

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 1.30 pm on 26 June 2015  
at Hale Institute, Wings Road, Farnham GU9 OHN.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Carole Cockburn
- \* Cllr Brian Ellis
- \* Cllr Mary Forszowski
- \* Cllr Simon Inchbald
- \* Cllr Denis Leigh
- \* Cllr Stephen Mulliner
- \* Cllr Julia Potts
- \* Cllr Wyatt Ramsdale
- \* Cllr David Round

\* In attendance

---

**15/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mr D Leigh, Ms J Potts and Mr D Round. Ms D Le Gal had indicated that she would be delayed and joined the meeting during Item 7; Mr W Ramsdale also joined the meeting during Item 7.

**16/15 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**17/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **18/15 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No petitions had been received.

#### **19/15 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

The text of four formal questions received and of the responses provided is attached at **Annex 1**.

Supplementary to question 1, Mr T Forrest asked whether anything could be done to speed up the process of the Open Market Review into broadband coverage or improve infrastructure. Mr P Martin, as Deputy Leader of the county council, replied in the negative to both questions.

#### **20/15 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

No member questions had been received.

#### **21/15 WAVERLEY PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 7]**

[The item was taken after Item 8.]

The Chairman invited Mr D Wydenbach to comment on the proposed action relating to parking in **Little Austins Road** and **Mavins Road, Farnham**, in response to the petition presented at the meeting on 20 March 2015. Mr Wydenbach reflected the broad support of residents of Little Austins and Mavins Roads for the recommendation contained in the report, but wished to include an adjustment such that the proposed scheme for these two roads which the committee had rejected in May 2014 should be implemented. Residents felt that, with the continued increase in displaced parking into the area, matters of safety had now become paramount, especially for parents wishing to drop off/collect children at either end of the school day.

[Mr W Ramsdale joined the meeting at this point.]

Five further residents were invited to address the committee:

- Mr M Lear stressed that residents did not wish to stop parents parking in the two roads, but noted that the current problems had arisen from the combination of this usage with commuter parking. He supported the immediate introduction of restrictions in Little Austins Road and Mavins Road.
- Mr T Young noted that displacement from Lancaster Avenue had exacerbated the problems and that pressure at both ends of the school day was also being experienced in Great Austins. Residents of Mavins Road looked forward to an area-wide solution, but felt that concerns about child safety led them to request immediate implementation of restrictions in Little Austins Road and Mavins Road.
- Mr P Openshaw felt that a solution for Little Austins and Mavins Roads in isolation would itself generate displacement to Greenhill Road which is used as a "rat run" and carries fast-moving traffic.

[Ms D Le Gal joined the meeting at this point.]

- Ms L Anthony suggested that an area-wide solution, rather than one which addressed the situation in two roads only, is needed. Pedestrians with children in Greenhill Road, Swingate Road, Middle Avenue and Vicarage Hill already experience difficulties, e.g. through parking displaced away from Ridgeway School, and are concerned that further displacement into narrow roads may present additional safety risks through encroachment onto pavements.
- Ms R Berry reinforced these concerns in advocating an area-wide approach to prevent the risk of displacement from Little Austins and Mavins Roads; she noted that there is already pressure on Vicarage Hill from a nursery.

Mr D Munro, in whose division the locations in question are situated, believed that it is now recognised throughout the area that action is needed. There is a shared wish to remove commuter parking but, at this stage no clear consensus on solutions to the safety concerns; even if additional parking spaces were to become available at the station, solutions for street-parking would need to be found. Mr Munro's hope was that the proposed wide consultation would deepen understanding and take all the relevant factors into account.

Members supported the view that consultation should be as wide as possible, but some supported the suggestion that the safety concerns in Little Austins and Mavins Roads and the pressure on Great Austins (which is regularly used by heavy goods vehicles and coaches) are so severe that implementation of restrictions in Little Austins and Mavins Roads should be taken forward now.

It was also noted that the successive displacement of drivers parking all day could perhaps be addressed by improved bus services.

Following discussion as to the timescale of the proposed area-wide consultation it was proposed from the chair that its outcome should be reported to the meeting of the committee on 11 December 2015. This amended recommendation was put to the vote and agreed by ten votes to two, with three abstentions; this decision is reflected in resolution (iv).

Members were satisfied with the remainder of the proposals contained within the review. In relation to **Borough Road** and **South Hill**, Godalming, Mr S Cosser supported consultation in a wider area, but did not start from the presumption that restricted parking is desirable.

Officers introduced an additional proposal involving restrictions in the vicinity of Grayswood Primary School, Lower Road, Grayswood. This was agreed by the committee and contained within resolutions (i) and (iii).

**Resolved that:**

- (i) The proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in Annex A are agreed, along with a further proposal to provide additional or extended "School Keep Clear" markings and/or double yellow lines outside Grayswood Primary School (details to be agreed by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the chairman, vice-chairman and local

member prior to advertisement of the final restriction layout as part of this parking review).

- (ii) Funding is allocated as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report to proceed with the introduction of the parking amendments.
- (iii) The intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on-street parking restrictions in Waverley as shown on the drawings in Annex A of the report, and adjacent to Grayswood Primary School (as set out in (i)) is advertised and that, if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.
- (iv) The consultation proposed in section 3.3 of the report in relation to Little Austins Road, Mavins Road and adjacent roads (Farnham) be undertaken in response to the petition received by the committee at its meeting on 20 March 2015 and the outcome reported to the committee at its meeting on 11 December 2015.

### **Reason**

The proposed on-street parking restrictions 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

### **22/15 RESPONSE TO PETITION: REQUEST FOR SAFETY MEASURES, GRAYSWOOD ROAD, HASLEMERE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]**

[The item was taken before Item 7.]

The Chairman invited Mr W Johnson to comment on the proposed action relating to safety measures on Grayswood Road, Haslemere, in response to the petition he presented at the meeting on 20 March 2015.

In response to outstanding concerns, the Area Highways Manager reassured petitioners that a review would be conducted to determine whether the suggested pedestrian crossing meets the relevant criteria and that the feasibility of hard-wiring the Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) adjacent to Three Gates Lane is being taken forward along with the additional northbound VAS.

**Resolved** to agree the proposed response.

### **Reason**

The committee is required to respond to petitions.

## **23/15 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]**

The Area Highways Manager provided two addenda to the published report for inclusion in the programme:

- The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding has upheld the committee's decision made in December 2014 to reduce the speed limit to 30mph on the A283 Petworth Road, Milford between the Cherry Tree roundabout and the existing 30 mph speed limit near Milford Heath Road; the limit will be introduced on an experimental basis and engineers will assess its impact after implementation.
- The zebra crossing in Station Road, Bramley which is funded by St Catherine's School.

The Chairman noted that for a variety of reasons, e.g. weather conditions in previous years and insufficient design and contractor capacity, implementation of schemes is running significantly behind schedule. She asked task groups to consider rebalancing their priorities for 2016-17 towards maintenance (including pavements). Members remained concerned about delays in agreed schemes and the damage to credibility incurred; Ms D Le Gal undertook to raise the concern at Cabinet.

### **Resolved to:**

- (i) Note progress and outturn cost for the 2014/15 programme of highway works funded by this committee and described at Annex 1 of the report.
- (ii) Note progress of the 2015/16 programme of highway works funded by this committee and external sources and described at Annex 2 of the report.
- (iii) Agree to extend the 30mph speed limit on the A286 Grayswood Road on the approach to Haslemere approximately 200m to the north as part of the gateways improvement scheme for the town.

### **Reason**

The committee has requested regular reports on the progress of its programme and associated budgets. Recommendation (iii) is intended to improve road safety at the junction of the A286 with Three Gates Lane and Church Lane, Haslemere.

[Mrs N Barton left the meeting.]

## **24/15 REVIEW OF COLD WEATHER PLAN AND WINTER SERVICE ARRANGEMENTS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 10]**

The committee agreed that there was no need to change the salting routes in Waverley, although members were reminded that it is possible if required to exchange roads on a like-for-like basis. Arrangements for extending the service to member-funded grit-bins were noted.

**Resolved** to note the current highways cold weather provision and operations in Waverley and request that its feedback be passed to officers.

## **Reason**

The report gave the Local Committee the opportunity to provide feedback into the annual review of winter service operations.

### **25/15 REVIEW OF TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL APPOINTMENTS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]**

#### **Resolved:**

- (i) That the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Task Group should continue for the council year 2015-2016 reporting to this committee.
- (ii) That the following Local Task Groups should continue for the council year 2015-2016 reporting to the LTP Task Group on transportation funding priorities and directly to the committee on other matters:  
  
Farnham  
Godalming, Milford and Witley  
Haslemere and Western Villages  
Cranleigh and Eastern Villages
- (iii) That the Terms of Reference set out at Annex 1 of the report for the Task Groups established in (i) and (ii) should be confirmed.
- (iv) That the Youth Services Task Group should continue for the year 2015-2016, reporting to the committee and subject to the Terms of Reference set out in Annex 3 of the report
- (v) To agree that the membership of the task groups for the council year 2015-2016 should be as set out at Annex 2 of the report and that representation from relevant partner agencies should be sought.
- (vi) To appoint Mrs Nikki Barton to be Champion for the County Council's Family Friends and Communities initiative for the council year 2015-16.

## **Reason**

The task groups support the Local Committee in carrying out specific aspects of its work. The role of Family, Friends and Communities Champion would assist the Committee in understanding the work of Adult Social Care and multi-agency activity to promote well-being in Waverley.

### **26/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE COMMUNITY SAFETY BUDGET 2015-16 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]**

#### **Resolved that:**

- (i) The community safety budget of £3,337 that has been delegated to the Local Committee be transferred to the Safer Waverley Partnership for the

purpose of addressing the criteria and monitoring requirements detailed in paragraph 1.3 of this report.

- (ii) The Community Partnership Manager authorises this expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision.

**Reason**

The County Council is a statutory member of the community safety partnership, known as the Safer Waverley Partnership. The Council values partnership working that will make a positive contribution to local projects and activities that will create a safer community for Waverley residents.

**27/15 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2015-16 (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 13]**

It was requested that air quality be added to the programme and that the timescale for receipt of the report on HGVs in rural areas be clarified.

**Resolved** to note the Forward Programme for 2015/16, as outlined in Annex 1 of the report and to request the inclusion of the additional items proposed.

**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: 3.50 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank





## LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

# ANNEX 1: PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

26 June 2015

### 1. From Mr Tim Forrest (Chiddingfold Parish Council)

Further to the response at Annex 3 of the March Local Committee minutes, the suspension of any further implementation of high speed broadband in the rural areas of Surrey is of great concern to the large number of residents without high speed broadband. I understand that submissions from broadband suppliers were received as part of the Open Market Review carried out by Surrey County Council at the end of last month. Is the Committee now able to say if there are any indications of a feasible solution coming forward that will provide a reliable high speed service to the several thousand residents in rural parts of Waverley, who currently either do not have an acceptable standard of high speed broadband or are being encouraged by BT / Openreach to fund a high speed service out of their own pockets at a cost of more than £1,000 per household ? If they are not able to give such an indication, can they confirm the review program is still on target to go to public consultation on the new intervention areas in the autumn ?

#### Response

Surrey County Council has embarked on an Open Market Review (OMR) and will be seeking State Aid Approval for plans to further extend broadband coverage across the county within the constraints of available funding following a process laid down by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK).

The first stage of the OMR, which involved requesting current and future broadband coverage information from existing infrastructure providers, has finished and the checking process has commenced. This will take a number of weeks and, once the broadband coverage and speed responses are analysed, a map will be produced and uploaded to the Superfast Surrey website as part of the public consultation process. This stage, which is likely to be during Autumn 2015, will be the opportunity for residents, businesses as well as any other infrastructure providers to contact the Superfast Surrey team by email to provide additional information that may further inform the understanding of broadband

coverage across the County.

Following this consultation phase, the Superfast Surrey team will then agree with BT Group, as part of the existing contract and within the constraints of available funding, how to target those areas identified as not having current or proposed broadband coverage or access to download speeds of 15 Mbps or above. The proposed deployment must be signed off by Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK) as being compliant with State Aid Funding regulations before any deployment can commence.

The OMR, analysis of responses, mapping, public consultation and development of a new deployment plan will take many months and whether or not residents who are currently unable to access a fibre service will benefit from any subsequent deployment will not be known until the above process is completed.

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

Surrey County Council (SCC) has invested in computer software to produce bus timetable display information that is specific to each bus stop, giving "times of buses from this stop to . . ." information; this has started to replace conventional bus timetable information displayed at bus stops which has generally just been a copy of the full timetable. The provision of details of times from each bus stop is of course more helpful to passengers. The new timetables displayed in the bus stops along the 17 and 18 routes associated with the service changes that were implemented from 24<sup>th</sup> May, however, have taken a backward step in that the timetables for each of the services which both follow the same route to the same destination (Aldershot) are shown as two separate timetables in two different formats. This is confusing and will not help to encourage people to use public transport. In Hampshire Stagecoach has roadside timetable information that gives "times of buses from this stop" by all services which follow the same route in a single comprehensive basis which is obviously far more helpful to passengers. Is the software used by SCC not capable of doing the same thing ?

### **Response**

The "Omnitimes" software used by Surrey County Council to produce Stop Specific bus timetables is capable in some cases of producing combined consolidated versions showing several bus services that run from a particular stop. However, the dataset used by the software is that generated by the bus operator for their own scheduling or electronic registration systems. A stop-specific timetable output is straightforward, for example, with service 18 that follows a linear route between Aldershot and Haslemere. For a service like the 17 that runs in a large loop at its western end around Wrecclesham and Rowledge, the output from the software is not properly reflective of what journey opportunities are possible and the supplier needs to undertake further work to resolve this. For this reason, the service 17 timetable was produced in a different form that would be suitable for all stops in both directions.

The section of route between Farnham town centre and Aldershot (in that direction) lends itself far more easily to having a stop-specific timetable output listing the times of services 17, 18 and 19 together. Of course, this would be a better way of portraying the entire service offer and as soon as time permits it is intended to produce a version in a single combination format. However, previous attempts to combine the 17/18/19 when travelling out of Aldershot have resulted

in passenger confusion within the portrayal, due to the different destinations served south westwards from Farnham.

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

At the last Local Committee (Waverley) meeting I asked the committee to consider a request for two 'missing' street lights in Haslemere, one in Derby Road and one in Weydown Road.

I was told that the request for additional street lighting in Derby Road and Weydown Road would need to be discussed and prioritised at the Haslemere and Western Villages Task Group meeting later in the year with the view to prioritisation for funding in the 2016/17 highways programme. This I am proceeding with.

In addition I was told that the 2015/16 Highways budget of £280,000 had already been fully allocated. However, the notes provided at the meeting stated that £75,000 of that budget remained unallocated. In response to my question at the meeting the Chairman kindly explained that the sum of £75,000 was not unallocated, but had been set aside to cover any of the existing schemes which exceeded their budgeted costs.

My questions for this meeting are:

- (i) How much of that £75,000 'contingency' has already been allocated to those existing schemes, and how much has been allocated to each ?
- (ii) What is the latest estimate for the one additional street light in Sandrock Hill which was originally estimated at £10,000 ?

**Response**

- (i) A Highways update report is brought to each meeting of the committee to provide the latest progress on its programme of highways initiatives and schemes. As individual schemes are designed and priced forecast costs are revised and, as can be seen from the annexes to the update report on today's agenda, can differ significantly from the original estimate. The aim is to complete as many schemes as possible within a financial year while fully expending the overall budget, since underspend may be clawed back. It is prudent to reserve a contingency sum against scheme costs exceeding the original estimates and this is allocated as required to achieve the objectives above.
- (ii) As can be seen at Annex 2 to the Highways update report, the forecast cost remains the same as the original estimate at £10,000. Our lighting contractor, Skanska, has been asked to specify and price the new lighting, but this has yet to be received.

**4. From Mr John Fraser (Waverley BC and Farnham TC: Farnham Upper Hale)**

Two matters relating to road safety in Upper Hale

- (i) A request was made in October 2014 by a resident of Nutshell Lane , Hale, for solar-powered flashing 30mph maximum speed reminders to be

sited on the eastern portion of A3016 Upper Hale Road. When can their installation be expected ?

- (ii) A request on behalf of a resident of Alma Lane, Hale for Surrey County Council (SCC) to consider, approve and install similar solar-powered flashing 30mph maximum speed reminders on the eastern portion of B3005 Alma Lane. We refer SCC to police incident report P15123319 regarding an accident at 1530 hours on 14 May 2015 when a vehicle travelling in excess of 50mph (estimated) left the carriageway, crossed the footpath, demolished 20m of concrete-posted timber fence and entered the garden of her house, narrowly missing school children.

### **Response**

Surrey County Council Highways has been working with Surrey Police in recent months following a number of complaints about speeding on Upper Hale Road and Alma Lane. Speed readings have been taken in Upper Hale Road near Nutshell Lane, and the average speed was recorded at 30 mph. Readings have also been taken in Alma Lane near Bricksbury Hill, with an average recorded speed of 29 mph. Neither measurement suggests that a particular speeding problem exists, although on any road some drivers will exceed the posted limit. Nevertheless, a temporary Vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) has been installed near the Lobster Pot in Upper Hale Road to highlight the 30mph limit and provide reassurance to residents. Another VAS is planned for Alma Lane, which we hope to install in July.