



LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSES**

22 JUNE 2012

1. From Ms Pamela Pownall (South Farnham Residents Association)

Local residents have become increasingly concerned about traffic and pedestrian safety on the A31 in Farnham on the stretch from the Shepherd and Flock roundabout up to and including the Hickley's Corner junction. Councillors will know that this stretch of road is extremely busy, not just along the A31, but also from the north/south traffic movement across the A31 into Farnham. We as local residents have become aware over recent months of the increasing number of vehicles who "jump" the lights as they travel along the A31.

With the absence of any more radical long term solutions to the Hickley's Corner junction, would the Committee please consider four suggestions that we feel would increase safety in this area?

1. At night there is a serious "black patch" for traffic moving west along the A31 after leaving the Hog's Back and past the Shepherd and Flock roundabout, and also eastwards from Hickley's Corner. The bright lighting, clear road edging and cat's eyes of the roundabout and Hog's Back suddenly give way to darkness and no markings along the A31 towards Hickley's Corner. Even people who have lived in the area for years find it difficult to see where the road goes. The entrance to the BP garage is the first indicator of the road edge with its bright new cat's eyes, and then there are no further markings before the traffic lights. **Suggestion:** White lining along both edges of the A31 carriageways (Shepherd and Flock to Hampshire border).
2. The yellow markings on the Hickley's Corner junction (the "sin bin") have become very pale, either through tarmac repairs or through weathering, and so are largely ignored by motorists. This is particularly dangerous in view of the speed of cars along the A31 when north/south cars block their access. **Suggestion:** Re-painting of the yellow box.

3. Pedestrians, taking note of the pedestrian crossing lights. The danger arises because crossing north/south have to negotiate the various pedestrian refuges on the carriageway pedestrians crossing northwards do not always recognise that the traffic which filters left up Station Hill is on a different phase from the traffic going straight ahead (west) along the A31. Even when westward traffic is at a halt, vehicles can still turn left up the hill – and do so at speed. Warning markings (“look left/right”) on the road have become worn or obliterated by repair work. **Suggestion:** Re-paint all the “Look left/look right” markings at Hickley’s Corner.
4. “Jumping” the traffic lights has always happened occasionally at the Hickley’s Corner junction. However, the level of transgression has become hugely more frequent over recent months, to the extent where locals are now allowing for it ! However this does not help occasional users of the junction, who have to brake sharply to avoid collisions. **Suggestion:** Traffic cameras at the lights. (We imagine this addition would be self-funding in a very short span of time.)

Committee response

Parts 1, 2 and 3: A programme of refreshing (re-painting) existing road markings throughout Surrey is underway, with the A and B road network to be tackled this year. All markings on the on the A31 Farnham Bypass and Alton Road, including yellow box and ‘Look Left/Right’, are scheduled to be refreshed in September/October. However, the question has led officers to identify variations in the existing lining along the A31: edge lines are in place on sections of the Alton Road, but are absent on much of the Farnham Bypass. Edge lines will be added at the same time as all other lines are refreshed so that markings on the A31 are consistent between the A3 at Guildford and the Hampshire boundary.

Part 4: The Surrey Safety Camera Partnership installs and maintains speed and red light violation cameras throughout Surrey. The Partnership is made up of four public sector organisations who are working together to cut casualties on the County’s roads – Surrey County Council, Surrey Police, the Highways Agency and Her Majesty’s Court Service – and is dedicated to reducing the number of collisions through the enforcement of speed limits and traffic signals, supported by road safety campaigning and publicity. The Partnership monitors accidents reported to the Police and will consider installing new cameras at sites where recorded accidents suggest a camera could reduce the likelihood of accidents in the future. Thankfully this is not the case at Hickley’s Corner at present, and recorded accidents do not indicate a red light violation camera is required, although the Partnership will continue to monitor the situation. For information the costs of installing and maintaining speed and red light violation cameras is borne entirely by the Partnership. All penalties go directly to HM Revenue, so nothing accrues to the County Council.

2. From Mr Christopher Peck (Farncombe)

On 17 May 2012 Godalming Town Council resolved to follow casualty reduction measures as outlined in Surrey’s Speed Limit Policy. This document (November 2010) states that 20 mph is the preferred maximum speed limit for “residential roads off main routes for where the needs of local residents will generally have priority over ‘through’ traffic, especially the roads used by children to get to schools.”

Will the Local Committee (Waverley) investigate average speeds within the Godalming Town Council area and set out preferred options for implementing Surrey's speed limit policy on residential roads, through either 20 mph speed limits or 20 mph zones, where appropriate ?

Committee response

The Highway Service receives many requests for reduced speed limits, traffic calming, new crossings, junction improvements, etc. All these measures constitute Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS), for which the Local Committee is allocated an annual budget. The ITS budget for 2012/13 is already fully committed, see agenda Item 9. Later in the year ITS schemes for 2013/14 will be prioritised, initially at a local level, by the four local Task Groups (see Item 7) that report to the Local Committee, and this request will be considered by the Godalming, Milford & Witley Task Group along with others that have been submitted.

3. From Mr Ian Clifton (Tower Road, Pine Bank and Moorlands Close Residents Association, Hindhead)

The vegetation from Broom House, Tower Road, Hindhead has grown to such an extent that senior citizens and parents with pushchairs wishing to walk along the pavement are now forced to walk in the road.

This matter of vegetation growing across the pavement from Broom House was first raised with Surrey County Council nearly a year ago. I understand the Highways Department have been following the normal processes to get this matter resolved.

My question to the Local Committee is what action is going to be taken to return the pavement back to public use ?

Committee response

Highway officers have already served an initial notice on the owners of Broom House requiring them to clear the vegetation which is obstructing the footway. If they fail to do so, Surrey County Council will have the vegetation cut back and re-charge costs to the owners.

4. From Mr David Kirkham (Farncombe)

Following the withdrawal of the County Council cycling officer position how will the Council ensure that consideration is given to cyclists' needs in the Borough of Waverley ?

Committee response

As part of a recent reorganisation the post of County Cycling Officer was deleted, However, the longstanding incumbent of that post, Mr Alan Fordham, is still employed by the County Council within the Sustainability Programme Delivery Team, where he effectively fulfils the same role as he has in the past, namely offering expert advice on cycle matters, in particular those relating to the public highway.

5. Questions relating to on-street parking in Haslemere

(i) From Mr John Cox (Sandrock, Haslemere)

It is recorded that, at the Local Committee Meeting held on 16 March 2012 at Witley, the Committee made a decision with regards to the management of parking in Sandrock in Haslemere. This decision was that the matter be deferred until June 2012 for amendments.

A well attended meeting of Sandrock residents was held on 5 April 2012. Prior to this meeting many residents had not been keen to see permit parking introduced in Sandrock, as first proposed by Surrey County Council (SCC), but the purpose of the meeting was to reassess the likely adverse impact on upper Sandrock in the event that resident permits and other parking restrictions were to be introduced in surrounding roads, as seemed likely. (Sandrock is sited between the railway station and Haslemere Town Hall; vehicular access to the upper part of Sandrock, a cul-de-sac, is already restricted.)

In those circumstances it was acknowledged that Sandrock would be left exposed to parking of vehicles of rail users and to displacement from other roads. Agreement was reached at the meeting on 5 key points. A note of those is at Annex A for ease of reference, from which it can be seen that residents agreed inter alia that:

“ In the event that parking restrictions are introduced in surrounding roads, Sandrock should be a 'street specific' resident parking zone 'F', with no inter-availability and no parking allowed other than by our residents and their visitors. “

On or shortly after 12 April 2012 SCC was informed of those 5 points and the wishes of the residents. John Cox was ready to discuss with Mr Renshaw and relevant SCC officials the exact positioning of the necessary signs and yellow lines and to coordinate responses by residents once the details were mapped and any necessary formal consultation process was re-initiated by SCC. Sandrock residents are now aware of the subsequent announcement by the Leader of SCC that it has been decided that the proposals relating to parking restrictions in Haslemere will not proceed. They know that residents in neighbouring roads near the station are understandably pressing for the introduction of their much needed parking restrictions, as envisaged up to your March meeting. Sandrock residents are concerned that consideration of our particular requirements for resident only parking in Sandrock – relevant *only if* parking restrictions are introduced in nearby roads - will be significantly delayed or overlooked entirely. Consideration of Sandrock parking is therefore also needed at the earliest opportunity.

It should be noted that while Sandrock can expect to be adversely impacted by displacement of commuter and other vehicles if parking restrictions are introduced elsewhere, there is no significant risk of displacement of vehicles from upper Sandrock itself, due to the existing traffic limitation on vehicular access to residents only and their visitors by the Order of 1981 (as referenced at Annex A). Thus while consideration of Sandrock is essential when the management of parking in roads near the station is revisited by SCC, if as a result parking were to be restricted in Sandrock this should not create any knock-on effect. No additional roads would be impacted or need to be considered at this stage as a

consequence of including Sandrock.

May we please request that parking in Sandrock be considered, in conjunction with other roads near the station, at the earliest opportunity and that we be informed now of the planned timescale for this consideration ?

Annex A

Sandrock Residents: Meeting 19:30 Thursday 5 April 2012 held at 11 Sandrock.

The meeting was extremely well attended and after discussion agreement was reached by the residents on five key points.

1. Existing Regulation and Improved Signage

The Surrey County Council (Sandrock (D5523)) Haslemere (Prohibition of Driving) Order 1981 and the related 'no motor vehicles except for access' signage should remain in force.

To further improve pedestrian safety, residents would like to see the installation of another sign at the top end of Sandrock (close to the gap left primarily for pedestrians), which would prohibit motor cyclists from driving down the length of Sandrock. (This was raised at the meeting).

2. Sandrock Parking Zone

In the event that parking restrictions are introduced in surrounding roads, Sandrock should be a 'street specific' resident parking zone 'F', with no inter-availability and no parking allowed other than by our residents and their visitors.

3. Permit Holders Only Restrictions

Signs should be placed at the entrance to Sandrock its junction with Courts Mount Road, stating 'permit holder parking only beyond this point' or words to that effect, eliminating the need for marked out parking bays, and thereby increasing the available parking space. *Residents feel strongly that a marked out parking bay is not appropriate for this cul de sac.*

4. Permit Holders Parking Hours

There should be no evening and overnight parking permitted, other than for Sandrock residents and their visitors; space is in any case very limited in this cul de sac. Sandrock resident permit parking hours should be 24/7, (and not Monday-Sunday 08:00 – 20:00 hrs).

5. Yellow Lines

In the interest of improved safety, better access, and the free flow of traffic some double yellow lines would still be required, but these should be restricted to: 1) the narrow entrance of Sandrock above the junction with Courts Mount Road and 2) in/around the only turning place, opposite No. 11.

(Note: residents park only on the east side of the hill.)

John Cox was to liaise with Councillor Renshaw and relevant SCC official(s) as necessary about exact positioning of signs and yellow lines so that these can be mapped and agreed, and would endeavour to coordinate response by the residents once the formal consultation process is initiated by SCC on the amended proposals.

Committee response

The Committee thanks Mr Cox for his question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(ii) From Mr Graeme Spratley (Popes Mead/West Street, Haslemere)

David Hodge, the Leader of Surrey County Council, has announced, in conjunction with you Madam Chairman, that Richard Bolton will be responsible for setting up a working group to look at issues for Haslemere affecting the community and that there will be talks with all relevant stakeholders.

Can the Chairman please:

- Advise how 'all relevant stakeholders' will be defined and who in Haslemere will be involved in agreeing this definition ?
- Reassure the residents of the roads living close to the station that those invited to attend any meeting will not be decided by the same group of non-representative individuals from the Haslemere Society, Haslemere Action Group and others with whom Mr Hodge has already had a private meeting?
- Ask Mr Hodge whether he is willing to have a private meeting with the residents of the roads living close to the station and town centre, in order to hear the 'other side' of the argument, rather than to listen purely to those who have ample off-street parking and live some distance away from our day-to-day inconvenience?
- Reassure the residents of the roads living close to the station and town centre, that they will be able to arrange their own meeting in the near future, with their own choice of invitees, to which Mr Bolton, will also be willing to attend.

David Hodge, the Leader of Surrey County Council also has announced, in conjunction with you Madam Chairman, that the decisions relating to parking restrictions in Haslemere agreed at the Local Committee on 16 March 2012 will not proceed.

- The reason given was the strength of feeling among local people. Will the Chairman please confirm that that almost none of these 'local people' with whom the Leader met subsequent to the March 2012 decision, live in the roads where commuter and town centre parking prevents them from being able to park near their houses and hence this is a false rationale?
- Will the Chairman please also confirm that there is no sound reason whereby resident only parking in roads close to the station or town centre, cannot be introduced as soon as possible, if it does not give rise to significant displacement parking? In the 'Phase 1' roads, the need for residents' parking has been established after years of effort and consultation and further consultation will surely arrive at exactly the same conclusion.

Committee response

The Committee thanks Mr Spratley for his question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(iii) From Ms Jane Godden (Courts Hill Road [Lower End], Haslemere)

The preamble is as set out in Question (ii).

Can the Chairman please:

- Advise how 'all relevant stakeholders' will be defined and who in Haslemere will be involved in agreeing this definition?
- Reassure the residents of the roads living close to the station, including the lower end of Courts Hill Road, that those invited to attend any meeting will not be decided by the same group of non representative individuals from the Haslemere Society, Haslemere Action Group and others with who Mr Hodge has already had a private meeting ?
- Confirm that almost none of the "local people" represented by the above mentioned groups with whom Mr Hodge had a private meeting subsequent to the Local Committee on 16 March 2012 live in the roads affected by commuter and town centre parking and thus have a limited right to influence the solution to the problem?
- Ask Mr Hodge whether he is willing to have a private meeting with the residents of the roads living close to the station and town centre, in order to hear the 'other side' of the argument, rather than to listen purely to those who have ample off-street parking and live some distance away far away from our day-to-day inconvenience?
- Reassure the residents of the roads living close to the station and town centre, that they will be able to arrange their own meeting in the near future, with their own choice of invitees, to which Mr Bolton, will also be willing to attend.

Committee response

The Committee thanks Ms Godden for her question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(iv) From Mr George Tafft (Kings Road Residents' Association, Haslemere)

We wish to draw the attention of the councillors attending the above meeting to the totally undemocratic decision made recently to overrule the agreements made at the meeting of Local Committee, on the 16 March 2012. We must point out that the Haslemere Society and Haslemere Action Group (HAG) speak only of their own interests and even the Haslemere Town Council (HTC) failed to adequately to represent us.

As a residents' association we have been in discussion with Surrey County Council (SCC) in respect of the following since 2006:

1. Residents' parking only (with an element of pay and display)
2. No HGVs allowed other than delivery or collection from residential properties.
3. No left turn at station-end of Kings Road

To this end in May 2011 a house by house survey, was carried out which resulted in the residents supporting these proposals with the following percentage votes:

1. Residents' parking: in favour 92.8%.
2. No HGVs: in favour 91.3%
3. No left turn: in favour 69.6%

This information was passed to SCC and Waverley Borough Council. Subsequently it was indicated to us that the proposals had been accepted and that, when approved by the Local Committee, the necessary work would be carried out.

To this end I would like to ask the following question:

Does the Chairman agree with me that a 92.8% level of support from the residents of our road should carry more weight than the views of the Haslemere Society, HAG and HTC, who do not represent us, and that SCC should introduce some residents only parking in Kings Road at the earliest opportunity?

Committee response

The Committee thanks Mr Tafft for his question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(v) From Chris Cook (Longdene Road, Haslemere)

Now that the parking restriction proposals for Haslemere appear to have been seriously jeopardised by a vociferous group of people (many of whom seem either to be little affected by policy either way or who do not live in the town), what does the Council intend to do about the ongoing problem of residents being unable to park outside their own properties due to certain roads being commandeered by commuters and others from outside of the town looking to dodge charges in such places as the station car park, and, if action is to be taken by the Council, can you give us an idea of time frame ?

Committee response

The Committee thanks Chris Cook for this question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(vi) From Mr Jakob Van Klinken (Bunch Lane South Residents' Association, Haslemere)

Does the Committee recognise that the decision taken to nullify all the agreements concerning parking in Haslemere was too broad in its scope, and that the proposals that address safety and local amenity issues which do not have an impact (such as displacement of parking) on the wider community should be considered separately ?

Committee response

The Committee thanks Mr Van Klinken for his question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(vii) From Ms Jill Govier (Haslemere)

Will the Committee agree to reinstate the phase 1 resident parking proposals for Haslemere as early as possible in 2012, as agreed at the 16 March Committee meeting, and accept that the proposals do not undermine any longer term solutions to resolve parking difficulties, nor will they cause significant displacement of cars on the roads in Haslemere, but will simply correct the current displacement of residents cars by commuter parking ?

Committee response

The Committee thanks Ms Govier for her question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

(viii) From Mr Alan Blinder (St Christopher's Green, Haslemere)

On 16 March 2012 St Christopher's Green was one of four roads that had its request for residents only parking passed at the Local Committee meeting. Subsequent to this, the Leader of the County Council has set aside that decision without referral or communication with the affected residents. Jeremy Hunt MP has previously stated to residents that 'residents' parking should be an option if the majority in a particular street want it'. The residents of St Christopher's Green want residents' parking due to the on-going blight of commuters preventing residents from parking near their homes. Now that parking charges have been removed from the parking proposals and thus the church side of the green will remain free to park, will the Committee agree to implement 'residents' parking on St Christopher's Green in line with the original Phase 1 agreement of 16 March ?

Committee response

The Committee thanks Mr Blinder for his question. Due to the number of questions about parking a full answer is provided in the final section of this item.

Combined Committee response to Question 5

The Committee is fully aware of the wide range of concerns (including the delay for resident parking schemes) expressed by both those who have penned questions and other residents who have spoken directly to Members or Officers. Following the March meeting the decision was taken by the Leader of the Council not to proceed with the decisions taken but to enable a further period of engagement.

This Committee is committed to working with all affected residents to ensure any parking proposals have substantive support from the key stakeholders, are fit for purpose, any consequences are anticipated as far as practical and there is swift progress. Stakeholders include all who may be impacted upon by any changes – safety is always the first priority, followed by those residents who are directly impacted upon on a day to day basis. As part of today's agenda a request is to be considered by the Committee which will clarify the timeframe for bringing some parking schemes back to its meeting in September. This includes the roads referred to in the submitted questions.

ITEM 5

Mr David Hodge, as the Leader of the County Council, meets with a wide range of residents for a variety of reasons. The County Council is the Highway Authority and has overall responsibility for on-street parking policy. The Leader has instructed Officers to engage with all appropriate residents and interest groups to consider both short- and longer-term aspirations for the town. The County Council will lead this process and set timeframes. Residents can be assured that Officers will seek comments from all, not a selected minority. There will be the opportunity for all who wish to participate to make sure their views are heard and considered.