

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**WAVERLEY LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 1.30 pm on 13 December 2013  
at Godalming Baptist Church.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mrs Pat Frost (Chairman)
- \* Mr David Harmer (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mrs Nikki Barton
- \* Mr Steve Cosser
- Ms Denise Le Gal
- \* Mr Peter Martin
- \* Mr David Munro
- \* Mr Alan Young
- \* Mrs Victoria Young

**Borough Council Members:**

- \* Cllr Brian Adams
- \* Cllr Maurice Byham
- \* Cllr Elizabeth Cable
- \* Cllr Carole Cockburn
- \* Cllr Brian Ellis
- \* Cllr Robert Knowles
- \* Cllr Bryn Morgan
- \* Cllr Julia Potts
- \* Cllr Simon Thornton

\* In attendance

---

**59/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies for absence were received from Ms Denise Le Gal.

**60/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

**61/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

Ms J Potts asked the Committee to note a non-pecuniary interest in Item 13: Surrey Cycling Strategy on the grounds that she is Portfolio Holder at Waverley Borough Council for Leisure, Culture and Young People.

## 62/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

Mr D Starr presented a petition on behalf of residents in Bramley and surrounding areas requesting the Local Committee to support the introduction of:

- A pedestrian crossing on Station Road
- A 20mph speed limit from The Street in Womersley, along Station Road to its junction with the A281 in Bramley

Residents believe that the proposed measures would benefit the whole community, including St Catherine's School, children using school buses which stop in Station Road, users of bus routes 53 and 63 and other road users. In his presentation Mr Starr referred to a number of recent road accidents and drew attention to residents' concerns about the increasingly heavy use of the road and inappropriate vehicle speeds in circumstances where there are felt to be a number of hazards, e.g. poor visibility and sight lines, low pavements and obstructions caused by the location of bus-stops. Residents would prefer two pedestrian crossings: one close to the Downlink and one near to St Catherine's School.

The Chairman thanked residents for their petition and confirmed that the Committee would consider a report on the matter at its next meeting.

## 63/13 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

The text of ten public questions received and the responses provided are attached at **Annex 1**. The Chairman announced that she would consider questions 8-10 which related to Item 8 (Annual review of on-street parking in Waverley) during discussion of that item.

Supplementary questions relating to questions 1-7 were received as follows.

1. Mrs Sandars asked whether consultation on further secondary school places in Farnham would extend to members of the public. The Chairman replied that this would take place, but to a limited extent. Projections of need are currently being carried out and nothing is excluded at this stage.
2. Mr Price felt the response provided in relation to the junction of Frith Hill Road with Deanery Road, Godalming was inadequate, as was a recent Freedom of Information (FOI) request on Highways' handling of the matter. The Area Highways Manager understood that further information would be provided to fulfil the FOI request. Mr S Cosser, as local County Councillor, requested that officers ensure that information on Highways' reasons for their position on this matter be provided to residents.
3. Mr P Hunter (on behalf of Thursley Parish Council) referred to the County Council's responsibility to ensure that emergency services are able to reach those in need promptly and pointed out that recent closures of the A3 would have caused substantial delays. The Chairman replied that the Council is taking the impact of closures on Thursley and other areas very seriously.

5. Mr D Wylde sought an assurance that the needs of disabled people would be given consideration in assessing the feasibility of relocating day centre provision in Farnham. The Chairman confirmed that she had made this assurance.

#### **64/13 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

There were no member questions.

#### **65/13 POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SURREY [Item 7]**

The Chairman introduced Mr Kevin Hurley, Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Surrey. Mr Hurley summarised the responsibilities of the PCC:

- Establish the priorities of the public
- Establish a budget for the force
- Hold the Chief Constable to account
- Broaden partnership working

The priorities on which Mr Hurley was elected are:

- Take a zero-tolerance approach to policing in Surrey
- Deliver more visible street policing
- Put victims at the centre of the criminal justice system
- Give you more opportunities to have your say about policing
- Protect local policing, standing up for officers and promoting the highest standards of service

The principal challenge facing the PCC is financial and savings are needed; he noted that salaries account for the largest element in the Police budget. In his first year in office the PCC has worked with Sussex Police to maximise joint back-office and operational support functions and with partners in Surrey to explore savings on emergency services through more collaboration. Progress has been made in developing a regional capacity to address criminal activity which is best addressed at that level. He is making representations to central government for increased funding for Surrey Police and has cancelled a major computer development project; the sale of Police Stations has been resumed following a review. Mr Hurley feels that he and his deputies are visible to the public and will be holding a Crime Summit in Waverley on 11 March 2014 at Farnham Maltings.

Mr Hurley reassured the Committee that he has a clear understanding of the distinction between his role and that of the Chief Constable in terms of operational matters and that he holds her to account on a monthly basis for progress against his priorities. He is equally alert to the need for care in measuring policing outcomes and, alone amongst PCCs nationally, he has not given the force performance targets. In response to a question about specific activity to focus on crime and antisocial behaviour in rural areas, Mr Hurley referred to the comprehensive nature of his “zero tolerance” commitment and explained that the Chief Constable constantly keeps the balance of her resources under review, including that between rural and urban policing. The Chairman added that the Police and Crime Panel, which scrutinizes the PCC at the county level, has established a task group to examine rural crime.

Mr Hurley responded to a question on amalgamation of forces, by reflecting his view that the public's interest is principally in visible, front-line policing and that support and managerial functions can be shared amongst forces; his own opinion is that there should be fewer forces nationally.

The PCC confirmed his commitment to neighbourhood policing and, although the number of Police and Community Support Officers would decrease overall, the local presence would not reduce.

Finally, Mr Hurley responded to a member of the public who had raised a question about the Police's capacity to respond to human trafficking (especially involving children): the scale of this problem in Surrey is unknown, but he is pursuing the matter at a regional level.

The Chairman thanked Mr Hurley for his contribution.

## **66/13 ANNUAL REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN WAVERLEY [Item 8]**

Consideration of proposals for Farnham Central was completed before Item 7.

The following locations were discussed (plan reference in brackets):

### **Farnham Central**

Guildford Road (24015, 24016) It was noted that consideration would need to be given to mitigating possible displacement.

Station Hill (24025) The location is noted for poor air quality and the proposals have been designed to alleviate congestion in the vicinity of the level crossing and to improve movement.

Weydon Lane (24032) It was recognised that there are opposing views in the community on these proposals which are best assessed through statutory consultation.

### **Farnham North**

Upper Hale Road area (24127) It was hoped that, subject to satisfactory enforcement, concerns about parking adjacent to the school and children's centre would be addressed through the proposals. Officers agreed to review the possibility of advertising additional restrictions on the corners at the junction of Spring Lane with Folly Lane North.

### **Farnham South**

Lancaster Avenue/Little Austins Road/Mavins Road area (24121, 24130) The complexity of this area and the pressures of commuter parking were noted, along with a recognition that there are concerns about consequential displacement into adjacent roads. It was felt that Lancaster Avenue needs to be included in an area solution and Mr D Munro, as local County Councillor, requested that the proposals return to the Local Committee for decision after statutory consultation.

Frensham Road j/w Gold Hill (Private) (24039) Local members expressed some concerns about the impact of the proposed measures on the viability of the local shops.

### **Godalming North**

Town End Street, Latimer Road, Carlos Street, Croft Road, Upper Queen Street and South Street (24075, 24076) Mr S Cosser, as local County Councillor, reported that residents and businesses had been given the opportunity to develop their own proposals and their representatives, invited to address the Committee, were satisfied with the extent to which these had been reflected in the published plans. Mr P Martin, however, expressed serious concerns that users other than residents, e.g. town centre workers, would be excluded and that displacement elsewhere would lead to the extension of restrictions into adjacent roads in subsequent reviews. He felt that a piecemeal approach was inappropriate and requested that his vote against the proposals be recorded.

Mint Street and Station Road (24077) It was suggested that careful implementation would be necessary in view of the proposed changes to established parking arrangements.

Catteshall Lane j/w Langham Close (no plan) Officers undertook to advertise restrictions at this location.

### **Godalming South, Milford and Witley**

Portsmouth Road, Milford (24067) While members wished to improve sight lines at this location it was noted that some opposition would be revealed in the consultation process. It was pointed out that current discussions about traffic mitigation measures for the Upper Tuesley development may have some impact on the parking proposals and officers were asked to make contact with Waverley Borough Council Planning colleagues to explore the implications and any funding which might be released by the development.

Brook Road, Wormley (24135) Officers undertook to include in the statutory consultation additional restrictions on the north side of the junction with Bridewell Close.

### **Waverley Western Villages**

Thursley Road, Elstead (24142) Officers agreed to add additional restrictions at the eastern side of the Green to the statutory consultation. There was some discussion about further restrictions on the western side, but it was felt that this may have an adverse impact on the adjacent businesses and that it was not appropriate to develop detailed proposals at this stage.

Tower Road, Hindhead (24137) At the junction with Moorlands Close, officers agreed to amend the proposals by replacing the existing single white line with a double yellow line and extending the restriction to cover one additional dwelling on the south side.

## **Waverley Eastern Villages**

The Street, Womersley (24134) It was noted that the proposed double yellow lines around the Pepperpot may not be supported in consultation.

Eastwood Road j/w Riverside Drive, Bramley (24115) It was noted that the proposed restrictions may not be supported in consultation.

Horsham Road, Bramley (24096) It was felt that the proposals to extend existing restrictions to cover access to the premises of Robertson & Sons and to introduce a single yellow line outside these premises were premature and officers agreed to withdraw this part of the proposal. It was noted that the correct location is "High Street".

## **Haslemere**

In relation to Haslemere generally Mrs N Barton felt that the recently introduced arrangements had settled down, albeit with some displacement. The town faces some possible changes in the light of the forthcoming public inquiry on the Wey Hill car park and continuing discussions about a Multi-Storey Car Park at the station.

Derby Road and Church Road (24050) Mr D Boyd thanked officers for their response to his public question in which they undertook to include the following in the statutory consultation:

- Derby Road: Extend the proposed double yellow lines on the south side by Church Road further westwards so that they are in line with the proposed double yellow lines on the north side.
- Church Road: Extend the existing double yellow lines by Derby Road further southwards to improve safety and sight lines on the junction.

Courts Hill Road (24058.24117) Officers amended the published proposal: the proposed double yellow line shown opposite number 15 would be moved in its entirety so that it is opposite the driveways to numbers 15 and 17. Mr D Pope, in a supplementary question to a response provided to Ms J Godden and speaking on behalf of supporters of the existing restrictions in Courts Hill Road (West), asked the Committee to bear in mind residents' concerns about the arrangements relating to Haughton House and to be aware that the matter is contentious locally. The Chairman agreed that, following statutory consultation, a decision on Courts Hill Road would be made by the full Committee.

Lion Lane (24049, 24051) Officers tabled an addition to the published text: "In addition, extend the existing double yellow lines north of the entrance to the Co-operative store and revoke part of the parking bay by the same length in order to improve sight lines and access, particularly for large delivery vehicles."

## **Cranleigh and Ewhurst**

Mr A Young thanked officers for their work and drew attention to the wider parking situation in Cranleigh and the comprehensive review undertaken; he hoped that arrangements could be put in place to introduce alternative

payment options for users of the Waverley Borough Council off-street car parks.

The Common i/w Horseshoe Lane, Cranleigh (24141) Officers agreed to include additional restrictions along the northern side of Horseshoe Lane subject to their having agreed feasibility with the local County Councillor.

Officers estimated that advertisement of the proposals contained in the review would take place in late February or March 2014 and pointed out that referral of schemes to the full Committee for decision would delay implementation. However, an additional resolution (contained in (vi) below) was proposed by Mr D Munro, seconded by Mr A Young and accepted by the Committee. The recommendations were put to the Committee ((i) amended to reflect adjustments made at the meeting) and agreed; Mr P Martin's opposition to the proposals for Town End Street, Latimer Road, Carlos Street, Croft Road, Upper Queen Street and South Street (Godalming) was recorded.

The Chairman requested an update on progress at the next meeting of the Committee on 21 March 2014.

**Resolved to agree that:**

- (i) The proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as described in the report, shown in detail on drawings in Annex A of the report and adjusted in certain locations at the meeting (see below), are agreed as a basis for statutory consultation..
- (ii) Necessary adjustments can be made to the proposals agreed at the meeting by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local member prior to statutory consultation. An additional member may be invited for comment.
- (iii) It allocates funding as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iv) 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 (and subsequently modified by (ii)) is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (v) If there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the County Council's scheme of delegation by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice-Chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor. An additional member may be invited for comment.
- (vi) The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager be authorised to agree with the Chairman of the committee a process for deciding which of those proposals considered under the arrangements described in (v) above should return to this committee for final decision, bearing in mind the committee's wish not to delay the overall programme.

### Adjustments agreed at the meeting

Section	Plan	Location	Amendment
3.2	24127	Spring Lane j/w Folly Lane North, Upper Hale	Officers to re-assess the implementation of restrictions at the junction and advertise if appropriate.
3.4		Catteshall Lane j/w Langham Close, Godalming	Include restrictions at this junction in statutory consultation.
3.5	24067	Portsmouth Road, Milford	Officers were requested to discuss with Waverley Borough Council Planning Officers the implications of the proposed traffic mitigation measures for the Upper Tuesley development and consider any related funding available.
3.5	24135	Brook Road j/w Bridewell Close, Wormley	Include restrictions on north side of this junction in statutory consultation.
3.6	24142	Thursley Road, Elstead	Include additional restrictions on eastern side of the Green in statutory consultation.
3.6	24137	Tower Road j/w Moorlands Close, Hindhead	Replace existing single white line with double yellow line and extend to cover one additional dwelling on the south side.
3.7	24096	High Street, Bramley	Withdraw the proposal to extend existing restrictions to cover access to the premises of Robertson & Sons and withdraw the proposal to introduce a single yellow line outside Robertson & Sons.
3.8	24050	Derby Road, Haslemere	Extend the proposed double yellow lines on the south side by Church Road further westwards so that they are in line with the proposed double yellow lines on the north side.
3.8	24050	Church Road, Haslemere	Extend the existing double yellow lines by Derby Road further southwards to improve safety and sight lines on the junction.

3.8	24058/24117	Courts Hill Road, Haslemere	The proposed double yellow line shown opposite number 15 be moved in its entirety so that it is opposite the driveways to numbers 15 and 17.
3.8	24049/24051	Lion Lane, Haslemere	Add to text: "In addition, extend the existing double yellow lines north of the entrance to the Co-operative store and revoke part of the parking bay by the same length in order to improve sight lines and access, particularly for large delivery vehicles."
3.9	24141	Horseshoe Lane, Cranleigh	Include additional restrictions along the northern side of Horseshoe Lane subject to officers having agreed feasibility with the local County Councillor.

### Reason

It was recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annex A of the report. They will make a positive impact towards:-

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles
- Easing traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking
- Better enforcement
- Better compliance

[The following members left the meeting during this item: Mr R Knowles, Mr B Ellis, Mrs V Young, Mrs N Barton, Mr B Morgan, Mr B Adams.]

### 67/13 RESPONSE TO PETITION: A287 FRENHAM [Item 10]

This item was taken before Item 9 on the published agenda.

Mr D Jones, presenter of the original petition, was invited by the Chairman to respond: he welcomed the officers' proposal and commended the scheme to the Committee.

### Resolved to:

- (i) Note the proposed response to the petition.
- (ii) Consider inclusion of the proposed scheme in the programme set out in

Item 1 on the agenda.

**Reason**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions presented.

**68/13 UPDATE ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME 2013-14 [Item 9]**

The proposal relating to the A281 in Bramley was welcomed. Mr M Byham will discuss the precise location of the northern terminal signage with officers.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note progress.
- (ii) Agree to extend the 30mph speed limit on the A281 Horsham Road at Bramley by approximately 130 metres to the north of the village.

**Reason**

Bramley Parish Council had requested extending the 30mph limit through the village both north and south along the A281 (see the report presented to the 20 September 2013 meeting of the Committee at Item 12). Highways officers and the Police have agreed it would be appropriate to extend the limit to the north only, but by a considerably lesser distance than originally requested by the Parish Council.

**69/13 HIGHWAYS BUDGETS FOR 2014-15 [Item 11]**

The Committee debated the proposed funding arrangements for the Lengthsman scheme. While recognising the success of the scheme in some parishes, a number of members were concerned about a lack of equity across the borough, in that residents in areas whose town/parish councils had opted not to apply to participate, were disadvantaged. These members would prefer an alternative arrangement in which the budget is made available on a divisional basis for members to allocate for additional work as appropriate. There was an opposing view, however, that rural parishes benefited from the existing form of the scheme and that the process need not be onerous. It was noted that the matter would return to the next meeting for a formal decision on allocations for 2014-15 and the Chairman undertook to consider the comments made.

Following the decision made in Item 10, Mr D Harmer proposed an amendment to recommendation (i) to enable the proposed 40mph limit on the A287 between Gong Hill Drive and Fifield Lane, Frensham to be added to the programme, funding to be allocated as follows: £8000 of the costs to be found from the Waverley Western Villages drainage budget and the residue from the unallocated sum. The amendment was seconded by the Chairman and agreed by the Committee.

Mr S Cosser requested that his opposition to resolution (ii) be recorded.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Agree that the improvement (ITS) schemes described in this report form the Waverley LTP programme for 2014/15, with Maintenance Capital and Revenue funding reserved to implement the programme, also that the implementation of a 40mph speed limit on the A287 between Gong Hill Drive and Fifield Lane, Frensham (as agreed at Item 10) be added to the programme, £8000 of the costs to be found from the Waverley Western Villages drainage budget and the residue from the unallocated sum.
- (ii) Agree allocations to the Lengthsman scheme and other revenue and capital headings as described at 1.3 of this report.
- (iii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager (AHM) to progress the schemes included in the programme in consultation with local elected members and associated task groups.
- (iv) Subject to approval of recommendations (i) and (ii) authorise the AHM to consider and determine any objections submitted following the statutory advertisement of the traffic orders and notices associated with the programme of schemes, in consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and relevant local councillors.
- (v) Delegate authority to the AHM in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and locally affected Members to amend budgets throughout the year if required to ensure the budget is allocated in a timely manner.
- (vi) Agree that Community Enhancement Fund is devolved to each County Councillor based on an equal allocation of £5,000 per division

### **Reason**

The committee was asked to agree 2014/15 allocations at this stage so that scheme design can start at the earliest opportunity, increasing confidence in delivery.

[Ms J Potts, Mr D Munro, Mr A Young and Mr M Byham left the meeting.]

### **70/13 WITLEY AREA: SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENTS [Item 12]**

On the recommendation of the relevant local councillors, the Committee agreed on options presented in the report as set out below.

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

- (i) **A283 Petworth Road**, Witley (between Chichester Hall and Witley Court): to retain the existing 40mph speed limit.
- (ii) **C31 Brook Road** Wormley (entire length between the A283 Petworth Road and the A286 Haslemere Road): to introduce a 40mph limit

between the A283 Petworth Road and Church Lane, the 'Preferred Limit' according to policy; to introduce a 30mph limit between the junction with Church Lane and the junction with the A286 Haslemere Road; to introduce a 30mph limit in the D151 Church Lane between the junction with Brook Road and the A286 Haslemere Road.

- (iii) **C31 Combe Lane**, Wormley (between the A283 Petworth Road and a point just south of Coopers Place): to introduce a 40mph limit, the 'Preferred Limit' according to policy; the same 40mph limit should be introduced in New Road, which is currently 60mph.
- (iv) **C32 Station Lane**, Milford (entire length): reduce the speed limit from 60mph to 40mph.
- (v) That where recommendations are to change the speed limit to give authority to advertise a notice in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes subject to no objections being maintained the Order be made.
- (vi) That authorisation is given to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Member resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.
- (vii) Where recommendations are that the speed limit should remain, that no further action is necessary.

#### **Reason**

Recommendations were made based upon existing policy, in consultation with Surrey Police.

#### **71/13 RESULT OF CONSULTATION ON SURREY CYCLING STRATEGY [Item 13]**

The intention to disaggregate the responses to borough level was welcomed. Members shared a concern that the proposal that local committees should oversee the development of local cycling plans may create public expectations that could not be met. There was interest in having oversight of events and an input into proposals for cycle routes, but also a recognition that resources for cycling would need to be balanced by the other highways priorities assessed by the Committee. It was noted that a programme of developed schemes may put the council in a stronger position in applications for government funding. It was agreed that local task groups should consider cycling proposals. Members were reminded that there is an active Cycle Forum in Waverley.

**Resolved** to note the consultation response and proposed Cycling Strategy.

## **Reason**

The Surrey Cycling Strategy has been developed following extensive consultation. The Surrey County Council Cabinet will consider the strategy on 17 December 2013.

### **72/13 IMPLEMENTATION OF SOUTH EAST PERMIT SCHEME FOR WORK ON THE HIGHWAY [Item 14]**

The Committee noted updated data from the scheme which covered the additional period since preparation of the report: this was proportional in scale to that published. It was reported that approximately 50% of Fixed Penalty Notices issued to contractors in the first month of operation were issued for not displaying the required information on site. It is possible that the number of notices issued at this stage may reflect initial unfamiliarity with the scheme's requirements.

Officers undertook to review the accuracy of the periodic list of highway works issued to County Councillors and to consider the wider context of applications received, e.g. the potential impact on businesses at particular times.

The Chairman thanked the officers involved with implementing the scheme.

**Resolved** to note the contents of the report.

## **Reason**

The report was for information only.

### **73/13 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 15]**

**Resolved** to agree the Forward Programme, as outlined in Annex 1 of the report.

## **Reason**

Members were asked to comment on the Forward Programme so that officers can publicise the meetings and prepare the necessary reports.

Meeting ended at: 5.15 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND  
RESPONSES**

**13 DECEMBER 2013**

**1. From Mrs Celia Sandars (Farnham)**

When and where does Surrey County Council intend to site, and/or facilitate provision of, a new secondary school in Farnham, in view of the existing shortfall in Farnham's secondary school places and the need to meet the ever-increasing demands for school places in Farnham, against the background of plans to considerably expand housing in and around the town ?

**Response**

- Surrey County Council is working closely with the Local Planning officers at Waverley Borough Council to ensure that timely action is taken to mitigate the impact of any new housing across the borough. The potential impact of planning applications is discussed and appropriate financial contributions are requested from developers towards education infrastructure to mitigate the expected impact.
- Surrey County Council is also working with all local schools and academies in the Farnham area to discuss future requirements for places and what action can be taken to meet any shortfall.
- To meet the need for secondary places in the area, Weydon Academy has already begun an expansion programme that will increase their provision by two forms of entry (one form of entry is 30 places) by September 2016.
- We expect to require further secondary places in the Farnham area by September 2018 and are beginning discussions with local secondary schools to determine how this need can be met.

**2. From Mr Martin Price (Frith Hill Area Residents Association: Godalming)**

Now that Frith Hill Road has been designated for resurfacing in 2013/2014, will Surrey County Council also take the opportunity to improve the safety for drivers

and pedestrians at the junction with Deanery Road when painting new priority lines, for which FHARA has been campaigning since 1977 ?

### **Response**

In recent years Frith Hill Area Residents Association representatives have corresponded with the highways area team on this subject on a number of occasions and will be aware that the Area Manager and Police consider that a change of priority at this junction would not be in the interest of road safety. Give-way arrangements will remain as they are following re-surfacing.

### **3. From Mrs Elaine Felton (on behalf of Thursley Parish Council)**

At the Hindhead Tunnel Public Inquiry detailed arrangements were agreed for diversions in the case of a required tunnel closure in order to provide a smooth flow of vehicles at various points on the way towards the tunnel in either direction – north- and southbound. There have been many instances when the tunnel has been closed for both planned and unplanned instances and traffic chaos has reigned supreme, much to the detriment of the residents of Thursley Parish. The Police tell us that the responsibility for implementing these arrangements lies with Surrey County Council (or possibly Hampshire for most northbound traffic). Surrey County Council informs us that that the responsibility lies with the Highways Agency and the Highways Agency keep very quiet on the matter. Which department of government will take responsibility for these arrangements ?

### **Response**

Management of the formal diversion route for the Hindhead Tunnel is an issue for the Highway Agency in consultation with and the agreement of both Surrey County Council and Hampshire County Council.

There is the responsibility for formal operational plans, mechanisms of co-ordination and appropriate signs to be in place. However, the recent network disruptions have highlighted that working arrangement (including co-ordination and signage) may need to be improved.

Surrey County Council will therefore be requesting a meeting with all parties to review lessons learned and identify any improvements that can be made to the management of future formal diversions.

### **4. From Mr David Beaman (Farnham)**

At the Cabinet meeting that was held on Tuesday 24 September the final report of the Surrey Rail Strategy was considered and decisions made which include giving approval for officers to work on developing options for Surrey County Council involvement in specific projects and initiatives. One of the recommendations of the Surrey Rail Strategy as a medium term objective is the introduction of a new direct rail service between Alton and Guildford with two trains per hour (i.e. every 30 minutes). If this recommendation is pursued for more detailed evaluation I would be grateful for reassurance that this evaluation would include the wider transport implications of the introduction of such a new rail service and, in particular, the effect of traffic in Farnham arising from the consequential longer period of time that the level crossing at Farnham station would have to be closed. In addition, I would also request that in undertaking any

evaluation of any new direct rail service between Alton and Guildford consideration is also given to evaluating a bus alternative and in particular enhancing the operation of the existing 65 bus service that operates between Alton and Guildford.

### **Response**

Poor access between Alton/ Farnham and Guildford was identified as an issue during the development of the Surrey Rail Strategy. It was considered that an improved service could relieve congestion on the A31 and A3 and improve access to employment opportunities in Guildford. Therefore the strategy included a recommendation to confirm the business case for two trains per hour from Alton to Guildford and that the council and partners then lobby the Department for Transport to include the scheme in the next South West Trains franchise.

As with any rail project, any evaluation – business case – would need to consider wider transport implications as highlighted in the question. This would include the impact on level crossing down times, any signalling improvements needed and the impact on local bus services.

At the moment there are no plans to undertake a business case.

Stagecoach continues to keep its bus network under review and will always consider increasing its provision if there is a robust business case. Surrey County Council is always keen to work with bus operators who seek to enhance their services on a commercial basis.

### **5. From Mr David Wylde (Farnham)**

It is very concerning that, at a time when cutbacks in Government grants are forcing local councils to identify and implement cost savings, Waverley Borough Council has decided to spend £30,000 of scarce money on a feasibility study for relocating Farnham's Brightwells Gostrey Centre, which provides essential and valued services for elderly residents from its present town centre site, to the Memorial Hall in West Street. The Council found itself in trouble with the provision of the proposed new Gostrey Centre in the town centre because it allowed the developers of Farnham's East Street/Brightwells development scheme an amendment to the original plan to include additional facilities, which undermined the working of the new old people's centre. Those elderly residents who currently have a degree of personal independence and are able to use public transport will find great difficulty in using public transport to travel to the Memorial Hall which is located 0.6 miles from the town centre and only served by two bus routes. In contrast the present town centre site is located within short walking distances of two of the town's main bus stops on East Street and South Street that are used by bus routes which serve virtually every part of Farnham. Surrey County Council has an overall responsibility for adult social care and before any money is spent on any feasibility of physically relocating the Gostrey Centre to the Memorial Hall could both Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council give consideration to accessibility issues which to date do not appear to have been given sufficient thought.

### **Response**

The Chairman of the Local Committee will undertake to ensure that the County Council considers the accessibility issues raised in the question and to encourage Waverley Borough Council to do likewise.

**6. From Ms Caroline Homfray (Farncombe)**

I would like to thank the Council for its ongoing support for the Marshall Road Cycle Route Project. I see that a construction date of February/March is given in the meeting agenda. Can the Council give me the planned completion date for the work ?

**Response**

Design work for this scheme is complete, an order has been placed with the County Council's term contractor who has resources programmed for February and March to complete construction by the end of the financial year, so the end of March 2014. This is subject to completing a legal agreement with Jewsons who are contributing land to enable widening of the existing footway. The negotiation of this agreement by the County Council's legal team is well advanced and it is expected to be in place in January, enabling a February start as planned. Progress of the works themselves are of course subject to delay due to adverse weather.

**7. From Jane Thomson (Waverley Borough and Godalming Town Councillor: Ockford and Central Ward), Mike Poulter (Chairman of Godalming Together CIC), Giles Pattison (Chairman of Victoria Road and Catteshall Residents' Association), Christopher Robinson (Chairman of Godalming Old Town Residents' Association)**

We ask the Committee to confirm its support for the principle of locally designed solutions and to confirm that it will allow these proposals, generated by local people in consultation with County Council officers, to be put out for public consultation.

**Response**

In support of the principle of localism the Committee will always examine, and where possible support, local solutions to all issues.

**8. From Mrs Victoria Leake (Haslemere)**

We would like the Waverley Local Committee members to know that the parking scheme that was introduced in Haslemere town centre in the summer of 2013 has had an adverse impact on the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill, with many residents having to walk over 800 yards to get from their cars to their homes, many with young children in tow in all types of weather. If town parking was at a premium before, it is now non-existent for those local residents who were excluded from Phase 1. To be clear, this is no fault at all of those residents who have been offered Residents Only Parking Schemes. They were perfectly entitled to petition and they have waited too long for Surrey County Council to come up with any kind of solution. But their neighbours in adjacent roads suffer exactly the same difficulty in finding on-road parking in Haslemere. For example, a neighbour of ours who is a nurse and works shifts, has to drive around Haslemere for around 15 minutes before she can find a parking space. When her elderly mother visits, she visits by train because she cannot find a place to park.

When our neighbour visits her mother she often stays overnight because if she returns home in the afternoon, she can't find a parking space. You have just made her life even more difficult. There are many other similar stories.

Please could the Waverley Local Committee members consider the impact of the Residents Only Parking Schemes introduced in Haslemere in the summer on the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill and let us know how they plan to proceed in Phase 2 for the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill ?

Would the Waverley Local Committee members not consider and consult on, a curfew parking scheme in a zone around the town centre, whereby for one hour a day, only residents would be allowed to park ? That would mean visiting commuters would have to park outside the town centre. It would not be as beneficial to residents who would have received a Residents Only Parking Scheme in Phase 1, but it would be of benefit to all residents.

### **Response**

A number of residents' parking schemes were introduced in Haslemere during the summer of 2013 (in what was termed Phase 1) and the majority of these have settled down and are working well. We recognised at the time that this first tranche of schemes may need adjusting and that it did not cater for some residents in the town centre area (such as Lower Street and Shepherds Hill). We planned to look at a more encompassing residents parking solution in Phase 2. This will also be linked to parking provision at the station and displacement. The outcome of a public inquiry in April 2014 about Waverley Borough Council plans for charging on the Weyhill Fairground site is also a consideration.

The residents' schemes introduced in Phase 1 have become established and we now have a clearer picture of their usage and the demand for permits. Some locations are well used by permit holders and others are generally under-utilised (for example the bays opposite the fire station in West Street, Sandrock and the bays outside Houghton House in Courts Hill Road). There is an opportunity to make small adjustments to make better use of the road space in this parking review (i.e. December 2013), but a Phase 2 review of residents' parking will need more thorough and wider consultation and cannot be achieved in the time scales for this review. There is also demand for residents' parking in other roads such as Museum Hill, but rather than adding residents' schemes in a piecemeal way, a wider town centre review is likely to provide the best solution.

It is therefore planned to carry out a consultation about residents' parking in the Haslemere town centre area during 2014 in a separate process to this review. Possible options and issues could include:

1. Creating a town centre residents parking zone. This could mean allocating all available parking space (except for shoppers) to residents parking in and around the town centre. Eligibility for residents' permits could be opened up to all residents in the zone who met the criteria and there may need to be a waiting list if demand exceeds the space available.
2. Providing more, but retaining street specific residents' parking areas.
3. How to cater for local workers ?
4. Minimising displacement.
5. Making the best use of the available road space.

A curfew parking zone can be considered but is perhaps not the most suitable arrangement near a town centre where shoppers would take up residents' spaces outside of the curfew period.

**9. From Mr David Boyd (Haslemere)**

I would like to raise two points under **Item 8: Annual Review of on-street parking in Waverley.**

With respect to 3.8: Weydown Road, it should also be noted that significant consultation has been undertaken by the Residents' Association with the residents in the road and a survey concluded that over 90% were in favour of these proposals.

With respect to 3.8: Derby Road, it should be noted that the Residents' Association, St Bartholomew's School, and the chair of The Parents of St Bartholomew's have all liaised on these proposals and are supportive of them as they are designed to improve road and pedestrian safety at the junction which is used by probably half the school. However, two minor adjustments which were discussed and agreed upon are missing and we would like them included before publication. They are best explained via the Map 24050 in the pack.:

1. The south red line - no waiting at anytime should be extended west to align itself with that on the north. That improves safety on the corner and rather helpfully there is already a post there with a parking restriction sign.
2. The existing double yellow lines at the junction of Derby Road and Church Road should be extended another 10 metres southwards to improve road and pedestrian safety on the corner from this direction. This would then match with the length of 'no waiting at any time' in (1) above.

I hope I have explained this clearly and that you will accept these changes. St Bartholomew's, the Parents of St Bartholomew's and the residents are all looking forward to this major school crossing becoming much safer.

**Response**

We would like to thank David Boyd for his involvement in the development of the proposed parking restrictions in Derby and Weydown Roads on behalf of the Residents' Association. The suggested changes at the junction of Derby and Church Roads highlighted above have been discussed and can be incorporated in our proposals for statutory consultation.

**10. From Mr David Pope on behalf of Ms Jane Godden (Haslemere)**

We urge the Committee to examine the detail of the proposed changes for Courts Hill Road (CHR) West before public consultation. We believe the changes go beyond "adjustments", run counter to the principles of the scheme and are unsafe. The majority of residents in this part of the road have not been consulted in the preparation of the proposals.

In these circumstances, we ask the Committee to reject the proposal to revoke the Haughton House Permit Holder's bay on the following grounds:

- During the working day this bay is no more lightly used than the schemes in Longdene Road and Sandrock. Furthermore, Haughton House puts unique parking demands on the road through its need for supply and maintenance vehicles, which arrive after commuters, and through the Hopper bus which needs somewhere to stop safely. We do not object to relaxing the eligibility requirements for parking permits for some residents, but it seems odd to increase the number of permits and then restrict where they may park. We have no desire to inflict problems on our neighbours in CHR East, but to argue that their problems are caused by the Haughton House residents parking bay is not sustainable. We fully support CHR East residents who want our comprehensive scheme extended to them.
- The Haughton House bay is currently marked on the ground by a cage and statutory controls govern the type and size of vehicles using it. Cages are an effective and integral part of the CHR West scheme, which is comprehensive, coherent and well engineered. The Haughton House bay is in a particularly narrow and vulnerable part of CHR, being bounded at one end by a blind corner and facing an increasingly developed and important side road at the other. Experience shows that abandoning controls and markings will lead to undisciplined parking and parking by oversized vehicles to the detriment of access and safety: precisely the situation the scheme is successful in overcoming.

Although we believe the bay should be retained for permit holders, we believe it should be reduced at its eastern end by at least one vehicle space, on safety grounds. Extending the double yellow lines leading into the blind corner with Courts Mount Road has been beneficial. But it is still a dangerous corner and will be more so if the Parking Review proposals are adopted. At present the lines are only two thirds as long as the corresponding lines in CHR East. Yet it is eastbound traffic which needs to face quickly moving westbound traffic from around the corner head-on on the “wrong” side of the road. Traffic, in both directions, now includes more cycles since the road has been signed as a cycle route to the South Downs National Park. A reduction will also enable residents at No 25 CHR to access the road more safely: to everyone’s benefit.

## **Response**

The parking restrictions introduced into Courts Hill Road during the summer have generally been a success and helped residents and visitors to park nearer their homes and/or access their driveways more easily. Vehicular movement along the road has also improved with the introduction of more passing spaces.

A seven-space permit bay was introduced adjacent to Haughton House, but observations indicate that it is very rarely used during the operational hours of the scheme (0830-1730, Monday-Friday). It is therefore proposed to make it an unrestricted bay to make better use of the road space and help absorb some of the parking in the eastern part of the road.

There are a further ten residents’ permit bays in the western part of the road and ten residents’ permits have been allocated to adjacent properties. During the operational hours some residents are out so residents’ bays are not all used. At the weekends and evenings (outside the operational hours) when residents tend to be at home there are far fewer commuter vehicles, creating more space for residents.

The bay markings will be retained regardless of the eventual restriction that is agreed for its use. This means it could only be used by vehicles that can fit into it.

We will look at all the comments received in response to the statutory consultation before deciding what changes are appropriate.