

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 1.30 pm on 21 March 2014  
at Haslemere Hall, Bridge Road, Haslemere, Surrey GU27 2AS.

**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

---

**1/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr B Adams, Mr B Ellis and Mrs V Young; Mr A Young was absent from the meeting until Item 11, having indicated that he would be delayed.

**2/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

**3/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

The following members requested that a non-pecuniary interest be noted in Item 9, specifically in relation to the applications for Highways Localism funding, on the grounds of their membership of Farnham Town Council: Mrs P Frost, Mrs C Cockburn, Ms J Potts.

**4/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No petitions had been received.

#### **5/14 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

The text of two public questions received and the responses provided are attached at **Annex 1**.

Mr D Pope, in a supplementary question to the response provided to Ms J Godden in relation to the on-street parking proposal for Courts Hill Road (West), expressed his continued concern that the response had not addressed the question presented. Residents feel that the proposal, if implemented, would result in unsafe traffic movements. He asked that the results of the statutory consultation be presented to the Committee along with details of objections and reasons for the recommendation.

The Chairman explained the process by which objections would be assessed and undertook to ensure that the proposal for this location returns to the Committee for decision.

#### **6/14 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

The text of four member questions received and the responses provided are attached at **Annex 2**.

Supplementary questions were presented as follows:

1. Mr R Knowles restated his concern that the signage for diversions away from the A3 remains inadequate and sought reassurance that progress was being made. The Vice-Chairman, as Chairman of the County Council's Environment and Infrastructure Select Committee, confirmed that following a multi-agency meeting agreement had been secured from the Highways Agency for a programme of improvements which an officer working group was developing. The Area Highways Manager was asked to circulate an update to members on the proposed measures.
2. Mr D Munro asked for further detail on what the County Council and Local Committee can do to promote the needs of Farnham under the Local Enterprise Partnership's funding regime for transport schemes. The Chairman explained that further detail would be provided in a report at the next meeting of the Committee.
4. Mr S Cosser thanked officers for the rapid response to his urgent question. He requested clarity on the prospect of at least one-way working not being feasible in Frith Hill Road and, in this event, the likelihood of remedial work being prioritised. He also sought assurance that he and the local residents' association would be kept informed. The Area Highways Manager outlined the work needing to be undertaken before a decision on one-way working could be made: if feasible, partial re-opening on this basis would be at least two months away. Prioritisation of remedial works following flood damage is now under way, but it is likely that A-roads would take precedence. Mr Cosser and the residents' association would be informed of progress.

#### **7/14 DEMENTIA FRIENDLY SURREY [Item 7]**

The Committee noted that the role of Champion would contribute to widening awareness of dementia and reducing stigma; Champions would also be involved in sustaining the initiative in the longer term. Members referred to the increasing pressure on day centres and the positive difference being made through increased awareness of dementia.

Mr S Cosser felt that there would be a benefit in the whole Committee making a commitment to the project and offered to keep members involved in its future evolution. The Chair put this proposal to the Committee and it was agreed as (iii) below.

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

- (i) Note the progress of the Dementia Friendly Surrey project.
- (ii) Note the particular work being done to make Waverley more dementia-friendly.
- (iii) Agree that the whole Committee become a collective Dementia Friendly Champion, Mr S Cosser acting as lead member.

##### **Reason**

Local Committees and members are very well-placed to help carry on the work of Dementia Friendly Surrey, making our communities better places to live for people with dementia, their family and carers.

#### **8/14 RESPONSE TO PETITION: BRAMLEY [Item 8]**

**Resolved** to note the response to the petition.

##### **Reason**

The Committee is required to respond to petitions received.

#### **9/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 9]**

The Chairman thanked officers for the work done in partnership during the recent extreme weather.

Officers were asked to consider whether the legal delays experienced in the Marshall Road scheme should be escalated for resolution at a higher level.

It was confirmed that the data in Annex 1 of the report referred to the 2013/14 programme only. The proposed allocation of £50,000 to flood recovery would be taken from the uncommitted sum for 2014/15. The extent of damage is currently being assessed and it is likely that remedial work to surfaces will begin in April. The poor quality of some repairs and early failures reflect the difficulty experienced by the contractor in complying with required timescales

in adverse environmental conditions: the cost of remedial work is borne by the contractor.

The Committee discussed funding for the Highways Localism scheme, noting that an application from Western Villages had now been received by officers. Some members continued to express their unease at the lack of equity experienced by areas where the parish council had not wished to submit an application; there was also concern at the lack of progress on a review of the processes involved. The Chairman proposed amended recommendations, which were agreed by the Committee as (iii) and (iv) below.

**Resolved to:**

- (i) Note the effects of the recent extreme weather across Waverley and Surrey.
- (ii) Agree that up to £50,000 be allocated from the 2014/15 budget towards flood recovery works organised by the Area Team.
- (iii) Agree to note the 2014/15 Localism (Lengsthman) scheme applications submitted by Chiddingfold Parish Council, Dunsfold Parish Council, First Wessex (Sandy Hill and The Chantrys), Hambledon Parish Council, Haslemere Town Council and Farnham Town Council and that an application from Western Villages had now been received, and to delegate final approval of the total funding granted to each project to the Area Highways Manager, in consultation with local members and subject to officer scrutiny to ensure that the proposed works fall within the remit of the scheme.
- (iv) Agree to review the principles and process to be adopted for the allocation of the Localism (Lengsthman) budget in future years.

**Reason**

The Committee recognised the need to contribute to flood recovery in Waverley and to support local enhanced maintenance on the highway through the Highways Localism scheme.

**10/14 OPERATION HORIZON: UPDATE FOR WAVERLEY [Item 10]**

The Committee welcomed the progress made in Year 1 and the high quality of the work completed. In view of the significant and costly damage sustained by the network over the winter, discussions are under way with central government with a view to bringing a plan for remediation to the full County Council in April. There may be an impact on the Horizon programme, but it is hoped that this can be preserved.

The Committee discussed the extent and timing of individual schemes in the programme. It was noted that members needed reasons for adjustments to the programme. Officers had acknowledged that local committee members should be provided with more detailed and timely information on progress and changes and enhanced communication methods were under consideration. It was pointed out that the requirements of developers presented a particular challenge in scheduling work in Waverley and officers were collaborating with

Planning colleagues on this point. Officers were reminded that multiple road closures in a relatively small area might have a major impact on traffic flows across a much larger area.

**Resolved to note:**

- (i) The success of the countywide five-year programme in Year One.
- (ii) The progress of Operation Horizon roads, surface treatment roads and changes in Year One in Waverley as set out in Annex 1 of the report.
- (iii) The proposed programme of Operation Horizon roads for Waverley for Year Two (2014/15) and the remaining approved roads to be undertaken in Years Three to Five (2015-2018) listed in Annex 1 of the report.

### **Reason**

The Committee requested an update of the project at the end of Year One and an opportunity to review the programme for future years.

## **11/14 ROAD SAFETY POLICY UPDATE [Item 11]**

[Mr A Young joined the meeting at this point.]

The following observations were made by way of contribution to the consultation:

- The phrase “outside schools” needs to be interpreted with some latitude, as roads, paths and hazards at some distance may have an impact on the safety of students’ journeys to school and on the range of travel options considered by families.
- Extensive parking in roads around schools can have a significant impact on safety.
- The acknowledgement that signage alone has little impact on speeds was welcomed.
- It was proposed that local committees should be entrusted with making correct decisions on speed limits, even if their decisions are contrary to Police and/or officer advice: it was suggested that referral to the Cabinet member should be by exception, e.g. through a call-in procedure or perhaps in relation to strategic routes.
- Although low-cost interventions can be delivered quickly, substantial schemes are likely to take a long time to implement.
- The provision of signage should be balanced against the wish of some neighbourhoods to “declutter” and resist urbanisation.
- The impact of building developments on the safety of routes to school must be taken into account and incorporated in the planning process.
- There should be a greater emphasis on the role that schools and parents themselves can have in promoting road safety.

**Resolved** to request that the Committee's comments on the draft policies be noted and taken into account, prior to the policies being submitted to the County Council's Cabinet for approval.

**Reason**

Local Committees are responsible for most highway and transport matters in their area, including speed limits and road safety measures outside schools. This report presented draft road safety policies with respect to speed limits and road safety outside schools for comment by the Local Committee prior to submission to the County Council's Cabinet for approval.

**12/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 12]**

The Chairman informed the Committee that some reports scheduled for the June meeting would be moved to September to ensure a better balance in the size of agendas. The wish to develop an understanding of Children's Services was expressed.

**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: 3.30 pm

---

**Chairman**



**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND  
RESPONSES**

**21 MARCH 2014**

**1. From Mr David Beaman (Farnham)**

Stagecoach South has registered a revised timetable for its Services 4 and 5 that operate between Farnham and Aldershot via Sandy Hill that will be effective from 20 April. I understand that the objective of the revised timetable is to make financial and operational savings required to maintain economic viability by reducing the number of buses needed by one without reducing the overall level of service operated during Monday to Saturday daytimes. The introduction of this revised timetable will, however, have the following consequences:

- During Monday to Saturday daytimes there will be no common bus stop in Farnham for passengers travelling to Sandy Hill and Heath End – whilst the level of service will remain unchanged (every 15 minutes) buses to Sandy Hill and Heath End will depart from Farnham alternately every 30 minutes from East Street (bus stop J) and Castle Street. In the evenings and on Sundays and Public Holidays buses to Sandy Hill and Heath End, which are subsidised by Surrey County Council, will continue to depart from the existing bus stop A on The Borough. The use of three different bus stops for buses travelling to the same destination rather than the single common stop currently used will cause considerable confusion to passengers, many of whom elderly.
- The level of service operated from Heath End, Sandy Hill and Upper Hale Road to and from Farnham Hospital will be reduced by 50% from every 15 minutes to every 30 minutes during Monday to Saturday daytimes.
- The level of recovery time (the time between when a bus arrives in Farnham and when it departs on its return journey to Aldershot) is being reduced from seven to two minutes. From personal observation, given the delays caused by traffic congestion in Farnham at all times of day and particularly during the peak periods, buses regularly arrive in Farnham late and reducing the recovery time is likely to result in the operation of the service becoming less reliable.

The only benefit to be gained from the revised timetable will be the restoration of a direct bus service to and from Farnham via Castle Hill for residents of Folly Hill.

In 2006 Stagecoach received a grant of £240,000, payable over three years, from a successful bid that was jointly made by Stagecoach with Surrey County Council to the Department of Transport's Kickstart initiative for the introduction of a Quality Bus Partnership between Stagecoach and Surrey County Council along the route of services 4 and 5, for which a fleet of nine low floor midibuses was acquired. Under this partnership Stagecoach made a commitment to operate a higher level of bus service and the service was increased to operate every 10 minutes during Monday to Saturday daytimes. The service has subsequently been reduced by 33% and now operates every 15 minutes.

My questions are as follows:

1. Why has the commitment given by Stagecoach in the Quality Bus Partnership with Surrey County Council, under which a grant of £240,000 in public funds from The Department of Transport's Kickstart initiative was obtained to operate a higher level of bus service, been allowed to be broken ?
2. Although Monday to Saturday daytime journeys on services 4 and 5 are operated by Stagecoach commercially, does a Quality Bus Partnership agreement still exist between Stagecoach and Surrey County Council covering services 4 and 5 ?
3. If there is still a Quality Bus Partnership agreement in force, has Stagecoach consulted with and secured the agreement of Surrey County Council to the service changes that are being made effective from 20 April ?
4. Whilst the desire to maintain the existing level of service is understandable, if operational and financial savings have to be made has consideration been given by either Stagecoach and/or Surrey County Council to the alternative option of reducing the existing level of service from every 15 minutes to every 20 minutes, which would preserve the use of a common bus stop in Farnham at all times for passengers travelling to Sandy Hill and Heath End as well as retaining existing recovery times in Farnham, to ensure the continued operation of a reliable bus service ?

## **Response**

Bus services 4/5 Farnham-Sandy Hill-Aldershot-North Town are currently operated on a commercial basis during the day time period on Mondays to Saturdays, without funding from or a contractual obligation to, Surrey County Council. Service planning decisions during that period are the prerogative of Stagecoach, in terms of being a commercially-provided service. The Council does make some financial support for journeys in the evening and on Sundays.

Stagecoach are a member of a Voluntary Quality Bus Partnership with local authorities for the wider Blackwater Valley area. Under this, the authorities pledged to improve infrastructure and bus priority measures using external funding opportunities and Stagecoach could improve services if such an enhancement was commercially sustainable, without being prescriptive. Additionally, in 2006, Stagecoach and Surrey County Council successfully bid for £226,000 (over 3 years) through the government's Kickstart Funding competition. This facilitated revenue support to increase the frequency of each of services 4 and 5 from every 30 minutes to every 20 minutes, such that where the services came together over the majority of their routes, a combined 10 minute frequency



resulted. In addition, Stagecoach invested £675,000 in order to introduce nine new low floor buses to replace the previous elderly step entrance vehicles.

Stagecoach hoped to continue the services at the end of the three year funding period, based on expectations of passenger growth during that period. By Year 5, it was expected that the service would be commercially sustainable, but that has been prevented by increasing operating costs and a patronage level below estimates made back in 2006. The Kickstart bid did not encompass a Stagecoach obligation to maintain the service indefinitely at an enhanced level or on a prescribed intermediate route, once the Kickstart funding had been expended.

Stagecoach has notified the Council that action is now needed to reduce operating costs, as further subsidy is not available. By introducing the two different routings between Farnham and Sandy Hill (Castle Street and Folly Hill or Hale Road and Upper Hale Road), they can save resource without having to reduce the overall four buses per hour frequency which will still apply over the majority of the route. Although fewer journeys will pass Farnham Hospital, they feel their way forward will minimise inconvenience to the majority of their customers and will not weaken the customer offer on the most patronised sections. As no additional subsidy funding is available due to budgetary pressures, the County Council has noted Stagecoach's commercial position and the timetable they propose to operate.

Although the new routing into and out of Farnham does not involve both services using common stops in Farnham town centre when heading for Aldershot, this was felt on balance to be manageable, subject to improved information being available at bus stops to clearly show from which stops the various buses depart from. A reduction in the whole service to every 20 minutes overall could perhaps have proved sufficient for all buses on routes 4/5 to navigate Farnham town centre in reasonable time, within the sustainable resources and all to serve common stops, but the company feels that such an overall reduction, especially at the Aldershot end where patronage increases remain positive, would be counter-productive and potentially commercially-damaging.

**2. From Ms Jane Godden (Parking Co-ordinator for Courts Hill Road West, Haslemere)**

We have the following questions about the proposal in Surrey County Council's 2013 Parking Review to revoke the Residents Bay outside Haughton House in Courts Hill Road in Haslemere.

1. Following our informal question to the Committee's meeting on 13 December 2014, and our follow-up letter of 16 December, has the Committee given further consideration to the above proposal; has it considered the effect of the proposal on traffic safety and movement, and access to the highway, in Courts Hill Road West; and has it considered the results against the objectives of the Review ?
2. If it has considered the proposal further, has anyone visited the site as part of that consideration; has the Council taken account of the representations made on behalf of the majority of residents who supported the present traffic and parking scheme in Courts Hill Road West; and what were the results of its consideration ?

3. If it has confirmed the review proposal, will it explain in public why it believes it is acceptable to send eastbound traffic from Courts Hill Road West into a blind corner on the “wrong” side of the road to face fast moving westbound traffic, often speeding to the railway station, head on with little or no warning and without any refuge ?
4. As the references to Courts Hill Road in the Public Notice in *The Haslemere Herald* on 7 March 2014 are unclear and potentially conflicting, what advice does Surrey County Council have for Courts Hill Road residents: should they respond to the proposal in Item 8 (b) to revoke the residents only parking places or should they take account of the Note which refers to further amendments for Courts Hill Road being advertised at a later date ? What amendments is Surrey County Council considering and when will the amendments be advertised ?
5. Will the Council explain why there is a difference between the consultation procedures in Item 17 of the Public Notice in *The Herald* and the Notice in the road ? Which takes precedence ? And what rules and criteria will the Council follow in considering the responses ?
6. Does the Council accept that the residents in Courts Hill Road are as entitled to receive consideration as other Haslemere residents ? We had no opportunity to make an input to the review other than to confirm that we believed the Courts Hill Road West scheme was a success; and yet a major change was proposed to the scheme which showed no evidence of attention being paid to the consequences for our residents. Apart from the Chairman’s agreement to find a mechanism for the full Committee to take final decisions in public, which we continue to appreciate, we have received no further information or response from Surrey County Council to our representations and questions. We are now faced with a statutory consultation where we do not know which proposal we should be responding to or the basis on which decisions will be taken. Given that the Courts Hill Road West scheme was introduced following full and transparent consultation, we believe it is wrong to subtract a part of that scheme without the same level of consideration and openness.

## **Response**

In August 2013, following Local Committee agreement, new parking restrictions were introduced in Courts Hill Road (West). These included residents’ parking bays, including a bay outside Haughton House.

Since these were introduced, frequent observations of the area indicate the resident permit bay outside Haughton House is infrequently used and is empty for most of the day. This parking space could perhaps be better used and so we are proposing to change the restriction here from 'permit holders' to unrestricted parking.

Parking Team members have discussed the proposals with some residents in Courts Hill Road (West), including Haughton House, and are aware that not all are in favour of this proposal. We will, however, look at the comments we receive and decide how best to proceed following the consultation period, which ends on 4 April 2014.

We are not planning any other amendments to parking restrictions in Courts Hill Road (West), the changes introduced last year have generally been a success and helped residents park more easily and access their driveways.

This page is intentionally left blank



**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

**MEMBER QUESTIONS AND  
RESPONSES**

**21 MARCH 2014**

**1. From Mr Robert Knowles**

The Hindhead tunnel has closed 34 times since it opened resulting in heavy traffic on side roads and in towns and villages around the tunnel. What steps are being taken to improve signage close to the tunnel and on roads used by traffic that turns off the A3 onto local roads, especially around Haslemere ?

**Response**

Surrey County Council Highway Engineers and Surrey Police Road Safety Officers have been working with representatives of the Highways Agency (HA) to assess the current diversion signs for planned (maintenance) and unplanned (accidents) closures of the Hindhead tunnel. A review of the signage was recently completed and a number of suggested permanent improvements have been submitted to the HA for consideration. With immediate effect the HA has agreed to trial the use of portable vehicle information signs at key diversion locations to alert drivers to closures at the earliest opportunity. The HA is hoping to secure funding in the next financial year to install the remaining suggested improvements.

**2. From Mr David Munro**

The M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) has published a draft 'Enterprise M3 (EM3) Strategic Economic Plan'. It is subject to consultation ending on 31 March 2014.

Many organisations are cited as having contributed to the draft plan, including Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council although, as a member of both councils, I do not remember having been asked to give any input – but I will be doing so anyway before the end of the month ! I am disappointed that Waverley Local Committee does not seem to have been consulted – is that correct?

I understand that funds channelled through the M3 LEP in accordance with the priorities and aspirations in the Economic Plan will be the main source of funding for road projects in the next few years. In other words, if it's not in the plan, it won't get built. Is that correct ?

Funding of some £300-400 million is being sought for a six-year economic programme starting in 2015. Of this, some £150-200 million has been provisionally earmarked for transport schemes, the majority for 'growth towns' (Basingstoke, Farnborough, Guildford and Woking) and 'step-up towns' (Aldershot, Camberley, Bordon/Whitehill and Staines). However, there is also mention of creating a 'pinch-point' fund although I cannot find any reference to how much this might consist of nor how it could be allocated.

I am concerned that the four substantial road schemes hitherto proposed for Farnham to relieve significant congestion and other handicaps to the amenities of the town and surrounding villages will be overlooked. These schemes are, as listed in Annex 4 to the plan, are:

- A31 Hickley's Corner Junction Improvements (I guess the medium term at-grade project)
- Hickley's Corner Underpass (the big one).
- Relieve Traffic Congestion in Farnham Town Centre
- Wrecclesham Relief Road

It is reassuring to see that all four are listed as schemes that are still worthy of promotion, but the fact that the prime criteria as to priority now seem to be economic (as opposed to relieving community separation, air quality, traffic congestion, quality of life, etc.) surely disadvantages all four as against other projects in growth and step-up towns.

Whitehill/Bordon has long been recognised as an area for redevelopment once the Ministry Of Defence moves out in 2015. While the plan goes into some detail about the improvements within the town itself, including a local relief road, it is vague as to the improvements to the wider network. In particular, there is no specific mention that I can find on funding for junction improvements on the Wrecclesham stretch of the A325 or the Farnham bypass.

In summary, I am concerned that the adoption of this plan as drafted will significantly set back the urgent improvements to roads in the Farnham area that are required.

Questions:

1. Are the statements and assertions above broadly correct ?
2. Is anything significantly missing ?
3. What can Surrey County Council, this Committee and individual members do to influence the plan so that it more accurately reflects the aspirations of the Farnham community ?
4. Longer-term, can assurances be given that this Committee will be involved in the plan as it develops and, if so, how can this be achieved ?
5. Specifically, how can this Committee influence the development of Whitehill/Bordon so that the wider community, particularly in Wrecclesham, can be compensated for the projected increase in traffic that will ensue ?

## Response

1. *Are the statements and assertions above broadly correct ?*
2. *Anything significantly missing ?*
3. *What can Surrey County Council, this committee and individual members do to influence the plan so that it more accurately reflects the aspirations of the Farnham community ?*

Not all of the statements and assertions are correct. Below is the current position which includes any missing information and how Members can influence the plans.

The Department for Transport have indicated that all of their capital funding for Transport has been allocated to LEPs for the period 2015-2021. The EM3 LEP is bidding overall for up to £350M of which between £180 and £250M could be allocated to transport projects. No money is available for local transport improvement schemes outside this allocation over the period 2015-2021.

National schemes for the Highways Agency and Rail Networks continue to be funded separately over the above period. It is broadly correct to say that if schemes have not been included in the plan then they will not secure funding. However, it is likely that there will be exceptions to cater for transport schemes promoted by either the private or public sector that have not been included at this stage but nevertheless have a compelling economic case measured by new jobs created and housing delivered.

Whilst the four Waverley major schemes have been included in submissions to the LEP they do not fall within the priority towns that have been identified as part of the main growth story set out by the EM3 LEP. The key growth and step up towns, which are backed up by the evidence include Guildford, Woking, Camberley and Staines. The LEP process is very competitive and the EM3 area has to prioritise areas which will deliver the largest amount jobs, housing, commercial floor space and Gross Value Added (GVA) in order to win a decent share of the national funding available. Feedback from Government to the EM3 LEP on the basis of the draft Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) submitted and on-going growth conversations have indicated that they have pitched this correctly. There are discussions with the EM3 LEP supported by both Surrey and Hampshire County Councils to create a smaller fund to cater for towns outside the priority areas. This fund if agreed will be scalable based on the overall amount secured later this year. If agreed the two smaller schemes in Waverley would stand a good chance of being funded via this route subject to their business case. The two larger schemes in Waverley are substantial undertakings for the County Council as promoter and realistically cannot be delivered within the proposed SEP funding period 2015-2021. These schemes remain part of the County Council's long term aspirations as they are part of the current major schemes programme approved by the Cabinet on 27 November 2012. However, both schemes would need show a significant economic impact over and above the transport and environmental improvements that they would deliver to succeed in the current SEP process. It would be helpful if the Local Committee and individual members supported the creation of the fund for towns outside the priority areas, accepting that this would be a smaller allocation than that likely to be set aside for the key growth and step up towns. This would address the issue of the two smaller Farnham schemes being overlooked.

4. *Longer-term, can assurances be given that this Committee will be involved in the plan as it develops and, if so, how can this be achieved ?*

The development of the SEP has been a very fast moving process which will have started and finished in less than six months. This has posed significant issues in relation to the level of engagement that could realistically be expected to meet this challenging timetable. I would urge you to compare this with the development of the Local Transport Plan which is of a similar scale but was carried out over a two and half year period allowing for a different level of engagement. Notwithstanding these pressures the transport schemes that have gone into the SEP have been synthesised from the emerging Local Plans into the Local Borough/District Transport Strategies that have been up to now informally discussed with Local Committees. In preparing the SEP some packaging of schemes in the Local Plans has been necessary. The Transport Strategies will come before the Local Committee for sign off later this year allowing full involvement in what is likely to go forward in the longer term. I hope this gives you and the Local Committee the assurances that you seek in shaping what happens locally. At a county level the SEP is being signed off by a Leaders Board made up of all of the Counties, Boroughs and Districts in the EM3 area.

5. *Specifically, how can this committee influence the development of Whitehill/Bordon so that the wider community, particularly in Wrecclesham, can be compensated for the projected increase in traffic that will ensue ?*

Surrey County Council was involved in earlier discussions with Hampshire County Council and East Hampshire District Council when a considerably larger "Eco Town" of 5,300 homes was being looked at. At that time it was demonstrated that the traffic impact arising from the residual movements that were left on the wider network, once all the sustainable transport measures had been implemented and delivered benefits, was not severe. The impacts mainly related to severance issues on the A31/A325 through the community of Wrecclesham, and it will be recalled that it was agreed that we would seek a package of low key measures that would assist in reducing the impact of the A325 through Wrecclesham, and to assist pedestrian movements across the A31 from the southern suburbs of Farnham to the old town. It is likely that the impact associated with the more recent proposals of some 4,000 houses (a reduction of 1,300) will be less. It is therefore unlikely that a case could be made for anything major in western Waverley. That said, the County will still push for the improvements so far negotiated, which will certainly help the community of Wrecclesham.

### **3. From Mr Bryn Morgan**

The development at Hollowdene, in Frensham, was accompanied by a section 106 agreement to provide community facilities for the village. This was something of a groundbreaking initiative with the major part of the monies from the infrastructure levy raised being allocated to the provision of a new village shop and a parish meeting room. The developer has fully complied with his obligations in this respect in a very satisfactory manner and in good time

However, a part of the monies raised was specified for improvement to parking facilities at Hollowdene and Surrey County Council was allocated funds from the



section 106 monies to carry out that work. I understand that the work has not been completed by the County Council's highways contractors on the grounds that part of the area concerned is in Parish Council ownership and, because it is not part of the highway the County Council cannot themselves carry out the work, even as the agent of the Parish Council.

My question, therefore, to the Local Committee, is to ask that the County Council decide either to:

- (a) carry out the works required by, and funded from, the section 106 agreement without further delay, or
- b) return to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) that part of the section 106 monies already paid or forego any part of the section 106 monies remaining in respect of the works required for the car park to enable another contractor to be engaged to properly satisfy the terms of the agreement made between the developer, the Parish Council and the LPA

I further understand that the parish clerk has not received a reply to the letter sent to the County Council, outlining the full details, on behalf of the Vice-Chairman, dated 23 May 2013, and would appreciate an update on the progress in dealing with the issues raised. May I be assured that she will receive a reply in the near future ?

### **Response**

The highways element of the S106 agreement does not require improving parking facilities at Hollowdene, but Surrey County Council (SCC) Highways have agreed some measures with the Parish Council (PC), which have been installed. The PC does not want any further alterations on the highway, such as signing or road markings, and SCC has agreed that if the developer is agreeable the outstanding highway element will be transferred to the PC, given also the consent of the LPA to the same. It is understood that the PC was going to obtain the written agreement of the developer to enable this arrangement.

#### **4. From Mr Steve Cosser**

Frith Hill Road in Godalming has now been closed for about five weeks following a land slip. Local residents are understandably concerned about the apparent lack of action to get the road reopened. I understand that senior highways staff met on site yesterday to discuss possible actions. Can I please be reassured that as a result of this meeting urgent action will now be taken to enable the road to be fully reopened ?

### **Response**

This major land slip, as a result of extreme rain and wind, occurred in early February, bringing a large tree and a lot of soil material down from a steep escarpment rising above Frith Hill and blocking the road, which remains closed to through traffic. The area was barriered off with only the footway on the opposite side of the road remaining open for pedestrians. Surrey County Council (SCC) Highways commissioned WS Atkins to investigate and their report was received 8 March. It concluded that the site continues to pose a risk of failure and in order to investigate further the debris in the road need to be removed in a controlled

manner to expose the lower part of the slip face, and trees at the top need to be reduced or removed. Subject to a further inspection of the cleared slope, a single lane on the footway side could be opened for traffic. These works are now being organised, and design options for single lane working (traffic lights, priority give way, possibly no-entry/one way) are with the SCC design team.

In the longer term Atkins recommended that a remedial solution be implemented, eliminating as far as possible risk to road users and third parties which could comprise re-grading the slope to a safe angle, soil nailing, rock fencing and face netting.

Further assessment is required before a long term solution can be identified and, whatever this may be, it is likely to be expensive. The Frith Hill slip has been listed in the bid for storm damage that SCC recently submitted to central government. Highways has an annual budget for embankment planned maintenance, approximately £0.3m in 2013/14; however, budget was used on embankment emergencies from Bridge Strengthening, making a total budget of £1.5m. Frith Hill will now be prioritised against other instances of embankment failure for potential inclusion in the 2014/15 programme.

If it is safe to re-open the road to a single lane of traffic, it is likely to be some considerable time before works can be undertaken that will allow reinstating two-way traffic.