proposals were modified in the light of these discussions. It was noted that a request to extend the loading restriction in West Street had been received and that a separate consultation on this would be undertaken.

It was agreed to defer any action in Derby Road to allow further consideration following the withdrawal of the Pay and Display proposals and, if necessary, consultation with residents and St Bartholomew's Church and School to determine whether parking arrangements to suit all parties can be agreed. There was some concern as to whether the proposals for the roads in the vicinity of St Stephen's Church would meet the Church's needs, but the recommended arrangements were felt to be reasonable. A correction was provided to the effect that an objection had been received relating to St Christopher's Green. The recommendations for Bunch Lane, Courts Hill Road and Weydown Road were deferred until the June 2012 meeting and those for Courts Mount Road to allow the evidence to be checked. The detailed amendments to the published recommendations are set out in **Annex 4**.

The proposals for Farnham were amended, in the light of the public question received at Item 5, to allow further discussion with residents in Wykeham Road. Mr D Munro felt that the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone into South Farnham had, with the current proposals, reached its reasonable limit. The proposals for Cranleigh were welcomed. In relation to Farncombe Mr S Cosser proposed deferral of the scheme for Summers Road as he was concerned about displacement and wished to consult further with stakeholders; he endorsed the officers' judgement that there is insufficient support from residents to proceed with a Controlled Parking Zone, but felt that the adjustments referred to at 2.11 were appropriate.

Members wished to avoid a situation in which annual parking reviews, as a result of deferred proposals, merged into a rolling programme. It was recommended that none of the proposals agreed for Haslemere should be implemented before June, but noted that schemes in other locations would be progressed in the interim. It was also proposed by the Chairman that any implementation costs above £30,000 should be found from the parking budget.

The proposed schemes, as amended in discussion and set out in **Annex 4**, were put to the Committee en bloc.

**Resolved to:**

In Farnham

- (a) Approve as amended the recommendations detailed in Annex 4.
- (b) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 4 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.
- (c) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 4
- (d) Agree that the response to the consultation in c) is reported to the Committee in June 2012.

In Haslemere

- (e) Agree that no "Pay and Display" parking schemes will be implemented in retail or residential areas at the present time.
- (f) Approve as amended the recommendations detailed in Annex 4.

- (g) Agree that the detail of the changes described in the recommendations in Annex 4 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman and that no schemes will be installed before June 2012.
- (h) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 4.
- (i) Agree that the response to the consultation in (h) is reported to the Committee in June 2012.

In Godalming, Farncombe and Wormley

- (j) Approve the recommendations detailed in Annex 4, as amended to allow for further consultation in Summers Road.
- (k) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 4 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.
- (l) Agree that, where necessary, formal advertisement and further statutory consultation is completed about changes proposed in Annex 4 and as described in section 2.11 of the report.
- (m) Agree that the response to the consultation in (l) is reported to the Committee in June 2012.

In Cranleigh

- (n) Approve as amended the recommendations detailed in Annex 4.
- (o) Agree that the detail of the changes described by the recommendations in Annex 4 is agreed by the local member, chairman and vice chairman.

In general

- (p) Agree that Waverley Borough Conservation officers are consulted about the location and type of pay and display machines.
- (q) Allocate £30,000 from the 2012/13 revenue budget toward the cost of implementing the parking review, the balance to be found from the parking budget.

**Reason for decision:**

The introduction of parking controls can help improve road safety and reduce obstructive parking.

[Mr B Vorley left the meeting during this item.]

21/12 **HIGHWAYS SCHEMES 2011-12: UPDATE (Item 9)**

The Chairman confirmed that the funding for any schemes not completed in the current year would be carried forward into 2012-13.

**Resolved to** note progress on highway improvement schemes.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee has requested regular updates on the progress of the programme.

**22/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE HIGHWAYS CAPITAL AND REVENUE BUDGETS FOR 2012-13 (Item 10)**

The Committee welcomed the increased funding available and the contents of the proposed programme. The inclusion of long-awaited cycle schemes was noted. The publication for the first time of funding made available from Planning Infrastructure Contributions was also welcomed, although further updated detail was felt to be necessary along with clarity on appropriate member involvement. Members expressed continuing concerns about the bridge in Elmbridge Road, Cranleigh.

The Committee discussed the balance between major maintenance and improvement schemes. The Chairman had asked the Area Highways Manager to convene the Local Task Groups to identify further priorities and to progress the design of schemes prioritised as a result. It was felt that the justification for the maintenance schemes identified needed to be explained more clearly to residents, who may feel that priorities lay elsewhere.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Agree that the improvement (ITS) schemes described in this report form the Waverley LTP programme for 2012/3, with Maintenance Capital funding reserved to implement the programme.
- (ii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager (AHM) to progress the schemes included in the programme in consultation with local elected members and associated task groups.
- (iii) Authorise the AHM to consider and determine any objections submitted following the statutory advertisement of the traffic orders and notices associated with the programme of schemes, in consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and relevant local councillors.
- (iv) Agree that Community Pride funding is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equitable allocation of £5,000 per division.
- (v) Agree that a report on how the £317,000 of local Maintenance Revenue is used is submitted to the June Local Committee meeting.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee was asked to agree a programme of schemes, which will allow work to progress.

**23/12 PROPOSAL TO MAKE PERMANENT THE EXPERIMENTAL AMENDMENTS TO LOADING RESTRICTION IN FARNHAM (Item 11)**

The proposal was welcomed, although it was acknowledged that further work would be required, e.g. in the remainder of Downing Street and in the vicinity of the roundabout in West Street adjacent to the Crondall Lane junction. Effective enforcement, e.g. through concentrated periods of activity, was

seen as essential to achieving the improvement in air quality envisaged by the proposal. The scheme was originally funded via the Leader's Climate Change Fund and the Committee was reminded that it was originally as a pilot and would wish to consider its application elsewhere in Waverley.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the objections received to the experimental changes to the loading restrictions implemented.
- (ii) Being satisfied that objections to the changes have been overcome, approve making the experimental Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), under section 9 of The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) which suspended the existing loading restrictions on The Borough and Downing Street (between Upper Church Lane / Ivy Lane and The Borough) and introduced new loading restrictions on those lengths of roads between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday, permanent.

**Reason for decision:**

Supported by a rigorous enforcement regime the experimental loading restrictions have been successful in reducing traffic congestion in the centre of Farnham.

**24/12 EXPERIMENTAL SPEED LIMIT: B2133 LOXWOOD ROAD, ALFOLD TO COUNTY BOUNDARY (Item 12)**

**Resolved to** authorise a Traffic Regulation Order making permanent the current 40mph experimental Order on the B2133 Loxwood Road between the boundary with West Sussex and the existing 30mph speed limit at Alfold village.

**Reason for decision:**

Following a decision by West Sussex County Council to implement a 40mph limit on the south side of the county boundary, officers consider that Surrey County Council has little alternative than to make permanent the experimental 40mph limit within Surrey.

**25/12 COMMUNITY PRIDE FUND 2011-12 (Item 13)**

**Resolved to** note committed expenditure to date.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee has requested regular updates on the progress of the programme.

**26/12 RESPONSE TO PETITION: AIR QUALITY IN FARNHAM (Item 14)**

The Chairman invited Mrs C Sandars, who had presented the petition at the previous meeting, to comment on the response. Mrs Sandars had been hopeful that progress would have been made in the intervening period and sought reassurance that work was under way. Mr B Morgan reported that a

grant from DEFRA to Waverley Borough Council is being used to fund a comprehensive review of all possible solutions to the problem of air quality in Farnham. All three relevant councils are collaborating effectively and the Highways Agency and Primary Care trust are also involved. The results would be evaluated with a view to ensuring that any solution does not displace pollution elsewhere. The Borough Council is working with several schools to raise awareness of air quality matters and would be interested in extending the Air Quality Management Area in Farnham. Farnham members felt that a priority remained the removal of unnecessary Heavy Goods Vehicles from the town and their diversion onto the A31 and A331.

**Resolved to** agree the response set out in the report.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

27/12 **GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION: DEVOLVING LOCAL MAJOR TRANSPORT SCHEMES (Item 15)**

Iain Reeve, Surrey County Council's Assistant Director for Strategy, Transport and Planning updated the Committee on the current consultation. The Government is proposing to devolve the funding of major schemes to bodies smaller than the regions. Under this proposal, decisions on major schemes would be made by new organisations called "transport bodies". It is for each area to set up its own transport body voluntarily through negotiation with neighbouring authorities. The Government's preference is for these transport bodies to be based on Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) geographies. This could mean that Surrey would be part of one transport body based on the Enterprise M3 LEP and another transport body based on the Coast to Capital LEP, or it could be part of a bigger transport body which combined the two LEPs together. Once a transport body is established, the Government will allocate funding to it via a formula largely based on population. The transport body would then decide which schemes to fund from within its budget. The Government have said that it would not interfere with these decisions, unlike previous funding mechanisms where the final decision on a major transport scheme was made by a Government Minister.

Officers are inclined to favour a consortium combining both of the relevant LEPs. There is a need now to develop schemes on which in the region of £10-£13 million could be spent per annum in Surrey – this could represent one large scheme combined over several years or a number of smaller schemes. Local Committees will be consulted on their priorities later in the year, but both the Wrecclesham Relief Road and the Hickley's Corner scheme are already listed. Members noted the opportunities presented by the proposed arrangements and suggested that a co-ordinated County/Borough Council response would be helpful.

The Chairman thanked Mr Reeve for his briefing.

28/12 **SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE BOROUGH PLAN FOR WAVERLEY 2011-12 (Item 16)**

The Committee welcomed the encouraging update and noted in particular the work undertaken with vulnerable young people. In response to a question it



was explained that, although most Surrey Fire and Rescue interventions are targeted, any resident may request a home fire risk check and a small number of these are provided each week in Waverley.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Recognise the achievements of the borough teams within Waverley in 2011/12 and support their commitment to improve initiatives to reduce risk and make Waverley safer through the delivery of the borough plan.
- (ii) Note the targets and initiatives set within the Waverley borough plan for 2011/12 and support the Fire and Rescue Service in the delivery of this plan.
- (iii) Support the achievements of the retained duty personnel at Godalming, Cranleigh, Dunsfold and Haslemere and acknowledge the availability offered by employers who release staff, and those who are self-employed.

**Reason for decision:**

The Service reports annually to the Local Committee.

**29/12 YOUTH SMALL GRANTS (Item 17)**

Mr D Munro reported that members of the Youth Services Task Group were now content with proposals and that provision had been made for its preferred approach. The scheme is now open for applications, with an initial deadline of 19 April 2012. It was confirmed that Parish Councils are able to apply.

**Resolved to** agree the process for approving Youth Small Grants proposed in the report.

**Reason for decision:**

To allow implementation of the relevant strands of the transformation project of Services for Young People.

**30/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS 2011-2012 (Item 18)**

The Chairman proposed an arrangement for absorbing any revenue balances remaining unallocated at the end of the financial year and this was agreed ((iii) below).

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the seven applications for expenditure annexed to the report
- (ii) Note the actions carried out under delegated authority since the last meeting.

- (iii) Agreed that any revenue balances remaining at the end of the current financial year should be allocated to the bursary scheme for Looked After Children.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee is required to ensure the timely and appropriate deployment of its budgets.

**31/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 19)**

**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 17.55 pm**

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

**Contact:**

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

## **ANNEX 1: PETITIONS**

### **1. e-petition presented by Mr Graham Precious on behalf of residents of Rowledge**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to create safe pedestrian access, particularly for parents and children, within the village of Rowledge.

Rowledge is a thriving village with a church, Primary School, two nursery schools, two pubs, three shops and a hairdresser. Many residents walk and cycle around the village, despite narrow roads and lack of pavements. They are forced to share the often winding, high-hedged, poorly signed roads with motor vehicles driving at speeds unsafe for the shared nature of the roads. A Village Plan exercise conducted in May 2011 identified road safety as the No.1 concern of villagers. We wish the Council to implement safe pedestrian routes, with particular focus on a short stretch of The Avenue from Chapel Road to The Long Road, to allow safe access from the East of the village to the Square, and Cherry Tree Road from Prospect Road to Boundary Road/School Road.

If this is achieved, it will give the children a safe route to walk to school and residents safe access to the shops. We believe that without swift action, it is only a matter of time before the village suffers a serious casualty or fatality.

### **2. e-petition presented by Ms Julianne Evans on behalf of Haslemere Chamber of Trade**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to abandon its proposals for on-street parking charges in and around Haslemere.

Surrey County Council has a responsibility to ensure a sustainable local economy all of the towns in Surrey. The introduction of on-street parking charges in Haslemere will have a negative impact on the vitality and viability of Haslemere as a whole. Introducing charges on existing free parking areas will disadvantage local retailers and commerce at a time of economic difficulty, these proposals will seriously affect passing trade. They will seriously inconvenience local people seeking to use and support local amenities such as the Haslemere museum and Haslemere Hall The cost of installing meters and enforcement would be a major charge on any funds raised by the scheme. We demand that the Council abandon its proposals for on-street parking charges.

### **3. Petition presented by Mr John Hurst on behalf of the Park View Residents' Association, Farnham**

We consider Drovers Way and Trinity Hill unsafe for all road users due to speed and increased traffic flows and as such we aim to create positive actions to implement regulations and/or processes which can be applied to our estate roads, thereby restricting the speed and type of traffic access to ensure a safer environment.

Park View Residents' Association (PVRA) has been active over several years with regards to the ever increasing traffic flows through the estate following the concerns of the residents. Drovers Way/Trinity Hill has now become a 'rat-run' following the arrival of buses currently routed through the estate.

There are 80 bus transits a day on this road and it has encouraged other traffic to use the road, including HGV's and lorries for driver training. It has become a route for vehicles from Upper Hale, Sandy Hill and Heath End seeking an easy route to Farnham Town, combined with the use of satnav equipment for strangers. The Farnham East Street development is also likely to increase the number of vehicles through the route. There is also serious concern for the safety of parents and children attending the local schools, particularly the Folly Hill Infants School.

Because of the concerns of the Association, a professional company was engaged in 2010 and 2011 to collect data on traffic flows and the speed of vehicles and these results show there is an important need to be concerned for safety on the estate, particularly on the access road – Drovers Way/Trinity Hill. A comprehensive dossier has been produced which covers all aspects of the issues around the Drovers Way and Trinity Hill, Farnham. The document contains the detailed traffic data, flows, speed, type of vehicle, and was commissioned by PVRA.

The Residents' Association strongly recommends that the County Council work with them to generate an affordable plan to increase the safety on the currently dangerous access road through the Park View Estate in Farnham.

## **ANNEX 2: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

### **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.

#### **Supplementary question**

Mr Spickernell requested further consideration of the matter as he did not feel that the response had adequately addressed the problem or fully recognised the character of Wykeham Road: there would still be an overall reduction in parking spaces in the neighbourhood.

The Chairman replied that she would propose deferral of the proposals for Wykeham Road pending further discussions with residents.

## **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.

### **Supplementary question**

Mr Barton felt that the consultation undertaken by the County Council hitherto had been one-way and sought reassurance that any future consultation would respect the values of the County Council, adopting a holistic approach and engaging the community more widely. He felt that an apology was due on the grounds that consultation to date –

and the development of the recommendations – had not lived up to the Council's values.

In response the Chairman stated that she understood the view that consultation in Haslemere had been insufficient; the County Council would ensure that any subsequent consultation would be improved.

**(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' oversized 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.

**Supplementary question**

Mr Serman felt that the County Council had not given proper attention to the data emerging from the consultation, suggesting that 23 objections received from Courts Mount Road had been treated as one in the analysis contained in the report. It was not clear to him why residents of Courts Mount Road (West) had not been consulted and he requested the installation of double yellow lines on the north side of the road only.

The request was noted.

**(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.

**Supplementary question**

Mr Greer asked if the phrase "if necessary" amounted to a caveat.

The Parking Manager confirmed that the response was intended to be affirmative.

**3. From Ms Vivien Williams**

My question relates to the Officer Report issued on 7<sup>th</sup> 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.

**Supplementary question**

Ms Williams asked why the Council had sought to mislead in its treatment of objections and expressions of support.

The Parking Manager maintained that there had been no attempt to mislead and that he believed that the report reflected the balance of views accurately.



#### **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 on-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.

#### **Supplementary question**

Ms Evans felt that the response had not clarified the stance taken in the report and asked whether the Local Committee did not consider it inappropriate to suggest to a low-paid worker that £100 per month for parking might be a small cost.

The Parking Manager responded that, although the primary focus had been on commuters, efforts had been made to reduce the impact of the proposed charges in areas further from the station.

**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 Licences 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.

### **Supplementary question**

Mrs Ames, on behalf of the Parish Council, sought reassurance that, in relation to (i), a named licensing officer at Waverley Borough Council could be identified as the primary contact for dealing with Vehicle Operating Licenses. With regard to (ii), Mrs Ames asked why there are no clear arrangements for a development brief to be prepared for Dunsfold Park and what arrangements are being proposed to allow the engagement of local residents. She also maintained that there are no operating centres in Surrey of a comparable size to that at Dunsfold Park and requested a correction.

The Chairman undertook to arrange a further response to the Parish Council, in conjunction with Waverley Borough Council's Executive Members.

### **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.

### **Supplementary question**

Mrs Sandars expressed her satisfaction with the response but asked why, given the clear advantage to Heavy Goods Vehicles of using the A31, it is necessary to wait for further evidence.

In response the Chairman explained that the Farnham County Councillors acknowledged the importance and urgency of addressing the problem, but recognised the risk of displacement. She undertook to progress the matter without unnecessary delay.

## **ANNEX 3: MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **From Mr David Munro**

For many months I have been trying to ascertain from Transportation Development Planning (TDP) the status of the £5000 that I understand was obtained from the developer of 'Kelmscott', School Lane via a s106 agreement. I understand informally that it is considered that these monies are available for highways safety schemes in the vicinity. I have received several requests from local residents and Borough Councillors that, if available, the £5000 should fund a flashing 'School' light and sign on Lodge Hill Road. I agree that this would be a good use of the funds.

Could I be told please:

1. Is the £5000 available as above ? Is other funding required and if so, how much?
2. Do Highways support its use to install a 'School' sign and light ?
3. If the answer is positive, what are the timescales for its installation ?.

### **Committee response**

1. TDP contacted the developer to clarify the situation with regard to the £5,000 funds and it can be confirmed that the money is available for road safety improvements. This should be sufficient for installation of a Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) and additional funding will not be required.
2. In principle Highways support the installation of a 'vehicle activated sign' in Lodge Hill Road in the vicinity of its junction with School Lane. "Slow" markings on Lodge Hill Road could be laid subject to the speed surveys results.
3. Depending on the supplier's timescales it could be three to four months before a VAS is installed and commissioned.

### **Supplementary question**

Although pleased with the response, Mr Munro asked for reassurance that the scheme would go ahead without delay.

The Area Highways Manager gave this assurance.

<b>ANNEX 4: PARKING REVIEW: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS</b>		
<b>Plan number</b>	<b>Road/Location</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<b>Farnham</b>		
24120	Shepherd & Flock Roundabout (Moor Park Road), Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24110	Lynch Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24038	Ridgway Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24029, 24034	Extension of Farnham (Railway) Controlled Parking Zone (Tilford Road)	Proceed as advertised
24029	St Georges Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24029, 24030	Longley Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24030	Menin Way, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24111, 24121	York Road & Lancaster Avenue, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24033	Arthur Road, Farnham	<b>Proceed as advertised, but following further discussion with residents</b>
24033	Alfred Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24032	Weydon Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24031	The Chantrys, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24030	Waverley Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24030	Old Compton Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24027	Crosby Way & Pengilly Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24023	Middle Church Lane, Farnham	Deferred until June 2012 for

		amendments
24018	Castle Street, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24015	St James Avenue, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24015	Adams Park Road, Farnham,	Proceed as advertised
24126	Bankside, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24014	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Wykeham Road.	<b>Deferred until June 2012 unless objections and issues from residents can be resolved beforehand (residents to be written to)</b>
24014	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Sumner Road	Proceed as advertised
24014	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Beaufort Road	Proceed as advertised
24014	Upper South View, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24011	Lower Weybourne Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24011	Badshot Lea Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24119	Heath Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24009	Alma Way, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24122	Lodge Hill Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24039	Burnt Hill Road, Farnham	Do not proceed
24121	Great Austins, junctions with Little Austins & Mavins Road, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24035	Weydon Lane, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24025	Bridgefield, Farnham	Proceed as advertised

<b>Cranleigh</b>		
24101	St James's Place, Cranleigh	<b>Proceed with minor amendments (relaxed permit criteria)</b>
24102	High Street, Cranleigh	Proceed as advertised
24102	Victoria Road, Cranleigh	<b>Proceed with minor amendments (relaxed permit criteria)</b>

<b>Godalming, Milford, Wormley and Witley</b>		
24062	Church Lane, Witley	<b>Deferred until June 2012 for site meeting and amendments</b>
24061, 24123	Combe Lane, Wormley	Proceed as advertised
24124	Tuesley Lane, Godalming	Proceed as advertised
24073	Ockford Road, Godalming	Proceed as advertised
24073, 24076	Busbridge Lane, Godalming	Proceed as advertised
24084	Deanery Road, Godalming	<b>Deferred until June 2012 for site meeting and amendments</b>
24071	Crownpits Lane, Godalming	Proceed as advertised
24069	Church Road, Milford	Proceed as advertised



<b>Farncombe</b>		
24125	More Circle, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24093, 24095	Summer's Road, Farncombe	<b>Deferred until June 2012 to allow further discussion with stakeholders</b>
24090	Upper Manor Road, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24090	Farncombe Street, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24088	Hare Lane, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24086	Catteshall Road junction Grange Close, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24085	Hallam Road, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised
24085	Wolsey Road junction Marshall Road, Farncombe	Proceed as advertised

<b>Haslemere</b>		
24059	College Hill and College Hill Terrace, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24058	Hedgehog Lane, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24056	Lion Green, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24056	Junction Place, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24056	Liphook Road, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24054	West Street, Haslemere (Loading restriction proposed in Sept.2011 report)	<b>Proceed as advertised for the loading restriction proposed in Sept.2011, but consult on proposed extended loading restriction and report in June 2012</b>

24051	Farnham Lane, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24127	Park Road junction Hill Road, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24127	Half Moon Hill junction Hill Road, Haslemere	Proceed as advertised
24050, 24117	Derby Road, Haslemere (Waiting restriction proposed in Sept.2011 report)	<b>Defer until June 2012 for further consideration following the withdrawal of the Pay and Display proposals and, if necessary, for further consultation with residents, St Bartholomew's Church and School to determine the most suitable parking arrangements for all, which if agreed will then be subject to a further statutory consultation</b>
	Amended residents and visitor permit criteria for Waverley Borough	Proceed as advertised

<b>ANNEX 4: ON-STREET CHARGING PROPOSALS: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS</b>		
<b>Plan number</b>	<b>Road/Location</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<b>Farnham</b>		
24017, 24018	Castle Street, Farnham	Proceed as advertised
24017, 24023	The Hart, West Street, Long Garden Way & Falkner Road (collectively Farnham Town Centre)	Proceed as advertised
<b>Haslemere</b>		
24055, 24118	Beech Road, Haslemere	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24054, 24050	Bridge Road, Haslemere	Do not proceed
24054	Chestnut Avenue, Haslemere	<b>Proceed with amendments (permits to be dedicated to road in which resident lives)</b>
24051	Bunch Lane, Haslemere	<b>Deferred until June 2012 for further consultation and amendments</b>
24050	Church Road, Haslemere	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24058, 24053	Courts Mount Road, Haslemere	<b>Deferred until June 2012 to check evidence</b>
24058, 24127	Courts Hill Road, Haslemere	<b>Deferred until June 2012 for further consultation</b>
24057, 24058, 24052	Kings Road, Haslemere	<b>Proceed as advertised, without pay and display, except that further</b>

		<b>consultation on the introduction of residents' parking permits in the slip road opposite Railway Bridge will take place, to be brought back in June 2012</b>
24056	Lion Mead, Haslemere	<b>Proceed with minor amendments. Retain parking bay, but free for 1 hour. Remove waiting restrictions on opposite side of road to the parking bay.</b>
24051, 24056	Lion Lane, Haslemere	<b>Do not proceed with parking charges but retain waiting restrictions to maintain traffic flows.</b>
24058	Longdene Road, Haslemere	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24059	Petworth Road, Haslemere	Do not proceed with blue badge bay
24054	Popes Mead, Haslemere	<b>Proceed as advertised with minor amendments</b>
24053	Sandrook, Haslemere	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24050, 24052, 24116, 24117	Derby Road, Haslemere	<b>Defer until June 2012 for further consideration following the withdrawal of the Pay and Display proposals and, if necessary,</b>

		<b>for further consultation with residents, St Bartholomew's Church and School to determine the most suitable parking arrangements for all, which if agreed will then be subject to a further statutory consultation</b>
24057	St Christophers Green, Haslemere	<b>Proceed as advertised but excluding on street parking charges</b>
24057	St Christophers Road, Haslemere	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24053, 24054, 24050, 24117	Tanners Lane, Haslemere	<b>North of railway: proceed as advertised; south of railway: deferred until June 2012 for amendments (residents parking provision)</b>
24052, 24116, 24117, 24128	Weydown Road, Haslemere	<b>Deferred until June 2012 for amendments (see Derby Road)</b>
24057	Wey Hill, Haslemere	Do not proceed
	Carers permit for resident parking schemes	Proceed as advertised (carers permits to be issued in residents parking schemes for a charge of £10)

## **ANNEX 5**

### **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. Mrs C Sandars (Farnham)**

Mrs Sandars referred to Item 11 on the agenda and asked for evidence for the statement at 2.5 that businesses had adjusted to the experimental loading restrictions.

It was explained that an officer would clarify the situation at the relevant point in the agenda.

**2. Mr D Beaman (Farnham)**

Mr Beaman sought reassurance that air quality would not be made worse by the impact of vehicles waiting at the traffic lights in central Farnham as a consequence of the Crest Nicolson development.

The Area Highways Manager replied that funding had been secured for further traffic modelling to assess this.

**3. Mr J Barton (Haslemere)**

Mr Barton asked whether the Committee would publish an account of its understanding of its place in the context of localism and relevant implications for the democratic structure which is transparent to the constituency it seeks to serve and is such that localism will be served.

The Chairman undertook to provide a written response.

**4. Mr J Birkett (Haslemere)**

A statement was made acknowledging the efforts of the Vice-Chairman to resolve parking problems in streets adjacent to the station, but expressing the view that the County Council had been misleading in that its underlying intention had been to raise revenue. He felt that insufficient evidence on the level of subsidy had been made available, that the legal notifications had been inaccurate, that displacement had been inadequately assessed and that the report did not accurately reflect the number of objections.

**5. A resident of Haslemere**

The Committee was asked if it understood the anger of residents and if felt that it did not intend to be in this situation.

The Chairman replied that she had seen all the representations and that she recognised the anger expressed.

**6. Mr C Biderson (Haslemere)**

The Chairman was asked about her understanding of moral leadership and the morality behind the parking proposals.

The Chairman replied that she had shown leadership in convening a meeting for stakeholders and that some changes would be proposed as a result. She hoped that residents would feel that a compromise had been reached.

**7. A parent of St Bartholomew's School, Haslemere**

The Committee was asked to note the concern of parents that they would be expected to pay to drop their children off at school and that volunteers at the school would be disadvantaged.

The Chairman expressed her understanding of the concerns.

**8. A resident of Haslemere**

The Committee was asked how it saw its role as servant of the community and to advise as to its professional expectations of the officers appointed to offer advice on traffic and parking.

The Chairman felt that the Committee was professionally guided by the Parking Team and the Area Highways Manager. In addition members had themselves built up experience of these matters over a number of years.

**9. Ms J Evans (Haslemere)**

Ms Evans asked about the value of public questions, referring to the tabled response to her formal question.

The Parking Manager, referring to the Equalities Impact Assessment carried out on the parking proposals, maintained his view that the impact was not considered to be significant.

**10. A resident of Haslemere**

The questioner noted the probable increase in commuter pressure on Haslemere as a consequence of developments outside of Surrey and asked whether a proposal to purchase land as part of a "park and walk" scheme had been considered.

The Chairman undertook to provide a written response in conjunction with Waverley Borough Council.

**11. A resident of Haslemere**

The Committee was asked how it would assist commuters to park in Haslemere and what progress had been made in building a multi-storey car-park to address the problem.

The Chairman referred the questioner to Cllr S Mulliner of Haslemere Town Council, who is pursuing the matter.