

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)****PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSES****21 SEPTEMBER 2012****1 From Mr Kevin Garvey (on behalf of Wonersh Parish Council)**

The residents of Blackheath and Wonersh Parish Council are grateful to Surrey Highways for recognising a year ago that flood mitigation works in Blackheath Lane is a high priority. However, our community is concerned about the lack of progress in installing the required drainage and soakaway infrastructure, despite Surrey Highways ring-fencing the necessary financial resources. Heavy rain in the spring and summer have once again regularly made this essential link between the villages of Blackheath and Wonersh hazardous or impassable for all pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and most car drivers. We would be grateful for an assurance that the necessary works will be undertaken before the onset of autumn/winter this year.

Committee Response

Options for addressing flooding at the elevated low point in Blackheath Lane just outside the village have been explored, and the preferred solution is now being progressed towards implementation this autumn. This will involve raising the road surface by approximately 500mm at the elevated low point to achieve a continuously longitudinal fall from Barnett Hill towards the village. The existing passing places will be preserved. The road is very narrow and it will be necessary to close the working area in Blackheath Lane to both traffic and pedestrians for a period of between one and two weeks, during which time diversion routes will be signed for both sets of users. The temporary closure is advertised in this week's local newspapers and work is expected to start during October.

2 From Cllr David Beaman (Farnham)

Will Surrey County Council make every effort to persuade Stagecoach to restore the "old" timetable on Route 18 that provided a regular 30 minute Monday to Saturday daytime service timed to connect at Farnham with all trains to and from

London for the residents of Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham ? I have proposals as to how this could be practically achieved which would also continue to provide services to Rowledge without costing any additional resources and which I would be happy to make available to Surrey County Council as a potential basis for discussion with Stagecoach.

Background

The changes to bus services operating in Waverley and Guildford arising from the Surrey Bus Review were implemented from Sunday 2 September and, although it has been possible for the bus network to remain relatively unchanged, there have been significant timetable changes to the bus service provided to the Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham areas of Farnham served by Stagecoach Route 18 that operates between Aldershot, Farnham, Whitehill and Haslemere. These timetable changes have resulted in these particular areas now being served by a timetable that is confusing and less attractive to passengers and which will not encourage more people to use public transport. Up until Saturday 1 September Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham were served by a Monday to Saturday daytime service that operated every 30 minutes apart and which were timed to connect at Farnham with train arrivals and departures to and from London. With the new timetable that was introduced from Monday 3 September -- whilst both Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham continue to be served by 2 buses per hour -- the regular 30 minute service and the connections with all trains to and from London have been lost. Weydon Estate is now served by buses which depart 20 and 40 minutes apart whilst Wrecclesham is now served by buses to Farnham 8 and 52 minutes apart. The situation in Wrecclesham is now even more confusing to passengers since, if a passenger misses the first bus, they then have to cross the road since the second bus that departs 8 minutes later to Farnham operates via Rowledge in the opposite direction. This situation has arisen because Stagecoach have decided to co-ordinate the times of routes 18 and 19 to provide a regular 20 minute, rather than 30 minute, service between Aldershot and Farnham via Weybourne, but this "improvement" is of little overall benefit given that there is a second route between Aldershot and Farnham via Sandy Hill (Routes 4 and 5) that continues to operate every 15 minutes Monday to Saturday daytime. The situation in Wrecclesham has not been further helped by operating certain Route 18 journeys (now numbered 17) via Rowledge to replace journeys on Route 16 that have been withdrawn. It is appreciated that these Monday to Saturday daytime services are operated by Stagecoach commercially over which Surrey County Council has no direct control.

Committee response

As part of the bus review process officers have worked with local bus operators to encourage commercial opportunities and ultimately to offer an as similar level of service to communities as the previous timetable, within the smaller support budget available.

In Waverley Stagecoach decided to reduce their commercial route 18 Aldershot-Farnham-Bordon-Haslemere, to hourly Aldershot-Bordon (and extend the Haslemere with the support of Hampshire County Council). This service was not subsidised by the County Council and the change was not part of the County Council's Bus Review. This change has led to the creation of new route 17, which provides some replacement over the Surrey section of route.

The timetables for routes 17/18/19 were designed by Stagecoach. In order to offer a 20-minute frequency between Farnham and Aldershot, Stagecoach have used a combination of the three different hourly services. Commercially, they wished to maintain two buses per hour for Weydon Estate, so if two of the three hourly services are routed that way, it is inevitable that there will be a 20/40 minute interval split through Weydon Estate. Whilst not as ideal as the old 30-

minute even split offered by route 18, this is a better outcome than their original proposal of only one bus per hour.

Surrey County Council encouraged the provision by Stagecoach of route 17 as it also provides the main link for Shortheath and Rowledge, including the re-instatement of a through service for those communities to Aldershot. Service 16, which has been reduced to run less frequently on Mondays to Fridays only, maintains a service for roads in south Farnham, which are not now covered by route 17. The 16 also maintains a shoppers link from Dockenfield / Rowledge / Shortheath to Sainsbury's in Water Lane.

The close gap between the two hourly services through Wrecclesham village is unfortunate, but unavoidable if the services are going to be equally spaced between Farnham and Aldershot, which is Stagecoach's commercial wish for the route through Weybourne.

This interface between Stagecoach's commercial services and those supported by Surrey County Council is a good example of partnership working to secure better value whilst enabling as many people as possible to continue to make essential journeys. The County Council's Passenger Transport Group will monitor the revised services with Stagecoach and can agree to discuss any suggested changes that are felt to be beneficial, acceptable to both parties and sustainable in the longer term, without imposing an additional financial support requirement on the public purse.

3(a) From Mr Jeremy Leake (Haslemere)

Despite assurances by both Surrey County Council councillors and officers that Shepherds Hill and Lower Street would be included in a parking solution for Haslemere, why were both roads excluded from parking proposals put forward by the Council at the exhibition on 9 August which would materially and adversely affect parking for residents in those roads ?

3(b) From Mrs Victoria Leake (Haslemere)

Surrey County Council admitted both in public and in private meetings that they had only focused on the roads in Haslemere that had off-street parking and had forgotten to include roads in the town centre that had limited parking or indeed no parking. Does the Committee think that that is a sensible way to implement a parking scheme in Haslemere or indeed any town centre ?

Background material relating to Questions 3(a) and 3(b)

The assurances received from Surrey County Council are summarised below for the Committee's information:

1) Mr Steve Renshaw (County Councillor) - Public meeting held the 21st January 2012 in Haslemere Town Hall on page 7 of 38 of the minutes.

Question: "Why are there no proposals for residents of the Town Centre who do not have access to road frontage such as Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill to have permits to park in other roads?"

Mr Renshaw's response: "**I admit this was an oversight. We hadn't picked it up and I'm working with officers to provide a solution for those residents because it is unacceptable not to give them that option.**"

2) Steve Renshaw's comments on Lower Street/Shepherds Hill Residents' Only Parking Scheme - article from the **Haslemere Herald** (19 February 2012):

"Residents in Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill, who only have limited parking, have said they were left out of the original consultation, but want to be included if residents' permits are adopted by the county. They have since met with Mr Renshaw, who said he accepted that Surrey County Council had "overlooked them", **but would seek to rectify the matter.**"

3) Email from Parking Team Manager (**in bold**)

Dear Victoria

Thank you for your recent emails in response to the County Council's consultation about on-street parking arrangements in Haslemere. We have received a number of comments from residents in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill Road and I understand Cllr Renshaw attended a meeting with you recently to discuss your problems.

You have highlighted that residents in Lower Street have very limited parking facilities and many park in neighbouring roads. **Following the consultation we will look at what changes may be needed to allow Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill Road residents be accommodated in residents parking schemes in surrounding roads.**

4) Email from Local Highway Services Group Manager citing that Lower Street and Shepherds Hill are **critical stakeholders (in bold)**

Dear Victoria

An initial meeting is provisionally planned for later this week. This is an SCC Officer led meeting and is not viewed as mechanism for engaging with all stakeholders, it is scoping only.

Please be assured that the County Council is fully aware that the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill (amongst others) are critical stakeholders and you will be fully engaged / consulted before anything is agreed.

3(c) From Ms Margaret Dowdles (Haslemere)

Please explain in very clear and unambiguous terms on what legitimate basis can Surrey County Council (and indeed Waverley Borough Council so far as their involvement is concerned) now (given the numerous different assurances that have been given and representations made, and upon which residents of Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill took comfort and were relying on, during and following the first flawed consultation process) or indeed in any event, irrespective, treat Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill residents differently from and blatantly prejudicially to the interests of other residents in Haslemere, particularly when we all pay Council tax and road tax. We are talking about public roads and no resident currently has a greater entitlement to park on any public road than any other and we are all experiencing the same problem, but for different reasons, and any preference given to some residents (which is exactly what we have been arguing about) will clearly be at the expense and to the detriment of ourselves, resulting in some residents having "the best of both worlds," being able to exclude others from their roads yet continue to park elsewhere and us being deprived of any prima facie right to park anywhere in priority to others. How can that be anything other than unfairly discriminatory and a breach of natural justice and why is it even being contemplated (as appears to be the case) in the first

place if we are continually being told that everyone is keen to look for a "holistic approach" and we are all, I believe, agreed that the problems rest primarily with commuters and not between residents (except of course by virtue of commuter displacement) and therefore that residents' needs as a whole should be put above commuters ?

3(d) Ms Solveig Lister (Haslemere)

Please can you let me know what parking provisions are being made for the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill. ? There is enough written evidence floating around that everyone in the decision making process is aware of the omission of the above to date so I will not yet again attach all the documentation.

Please can you just include all affected residents and find a solution, otherwise the problem will not go away and made worse.

Committee response

Lower Street (B2131) and Shepherds Hill (A286) are busy through routes having double yellow lines in most places for many years. It is not possible to introduce parking places in either road without causing major traffic disruption. Some properties in these roads have off-street parking, but many do not and residents park their vehicles in surrounding roads. Residents are also able to purchase discounted permits for Waverley Borough car parks in the town.

At the public exhibition on 9 August there were plans showing the layout in roads in which permit schemes and bays were proposed. As nothing was proposed to be installed in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill these roads were not part of the exhibition, but residents in the roads were invited to respond to the consultation. The response rate was quite low (20% Lower Street, 38% Shepherds Hill) and although respondents were marginally in favour of residents' parking, it was not an overwhelming expression of support.

There will still be unrestricted parking in several roads close to the centre of Haslemere which can be used by Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents. In addition the proposed operational hours for the residents parking schemes are 8.30am-5.30pm Monday to Friday (or Saturday). Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents will be able to park in these roads outside these times. Although residents in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill are not being offered residents permits as part of the current proposals, as mentioned in the report in item 7, parking provision for residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill will be considered as part of 'Phase 2' in 2013.

Although there is unlikely to be any significant parking displacement caused by the introduction of residents parking in the roads listed in Item 7, the allocation of residents' parking in Tanners Lane and Hill Road, could lead to parking displacement so it is considered that this should also be left to 'Phase 2' when the options for additional off-street parking provision in the town should be clearer.

4. Geoff Tafft (Haslemere)

The residents of Kings Road are disappointed that the recent Surrey County Council circulation of the parking proposals did not get a better response, due to

many residents being away on holiday. We would therefore like consideration to be given to the fact that in a previous survey, which was forwarded to the County Council, 92% of the residents voted for residents' parking only. Will the Committee therefore take this into consideration and vote for the proposals to go forward for formal advertisement and statutory consultation, as outlined in 8.1 of the report at Item 7 ?

Committee response

This is mentioned in the report and these comments will be taken into account by the Committee.

5. Mr Kevin Thomas (Haslemere)

Further to the proposed introduction of a residents' parking zone in Courts Hill Road (CHR), could the Committee please confirm that, of the residents in CHR who currently regularly require on-street parking, how many have expressed support for the introduction of a residents' parking zone ? (As against residents who have no need to park on-street who may be "in favour", but on whom such an introduction would have no impact.)

Committee response

The residents' parking survey had a good response rate (42 from 74 or 57% refer to Item 7 Annex 3). 64% were in favour, and three residents claimed to have no off-street parking. Of these two were against residents' parking. It is proposed to leave some unrestricted spaces in Courts Hill Road and these can be used by residents who do not wish to purchase permits.

6. Mr Chris Cook (Haslemere)

The residents of Longdene Road were disappointed that overall there was a relatively low response to the more recent survey from Surrey County Council, in all likelihood due to a combination of survey fatigue and the summer holiday period. However, officers know that, with their help and support, considerable effort was invested on the part of Longdene Road representatives to collect very detailed views from all residents on parking issues and provide a comprehensive majority result in favour of a residents' parking scheme, which was previously submitted to the County Council. Will the Committee please recognise and include the original submissions in their discussion and agree to move to formal consultation on the matter ?

Background material relating to Question 9

Communication to Parking Team 15/08/92

Further to our original email of 9 February 2012 (see below), we are writing again on behalf of the majority of residents of Longdene Road, who are strongly in favour of parking controls to limit non-residents, so that we can park near to our homes.

We recognise that due to the narrow nature of the road, there is insufficient scope to accommodate parking for residents, commuters and visitors and believe residents should be given priority to park over commuters.

The available spaces on Longdene should ideally be sufficient to enable those residents

who wish to park on the road to do so. However, we are more constrained than the residents of either Courts Hill Road, or Kings Road due to the nature of the road and hence it is possible that a small number of residents may on occasion need to park on nearby roads, particularly on Courts Hill.

We understand that some residents of other roads are requesting that permits for residents should be restricted to a specific road. We wish to state that we strongly support the proposals for zoning, as advertised. Any decision to disallow zoning will only mean that we, as residents may have to pay additionally to park on surrounding roads, when we have already paid for a permit, which seems to us to be most unfair and illogical.

[With regards to the new suggestion on the recent survey regarding individuals without permits being allowed 1 or 2 hours free parking, we did not collect responses on this from our road, although we have reminded individuals to complete the questionnaire. However, we would like to state that because of Stricklands Dental practice at the bottom of Longdene Road, it would seem likely that if this option were available, parking would still be difficult for the residents. Therefore we would suggest that visitors should require a visitors permit to park during restricted hours (which we understand we will be able to purchase as residents, to pass to friends or workmen as appropriate). Furthermore, we understand that commuters claim spaces are not available in the local car parks, which is why they need to park on our road. From our experience of the car parks there are spaces available throughout the day, particularly in the Weyhill car park which is located just past the bridge nearest the station.]

There was no support for the plans to including drive/ garage access in the parking bays and we appreciate the confirmation we have received from you that this will not be adopted. We thank you for allowing individuals to choose their preference in terms of single white lines or double yellow lines in front of their access.

We feel that the proposals outlined above would make best use of the off-road and on-road spaces in Longdene Road and maximise the chances of residents' vehicles being accommodated in our own road. Retaining the proposed zoning with Kings Road and Courts Hill Road would provide the extra flexibility of opportunities to use parking spaces in surrounding roads if necessary during occasional periods of high demand in Longdene Road. Adopting this approach would maximise support for parking controls amongst residents.

We would also like to include some comment on the spread of the bays, **although if this will mean that we need to go further into consultation and would delay things further, we would prefer to adopt the plans as described in your current proposals.** We had previously reviewed the original SCC plans for bays and proposed to make the following slightly revised suggestions to Surrey as to how the ROP spaces might best be located, working from the bottom of the hill (and lower numbers) upwards (this gives us one additional space compared to your plans and was agreed with the road):

Bay 1 (original extent from 15 to 25): Amend this to two bays of 3 spaces each to avoid blocking garages and off-street parking areas - as below.

Bay 1a to run from the downhill building line of 19 to the uphill building line of 21 (15m and 3 spaces) - no change to current

Bay 1b to run from 1m uphill of the steps from 25 for 16m (3 spaces), ending 4m downhill of the entrance splay to 25 to 29 [the double yellows currently in front of 25 are excessive]

Bay 2 (original extent from line of 27/29 boundary to line of 26/28 boundary, 6 spaces): Amend to avoid blocking 24 by moving the lower end up the hill by 2m and extending the upper end up the hill by 2m.

Bay 3 (original extent from middle of 35 plot to 42/43 boundary): Amend to divide into three bays to avoid bays in front of garages and off-street parking areas.

Bay 3a to run from middle of 35 plot (current end of DYL) for 10m to 35/37 boundary line

(2 spaces).

Bay 3b to run from 39/41 boundary line for 5m (1 space).

Bay 3c to run from just uphill of 41 garage for 5m to current start of DYL (1 space).

This will provide a total of **17** ROP spaces.

[Mon-Friday restrictions were preferred by the majority of residents noted below who expressed a preference.]

Communication to Parking Team 08/02/12

We are writing on behalf of the majority of residents of Longdene Road, who are strongly in favour of parking controls to limit non-residents [Mon-Friday 9am - 5pm*], so that we can park near to our homes.

We recognise that due to the narrow nature of the road, there is insufficient scope to accommodate parking for residents, commuters and visitors and believe residents should be given priority to park over commuters.

The available spaces on Longdene should ideally be sufficient to enable those residents who wish to park on the road to do so. However, we are more constrained than the residents of either Courts Hill Road, or Kings Road due to the nature of the road and hence it is possible that a small number of residents may on occasion need to park on nearby roads, particularly on Courts Hill.

We understand that some residents of other roads are requesting that permits for residents should be restricted to a specific road. We wish to state that we strongly support the proposals for zoning, as advertised. Any decision to disallow zoning will only mean that we, as residents may have to pay additionally to park on surrounding roads, when we have already paid for a permit, which seems to us to be most unfair and illogical.

We endorse Steve Renshaw's confirmation at the meeting in Haslemere Hall on Tuesday 24 January, that the proposal that parking bays be placed across some drive/ garage access will be modified to ensure that individual households maintain the right to decide the solution that suits them best.

We feel that the proposals outlined above would make best use of the off-road and on-road spaces in Longdene Road and maximise the chances of residents' vehicles being accommodated in our own road. Retaining the proposed zoning with Kings Road and Courts Hill Road would provide the extra flexibility of opportunities to use parking spaces in surrounding roads if necessary during occasional periods of high demand in Longdene Road. Adopting this approach would maximise support for parking controls amongst residents.

[*Mon-Friday restrictions were preferred by the majority of residents noted below who expressed a preference.]

Committee response

The Committee will consider the information you have provided in this question as part of their deliberations for Item 7.

7. Mr John Cox (Haslemere)

The residents of Sandrock are appreciative of the support that they have received from Surrey County Council in discussing their wish for residents only parking permits. However, because this is a small, quiet and narrow cul-de-sac, we have previously written to the Council's Parking Team and requested that the restrictions should apply at all times. We do not want rail travellers, shoppers or

displaced non-residents of Sandrock occupying the limited space available in the evenings and over weekends nor seeking for parking spaces. The County Council has received written notification of the unanimous decision of our well-attended residents' meeting in April confirming this position and a written question on this matter was submitted to your 22 June 2012 meeting.

Annex 3 to the officers' report to the Committee shows an 83.3% questionnaire response from Sandrock to the latest 19 July survey (a response rate higher in practice given some unoccupied properties at the time of the survey). It also shows that every Sandrock respondent, without exception, disagreed with the restriction times proposed by the County Council. Instead, residents again confirmed their wish for a 24 hrs 7 days a week restriction if they are to support and pay for permit parking.

We were therefore extremely disappointed that the report makes no mention of this and only proposes to advertise the restrictions from 08.30-17.30hrs, Monday-Friday. Can we ask the Committee not only to agree with the recommendation that the proposals for restricted parking go to formal advertisement, but that the hours of restriction are changed for Sandrock to reflect our wishes of their being permanent, or 24/7 ?

Committee response

The purpose of a residents' parking scheme is to make it easier for residents to park near their homes. The proposed operational hours for Sandrock are 8.30am to 5.30pm, Monday to Friday as this is generally when shoppers and commuters park in residential roads.

A 24/7 parking restriction would mean that residents would need to provide visitor permits for their visitors in the evenings and weekends. This could be quite inconvenient. In addition, considerably less enforcement takes place outside core hours and so enforcement of residents parking restrictions over-night or on Sunday would be extremely limited. It would therefore be unrealistic to propose these operational hours and would serve to raise residents' expectations unduly high and beyond what is likely to be delivered. Furthermore the existing 'except for access' restriction will still apply at all times to deter other vehicles from trying to make use of this road. The operational hours provide consistency with the other proposed residents parking schemes in the town.

8. Ms Áine Hall (Haslemere)

In the officer report to the Local Committee (waverley), **Review Of On-Street Parking In Haslemere: Phase 1 -- Response To Petitions** it states:

3.2 Beech Road. The consultation response rate was relatively low (36%), but 75% of respondents wanted a scheme. In addition residents have previously presented a signed letter of representation requesting resident parking. The operational hours proposed for this road would prevent all-day parking but still allow parking for visitors to the Health Centre in the morning and afternoon.

3.21 In the permit schemes, it is proposed to allocate a maximum of two residents' permits to any household without any off-street parking, a maximum of one permit to any household with one-off street parking space, and any household with two or more off-street parking spaces would not be eligible for

permits. The exception to this would be in Beech Road, where there would be no upper limit on permit numbers, as there is more space available on-street. The cost of permits would be £50 for the first permit issued to a household and £75 for any other permits issued.

I note that all Beech Road respondents to the questionnaire have off- street parking and yet the whole road is proposed to be residents' parking only. 83% of the respondents have two or more off-street parking spaces. Beech Road is also being considered in Phase One when there are significantly more pressing parking needs in other roads, for example, Lower Street, Shepherds Hill to name but a few. Councillor Robert Knowles who is a member of this Local Committee lives in Beech Road. Is Beech Road being given special treatment because Councillor Robert Knowles lives there ?

Committee response

No.

9. Ms Nikki Barton (Haslemere)

In June 2012 the Local Committee (Waverley) agreed that officers would prepare proposals for (quote): "...the introduction of several urgent matters of road safety [...] and 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." Officers also reassured the Committee that (quote) "... the Parking Team will work with all stakeholders in Haslemere".

The revised proposals that the Committee is discussing today go way beyond that scope and the County team has certainly not met with all stakeholders. The proposals are for extensive (not small) resident permit schemes in a very long list of roads.

In terms of meeting the criteria of very clear residents' support, other than for a handful of roads where there were petitions, the County Council seems to be relying heavily on just a small number of questionnaire responses. The survey and meeting were held over the school holidays when the town empties, and there was accordingly a very low overall response rate of 31.5%, in some roads considerably lower. Interpretation of the survey results has led to some extraordinary decisions. Approval rates for resident-only parking schemes of 75% for example seem convincing, until you understand that this was 75% of a mere 36% response, effectively only 27%. Yet on the strength of this 27% approval, the whole length of Beech Road has been given residents only parking, despite every resident, bar one that took part in the survey having two or more off-street parking spaces.

The report does not show whether any alternatives were considered with residents and it seems hardly credible to believe, as the report suggests, that there would not be significant displacement. The report makes no attempt to analyse this assertion. So my question is a simple one, in the light of the failure to follow its own commitment to the community of Haslemere, can this Committee please explain how it is appropriate for it to consider these parking proposals in their current form, let alone approve taking them to the next stage ?

Committee response

The response to the July/August resident parking consultation was disappointing from some roads, including Beech Road. The reasons for this are not clear. The time of year when the survey was carried out may have been a factor or possibly because residents had previously submitted a petition of 34 signatures from 31 properties in Beech Road supporting residents parking as currently proposed. (There are 32 properties in Beech Road).

The roads where resident parking is proposed in the report (Item 7) are expected to have a minimal impact on parking displacement. It is estimated by the County Council Parking Team and Haslemere Town Council that there will be approximately 35 non-resident vehicles displaced as a result of the residents' parking proposals. There is adequate space for these vehicles in nearby car parks and unrestricted roads.

10. Mr Jeremy Barton (Haslemere)

Regarding Haslemere parking, as a member of the public, one thing that I and others learnt in March this year was that Surrey County Council could not conduct a proper consultation or prepare a reliable report for the Committee within its chosen 28 day statutory consultation period (this was reinforced by the County Council's May letter giving notice that the Council in conjunction with the Chairman of the Local Committee (Waverley) had decided not to proceed with the March proposals, offering "an alternative way forward"); in this context, (a) what specific lessons did the Council, the Chairman of the Committee and the Committee themselves learn about improving consultation and due process and, (b) if the Committee decides (even after taking legal advice) to go to statutory consultation on the current, hurriedly thrown together, proposals for widespread parking controls in Haslemere (well beyond just those few roads mentioned in petitions), will the Committee give our esteemed County Council officers at least a chance to conclude their engagement and consultation properly, working with the Town Council, residents and all stakeholders, and therefore adopt an extended statutory consultation period of, say, at least ten weeks? To get it wrong twice - and the limited consultation effort so far since June clearly raises the flag - would not only be a material failure vis-à-vis Haslemere, but also deepen the crisis for the County Council and the Committee's reputation across Surrey.

Committee response

The County Council has listened to residents in Haslemere following two consultations about on-street parking in the town. After the first in January there was dissatisfaction amongst some residents with the proposals and the way the consultation was carried out. The Council subsequently decided to withdraw these and start again. In June the Committee also listened to residents who presented petitions requesting residents' parking. A further consultation has been carried out and the Committee now has more information to help it make a decision.

It is seldom possible to 'please all the people all the time' when implementing parking restrictions and the committee will need to make a decision in the best interests of the majority of residents in the roads where residents' parking is proposed based on the information available.

There is no reason to have a 10 week statutory consultation period given the amount of prior consultation that has taken place. A three week period is the minimum required by law, and observed by many local authorities, but the Council's practice is to allow an extended period of four weeks, which is an adequate time for people to register their comments.

11. Ms Maria Mateo (Haslemere)

*"As with the introduction of any new parking controls, there are **possible risks** attached to bringing in these new parking schemes. There is **likely to be some displacement** of vehicles that currently park in the roads, but will not be eligible for permits and will therefore need to **find somewhere else to park**. It is **not anticipated that this will prove too problematic**, but will need monitoring". (Report at Item 7, 3.26).*

Please explain the basis of this statement, including any analysis and reports prepared regarding the displacement of vehicles. In particular, please clarify:

1. What are risks envisaged by the County Council ?
2. What is the likely displacement anticipated by the Council ?
3. Where does the County Council propose that those displaced vehicles will park ?
4. On what basis does the Council anticipate that the displacement will not be problematic ?

For the avoidance of doubt, I understand the issue about "monitoring" which refers to the future (after the scheme is implemented). My question, however, refers to the analysis that the County Council has done to date to reach the conclusion stated in paragraph 3.26 and not its plans once the scheme is implemented.

Committee response

1. What are risks envisaged by the County Council ?
 - **Displacement causing congestion in other roads (paragraph 3.26)**
 - **Not enough space for permit holders at peak times (paragraph 3.27)**
2. What is the likely displacement anticipated by the Council ?
Approximately 35 vehicles.
3. Where does the County Council propose that those displaced vehicles will park ?
In local car parks or spread across other unrestricted roads.
4. On what basis does the Council anticipate that the displacement will not be problematic ?

There will be enough alternative parking in the area to accommodate the displaced vehicles.