



**Minutes of meeting**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**Date:** FRIDAY 22 JUNE 2012

**Time:** 2.00PM

**Place:** HALE INSTITUTE, UPPER HALE, FARNHAM

**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 Brian Adams (Frensham, Dockenfield and Tilford)  
Mr Maurice Byham (Bramley, Busbridge and Hascombe)  
Mrs Carole Cockburn (Farnham Bourne)  
Mr Brian Ellis (Cranleigh West)  
Mr Robert Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)  
Mr Bryn Morgan (Elstead and Thursley)  
Ms Julia Potts (Farnham Upper Hale)  
Mr Brett Vorley (Cranleigh East)

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

The Chairman announced that she would take Item 16 after Item 2.

**32/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)**

Apologies were received from Mr S Thornton and Mr K Webster. Mr M Byham was present as a substitute.

**33/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 16 March 2012 (Item 2)**

- (i) Subject to a correction to the list of members present that Dr A Povey represents Waverley Eastern Village, the minutes were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.
- (ii) The statement of the Leader of the County Council relating to on-street parking restrictions in Haslemere was noted.

**34/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 16)**

Mr S Renshaw referred to the statement of the Leader of the Council regarding parking restrictions in Haslemere (Minute 33/12 (ii)) and felt that its comprehensive nature had resulted in a delay in the introduction of several urgent matters of road safety, such as the installation of double yellow lines on the radii of a number of corners at junctions, measures to reduce congestion and proposals to improve road safety in the vicinity of the fire station. The introduction of a number of small resident-only parking schemes, for which there is very clear majority support amongst residents and where it is widely accepted that these would not result in any significant vehicular displacement, would also be delayed. It was proposed by Mr Renshaw, seconded by the Chairman and agreed by the Committee that urgent action to address these matters should be undertaken, as set out in resolution (ii). Officers reassured the Committee that the Parking Team will work with all stakeholders in Haslemere.

**Resolved to**

- (i) Note the proposed contents of the Forward Programme.
- (ii) Request that proposals covering the circumstances in Haslemere set out above be progressed at the earliest opportunity with some urgency and brought back to the next Committee meeting in September for consideration

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee wished to plan its business effectively and respond to certain urgent parking matters in Haslemere.

**35/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)**

Ms J Potts declared a personal interest as follows:

- Item 12: residence in Park View, Farnham and membership of the Residents' Association.

- Item 15: Executive Portfolio Holder for young people at Waverley Borough Council.

Subsequent discussion at Item 9 (41/12 below) mentioned a highways matter adjacent to St Catherine's School, Bramley, at which point Mr P Martin declared a personal interest on the grounds that he is Chairman of Governors at the school.

#### 36/12 **PETITIONS (Item 4)**

Five petitions were received: details are set out at **Annex 1**.

Responses will be discussed by the Committee at its next meeting.

#### 37/12 **FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)**

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

#### 38/12 **MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)**

There were no members' questions.

#### 39/12 **LOCAL COMMITTEE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROTOCOL AND TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP (Item 7)**

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the current review of Local Committees and the fact that, if agreed, the protocol would as a consequence remain in this form only until the conclusion of the review. Members agreed that there should be greater flexibility in the handling of petitions and requested amendments to the protocol as follows:

- (i) Paragraph 1.4: there should be no formal limit to the number of petitions presented at any one meeting, but that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should use their discretion to ensure reasonable flexibility.
- (ii) Paragraph 1.6: the existing wording should be replaced by "A decision made as a result of a petition should not be revisited within six months".

There were different views as to the level of confidentiality appropriate to Task Group meetings and it was noted that helpful engagement with, for example, Town/Parish Councils might be constrained without some flexibility.

**Resolved** to agree:

- (i) The provisions of the Local Protocol on Public Engagement set out in Annex 1 of the report, as amended at paragraphs 1.4 and 1.6 (above).
- (ii) That the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Task Group should continue for the Council year 2012-2013 reporting to this Committee.
- (iii) That the following Local Task Groups should continue for the Council year 2012-2013 reporting to the LTP Task Group on transportation funding priorities and directly to the Committee on other matters:

Farnham  
Godalming, Milford and Witley  
Haslemere and Western Villages  
Cranleigh and Eastern Villages

- (iv) That the Terms of Reference set out at Annex 2 of the report for the Task Groups established in (ii) and (iii) should be confirmed.
- (v) That the Youth Services Task Group should continue for the year 2012-2013, reporting to the Committee and subject to the Terms of Reference set out in Annex 4 of the report.
- (vi) That the Committee should continue to nominate members to the joint Surrey County Council/Hampshire County Council Task Group.
- (vii) To agree the membership and chairmanship of the task groups for the Council year 2012-2013 (as set out at **Annex 3** of these Minutes) and to agree that representation from relevant partner agencies should be sought.

**Reason for decision:**

The Local Protocol enables the Local Committee to engage residents in its decision making process. The Task Groups support the Local Committee in carrying out specific aspects of its work.

***EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS***

**40/12 ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN WAVERLEY: DEFERRED ITEMS FROM 16 MARCH COMMITTEE MEETING (Item 8)**

Officers provided an update on the implementation of schemes, including those in Farnham agreed at the meeting on 16 March 2012. It was requested that the scheme in Summers Road, Farncombe be advertised during the summer and officers undertook to investigate whether this could be accelerated.

**Resolved:**

- (i) That the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings presented at this committee meeting at Annex A of the report are approved.
- (ii) To allocate funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of the report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) That the intention of the County Council to make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Waverley as shown on the drawings in Annex A of the report are advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.

- (iv) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager will consider and try to resolve any objections, and that a decision on any remaining unresolved objections will be made by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and the relevant County Councillor.

**Reason for decision:**

The proposals will make a positive contribution towards road safety, access for emergency and refuse vehicles, easing traffic congestion and better regulated parking.

**41/12 HIGHWAYS REVENUE ALLOCATION FOR 2012-13 (Item 9)**

Updated details of the Integrated Transport Scheme programme for 2012-13 were tabled and are available at:

<http://online.surreycc.gov.uk/legcom/CouncilP.nsf/f5fb086c73d64f3000256954004aed25/6db40c68c39fd82580257a1c003716db?OpenDocument>

The Committee considered the recommended approach to allocating the funds available. In relation to small local road and footway surfacing schemes members felt that there was a tension between those proposed as priorities by engineers and those identified by residents as most needing attention and there was a discussion about the best way of ensuring a proper balance. Likewise some Parish Councils are sceptical as to the County Council's commitment to engage fully in recognising local priorities. Recognising, however, the need to ensure the prompt deployment of resources, it was proposed from the chair and agreed (by twelve votes to none, with two abstentions) that productive negotiation between officers and members would be encapsulated in a revised wording of paragraph 4.4 of the report, such that the final sentence would read: "It was suggested that members discuss their worst problem roads with the Maintenance Engineer."

There was a particular concern about the benefits of the "tar and chip" process and officers offered reassurance that this is an effective preventative measure in extending the life of certain stretches of highway. The process for dealing with failed reinstatement of the highway following work carried out by utility companies or other third parties was explained: it is hoped to allocate more resources to addressing problems of this nature. Officers confirmed that the funding available from the Planning Infrastructure Charge (PIC) for highways was correctly described in the report and explained that there is limited flexibility in assigning this to local schemes.

There was felt to be a need, principally in rural areas, for additional jetting capacity. Mr D Harmer proposed, seconded by Dr A Povey, that £10,000 be removed from the sum proposed for small local road/footway surfacing schemes and allocated to the provision of an additional two weeks' jetting. The Committee agreed this amendment (reflected in the formal resolution below) by seven votes to five with no abstentions.

**Resolved** that the £317,000 Maintenance Revenue allocation for 2012/13 is assigned as follows:

- |                                       |         |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| (i) Implement Waverley Parking Review | £15,000 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|

(ii) Ad-hoc minor work ordered by area team	£20,000
(iii) Support 2012/13 ITS programme	£110,000
(iv) Two weeks' additional jetting	£10,000
(v) Small local road/footway surfacing schemes, to be identified following a discussion between members and the Maintenance Engineer	<u>£162,000</u>
Total	£317,000

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee had requested a report on plans for use of its £317,000 Local Maintenance Revenue allocation in 2012-13.

The Chairman announced that she would take Items 11 and 12 before Item 10.

**42/12 RESPONSE TO PETITION: ROAD SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS IN ROWLEDGE (Item 11)**

Mrs D Podger, on behalf of the petitioners, was invited to address the meeting and circulated additional data reflecting the extent of residents' concerns about road safety and their suggested remedies. She felt that the proposed response did not adequately address the breadth of concerns or the contents of previous discussions. Mr D Munro, as the relevant divisional member, noted the financial constraints, but envisaged the implementation of some quick interventions. It was noted that a further report had been programmed for the next meeting of the Committee and officers were requested to develop a priority list of actions, together with possible sources of funding for each.

**Resolved** to agree the response set out in the report, as expanded in discussion.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

**43/12 RESPONSE TO PETITION: PARK VIEW, FARNHAM (Item 12)**

Mr J Hurst, on behalf of the petitioners, was invited to address the meeting. Recognising the financial constraints, he nevertheless expressed disappointment that a proactive response had not been developed to the considerable body of data provided by residents. Local members likewise felt that, with ongoing discussion between officers and residents, some low-cost measures could be developed, e.g. in relation to road markings and bus and Heavy Goods Vehicle use. It was noted that enforcement of the speed limit will continue and that the area would be added to the Local Speed Management Plan, supported by the professionally collected data submitted by the Residents Association. Officers were requested to work with residents to develop a priority list of actions, together with possible sources of funding.

**Resolved** to agree the response set out in the report, as expanded in discussion.

**Reason for decision:**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions.

44/12 **SURREY'S DRIVE SMART ROAD SAFETY AND ANTI-SOCIAL DRIVING STRATEGY AND THE LOCAL SPEED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR WAVERLEY (Item 10)**

The Committee welcomed the report, noting in particular the encouraging trends illustrated. The need to work with all cyclists was highlighted, along with the need to be aware of all the relevant circumstances in the event of an accident involving a cyclist. It was suggested that greater consistency be developed in categorising "young people".

PC Marc Sturrock responded to specific concerns and is happy to be the first point of contact locally. It was requested that the following roads be added to the Local Speed Management Plan:

- A333
- Station Lane, Milford (make live)
- A3100 Meadrow, Godalming
- A325 Wrecclesham Hill
- B2127 The Street, Ewhurst
- Crondall Lane, Farnham
- Crooksbury Hill, Farnham
- Tilford Road (make live)

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the draft Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti-social Driving Strategy and request that its comments be noted.
- (ii) Note the latest version of the Local Speed Management Plan for Waverley and request that the additional locations set out above be included.

**Reason for decision:**

The Drive SMART Road Safety and Anti-Social Driving Strategy will form one part of the Surrey Transport Plan that began in April 2011. It defines the main challenges and priorities for tackling road casualties and anti-social driving in future years. The Committee had an opportunity to comment prior to its presentation to the Cabinet. The addition of locations to the Local Speed Management Plan will ensure that Surrey Police and County Council road safety colleagues are targeting Drive SMART resources at the sites that need them the most.

[Mr R Knowles left the meeting during this item; Mr P Martin and Mr B Ellis left before the following item.]

#### 45/12 **ANNUAL REPORT ON THE SAFER WAVERLEY PARTNERSHIP (Item 13)**

The Committee welcomed the encouraging statistics on crime and anti-social behaviour presented in the report, noting some significant reductions in specific areas. Reference was made to the Partnership's joint preventative activity and some successful campaigns by Surrey Police. Concerns about policing levels in rural areas were noted, but the confidence of residents in Surrey Police remains high. Uncertainties remain about the implications of the election of a Police and Crime Commissioner later in 2012, but the Partnership is determined to ensure that candidates are appropriately briefed on the situation in Waverley.

##### **Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the contents of the report and the activities of the Partnership in the year 2011-12.
- (ii) Request that its comments on the work of the Partnership and its priorities be noted.

##### **Reason for decision:**

The Local Committee wishes to receive periodic reports on the work of the Safer Waverley Partnership, its achievements and priorities and to consider its contribution to these.

#### 46/12 **YOUTH SMALL GRANTS (Item 14)**

##### **Resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the recommendations of its Youth Services Task Group set out in Annex A of the report on the award of funding.
- (ii) Agree that for applications received for the remaining budget:
  - Those in excess of £1000 are considered for approval at future meetings of the Committee.
  - Authority should be delegated to the Head of Commissioning to approve any applications which are below £1,000.

However, in both cases applications would be subject to consideration by the Task Group and representative young people and their recommendations would be made available to the relevant decision-maker.

##### **Reason for decision:**

Recommendations had been made based on the criterion of addressing local needs of young people aged 10-19.



47/12 **LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING (Item 15)**

The Committee was reassured that legal and financial advice had been secured as to the validity of the application at Annex 7 of the report and it was concluded that significant community benefit would be derived from this grant.

Members were keen to see more robust action to ensure that recipients give due publicity to the Local Committee's contributions.

The recommendations were agreed, subject to an additional check being incorporated at resolution (iii).

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the summary of the Local Committee's expenditure in 2011/12 detailed in section 2 of the report.
- (ii) Agree that each County Councillor has an allocation of £12,615 revenue and £3,889 capital to fund projects within the local area in 2012/13.
- (iii) Agree the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 revenue and capital funding as set out in section 3 of this report, subject to confirmation of the exact amount required as appropriate.
- (iv) Note the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in section 4.
- (v) Agree that the community safety budget of £3,160 delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Waverley Community Safety Partnership and that the Community Partnership Manager authorize its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision, as detailed within section 5.

**Reason for decision:**

To enable the Community Partnerships Team to process the applications in line with the wishes of the Committee.

**The meeting closed at 5.45 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. From Mr G Lathey on behalf of the Badshot Lea Community Association**

The request is for the condition of Footpath 112 to be upgraded to allow use by pushchairs, prams and pedestrians from the top end of the village. This would provide a safe route to the local pre-school, avoiding the dangerous footpath along St George's Road.

### **2. From Mrs P Dovey on behalf of the residents of the Compasses Mobile Home Park and of Dunsfold Road and adjoining properties, Alfold**

The petition is made to the Local Committee by both groups of residents to make members aware of their united concerns relating to:

- The impact that the increased and increasing use of Dunsfold Road by Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) users to obtain access to Dunsfold Park has had on residents.
- The similar impact which HGVs have on other users of the road, i.e. cyclists and pedestrians, particularly the mainly elderly residents from the Compasses and children.
- The damaging impact these vehicles have had on the road itself.

The petitioners request that the Committee considers providing protection to Dunsfold Road users by declaring Dunsfold Road as unsuitable for use by HGVs.

### **3. From Ms D Keeley on behalf of residents of Bunch Lane (South) Residents' Association, Haslemere**

The signatories wished to express their lack of understanding of the reasons why the Leader of the County Council has reversed the decisions made by the Committee on 16 March 2012 with regard to the management of parking in Haslemere. The proposals that were agreed in outline for Bunch Lane would not, in the view of the signatories, have had an impact on other parts of the town, but would instead meet the expressed needs of Bunch Lane residents by making the lane safer for both motorists and pedestrians. The proposals would also ensure enhanced short-term parking provision for those needing to use local facilities, including St Christopher's Church, whilst providing sufficient parking for commuters to ensure that no displacement would occur. The proposals were unanimously supported by members of the Residents' Association. The request is that the County Council proceeds with these proposals as a matter of urgency.

### **4. From Mr A Blinder on behalf of residents of St Christopher's Green, Haslemere**

The residents request the urgent implementation of the parking arrangements for this location agreed at the meeting on 16 March 2012. The residents believe that no one else is able to claim to speak on their behalf. Due to its proximity to the station the road is subject to all-day parking by non-residents, as a result of which residents are themselves displaced, sometimes incurring charges for parking elsewhere. The residents feel that an immediate solution for this location – which would require a modest number of spaces and not

restrict parking on the church side of the Green or on Sundays – could be compatible with a long-term holistic solution for the town.

**5. From Mr G Spratley on behalf of residents of Popes Mead and West Street, Haslemere**

The request is to reinstate the agreed residents' parking permits scheme as approved by the Committee on 16 March 2012. A number of houses in this area have no access to nearby off-street parking other than paying at a car park. The specific problem is caused by town centre shop workers, shoppers and employees of a local company. Residents have been pursuing a resolution for over three years and believed that a solution had been reached, but were dismayed to learn that the Committee's decision of 16 March had been overturned and that the case of the "Phase 1" streets was likely to be the subject of further consultation. The residents of Popes Mead/West Street feel that they need no further consultation and little or no displacement had been identified.

## ANNEX 2: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

### 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 Hickey'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 who 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 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.

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.

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.

**Supplementary Questions**

- Mr Spratley and Mr Tafft sought reassurance that any decision made by the Committee would not be hijacked by an unrepresentative pressure

group. It was confirmed in response that any decision would reflect the views obtained in the consultation process.

- Mr Van Klinken asked whether the proposed report at the September meeting would offer a further opportunity to review the case for local restrictions with a view to upholding the March decision. The Chairman confirmed that this would be the case.
- Mr Blinder whether any schemes agreed in September would be implemented this year. It was stated in response that every effort would be made to implement decisions by the end of the current financial year.

### **ANNEX 3: TASK GROUP MEMBERSHIP 2012-13**

#### **LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY) TASK GROUPS 2012-13**

As at 27 June 2012

##### **Local Transport Plan Task Group**

SCC: Mrs P Frost (Chairman), Mr S Renshaw, Mr S Cosser, Mr A Young  
WBC: Mr R Knowles, Mr B Ellis, Ms J Potts

##### **Farnham Local Task Group**

SCC: Mrs P Frost (Chairman), Mr D Munro, Ms D Le Gal  
WBC: Mrs J Potts, Mrs C Cockburn, Mr J Ward  
FTC: Mr R Steel, Mr J Ricketts

##### **Godalming, Milford and Witley Local Task Group**

SCC: Mr S Cosser (Chairman), Mr P Martin  
WBC: Mr D Leigh, Mr S Thornton,  
GTC: Mr David Hunter, Ms Jane Thomson  
Witley PC: tbc

##### **Haslemere and Western Villages Local Task Group**

SCC: Mr S Renshaw (Chairman), Mr P D Harmer  
WBC: Mr R Knowles, Mr B Morgan  
HaslemereTC: Mr W King  
Churt PC: tbc  
Thursley PC: tbc  
Witley PC (Brook): tbc  
Tilford PC: tbc  
Elstead PC: tbc  
Frensham PC: tbc  
Dockenfield PC: tbc  
Peper Harow PM: tbc

##### **Cranleigh and Eastern Villages Local Task Group**

SCC: Mr A Young (Chairman), Dr A Povey  
WBC: Mr B Ellis, Mr B Vorley  
Cranleigh PC: Mr R Cole  
Alfold PC: tbc  
Dunsfold PC: tbc  
Chiddingfold PC: tbc  
Ewhurst PC: tbc  
Wonersh PC: tbc  
Bramley PC: tbc  
Busbridge PC: tbc  
Hambleton PC: tbc  
Hascombe PC: tbc  
Wonersh PC: tbc

**Joint Hampshire/Surrey Working Group**

Mr D Munro, Mrs P Frost, Mr D Harmer

**Waverley Youth Services Task Group**

SCC: Mr D Munro, Mr S Cosser

WBC: Mrs C King, Mr E Nichols (subject to confirmation)

## ANNEX 4

### INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The meeting was preceded by an informal public question time. The matters raised are summarised below. This summary does not form part of the formal minutes of the meeting.

1. Mr David Jones (Frensham)

As a Governor of St Mary's School, Frensham Mr Jones reported that a School Travel Plan had been recently initiated.

- (i) The Plan aimed to increase walking to school, but many families use the Wire Cut turning at its junction with the A287 which is a dangerous blind corner. Could sight lines be improved and appropriate signage installed ?
- (ii) Could an update on the situation relating to the repair of the "wig wags" at the school be provided ?

The Area Highways Manager undertook to investigate signage at the Wire Cut junction and reported that the wig wags are scheduled for repair during the summer.

2. Mrs Betty Ames (Alfold)

The Committee will be considering a response to the petition from Alfold residents (Item 4) at its next meeting, at which items on Vehicle Operating License applications and the HGV Strategy are also scheduled. The County Council is also likely in due course to receive the updated consultation document on Waverley Borough Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) strategy and reference to the newly forming Dunsfold Park Special Interest Group to take account of the proposed Dunsfold Park Master Plan in that LDF. Would the Committee consider the petition to be submitted in the context of the above and:

- (i) Take full account of the representations to recognise that Dunsfold Park – already an unclassified road – should also be recognised as unsuitable for HGVs ?
- (ii) Establish clear formalised processes for communication between all parties with the Traffic Commissioners with named role-holders in each council ?

The Chairman asked the Area Highways Manager to investigate the requests.

3. Mr Jeremy Barton (Haslemere)

Mr Barton referred to Item 7 and the opportunity provided by Task Groups to engage with communities. In relation to the Terms of Reference Mr Barton asked whether there could be more transparency in the record of the groups' proceedings and whether, when recommendations are made by the groups to



Committee, details of any engagement that has taken place and any material differences of view could be made available to members.

The Chairman replied that a review of Local Committees is under way and that she will ensure that the comments are fed in to this.