

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 10.30 am on 27 September 2019  
at Waverley Borough Council Chamber, The Burys, Godalming GU7 1HR.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mrs Victoria Young (Chairman)
- \* Mr David Harmer (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mrs Nikki Barton
- \* Mr Andy MacLeod
- \* Mr Peter Martin
- \* Dr Andrew Povey
- \* Mr Wyatt Ramsdale
- \* Mrs Penny Rivers
- \* Mr Stephen Spence

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Christine Baker
- \* Cllr Peter Clark
- \* Cllr Carole Cockburn
- \* Cllr Steve Cosser
- \* Cllr John Gray
- \* Cllr Jerry Hyman
- \* Cllr Mark Merryweather
- \* Cllr Liz Townsend
- \* Cllr George Wilson

\* In attendance

---

**OPEN FORUM - INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**28/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Mrs Penny Rivers and Cllr Steve Cosser.

**29/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

Minutes of the Waverley Local Committee on 28 June 2019 were agreed and approved as an accurate record.

**30/19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**31/19 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]**

The Chairman reminded Members that Cllr Colin Kemp, Deputy Leader for Surrey County Council, was asked through the Committee, whether the

County were prepared to undertake a feasibility study into the Guildford Society's proposals for a new road link between Dunsfold and the A3 at Milford.

Councillor Kemp provided an update on his investigations into this matter, which the Chairman read out, and asked for it to be minuted:

"In response to the question on a possible by-pass from the A281 to the A3: I have read a lot of paperwork and had many conversations on this matter to get a true understanding of the issue.

On the main point of the question which was a relief road, I believe the environmental and local impact would be too great and don't believe this could be delivered and should not be pursued any further.

Having said that it has become clear to me that with all the planned developments around this area we need to look at the road network and identify pinch points through the route and see if there are any local improvement schemes that would ease congestion and then see if we can identify funding for these. I am sorry if this caused concern but I don't believe in saying no just because somebody else did, if I am asked a question I will always consider evidence before giving a formal response."

### **32/19 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Frank Apicella, Area Highway Manager (South West).

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** One petition.

A petition was received from Cllr David Beaman, Waverley Borough and Farnham Town Councillor, which contained 327 signatures and read:

*"We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to erect a safe Pedestrian Crossing in the area of Longbridge, Farnham, from near Hawthorn Lodge (GU9 7GG) towards Gostrey Meadow. This has been a difficult road to cross for some time, particularly for those less nimble on their feet or those with pushchairs or small children. Since the erection of the Retirement Apartments at Hawthorn Lodge GU9 7GG considerably more people are at risk as many of the residents have mobility issues and a significant number of them use wheelchairs or walking aids. Pushing these wheelchairs or walking aids across the roads in this area is extremely dangerous as there have already been a number of falls in the road whilst hurrying to avoid oncoming traffic and many other close escapes, making this not just an inconvenience but an urgent Health and Safety matter."*

The petitioner spoke for the allotted three minutes. The petition response report was presented by the Area Highway Manager.

#### **Member discussion – key points:**

It was noted that the redevelopment of Farnham requires a masterplan in place. Although there was sympathy for residents, Members felt that the case would need to be looked at in light of the whole area. A Farnham wide approach was needed to ensure focus and best use of resources.

The Local Committee resolved to AGREE:

To note the response, which was originally provided as an answer to a Written Question at the 22 March 2019 Waverley Local Committee.

### **33/19 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

Five Written Public Questions were received from Waverley Borough and Farnham Town Councillor David Beaman; Witley Parish Council; Mr Peter Goodman; & Ward Councillors Follows and Rosoman who asked 2 questions.

The questions and answers were published on the SCC Waverley Local Committee web pages before the 27 September Local Committee and were available at the meeting. The following supplementary questions were asked:

#### **Question 4 – Supplementary Question**

Who will pay for the alterations needed in order for the rising bollards to work properly?

#### Response to supplementary question:

The Area Highway Manager replied that further conversations with Waverley Borough Council would be needed regarding removing the blocks and setts, but that the signals team would be able to pay for the bollard upgrade.

#### **Question 5**

No supplementary question was asked, however concerns were raised over the cuts to services and Members asked that Mary Lewis, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, be invited to speak to Waverley Borough Council.

### **34/19 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

Two Written Member Questions were received from Cllr Peter Clark and Cllr Jerry Hyman.

The questions and answers were published on the SCC Waverley Local Committee web pages before the 27 September Local Committee and were available at the meeting.

#### **Question 2 – Supplementary Question**

Cllr Hyman asked: "Why can't we see the paramics model that Crest Nicholson has used?"

It was noted that the model itself is not publicly available as it is a computer programme using specialist transport planning software. It is a mathematical model. A 'graphical user interface' can allow the modeller to view the results of the mathematical algorithms. It is that information, together with the analysis of the maths sitting behind it, that the modeller uses to interpret the results.

From this, the modeller produces a written report and it is this report that is publicly available. The reason the model itself is not publicly available is because it runs on specialist software (that can cost thousands of pounds) and requires training on how to run it. The report is therefore the best way of disseminating the results.

**35/19 HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN - FOR DISCUSSION) (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 8]**

This item was deferred.

**36/19 HINDHEAD TUNNEL UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Matthew Salt, Team Leader - Service Manager Maintenance, Highways England.

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None.

**Member discussion – key points:**

Highways England gave an excellent update on the Tunnel closures – both planned and unplanned and the detail was welcomed by Councillors.

**A325 Wrecclesham Road bridge**

Data showed that there was no direct correlation with the tunnel closures and the bridge at Wrecclesham being hit (this was the subject of a written question earlier in the meeting).

The officer confirmed that he had carried out a full comparison of the bridge strike data and the Hindhead Tunnel Incident Register.

The dates of the known 39 strikes were reviewed to see whether they coincided with a date that the diversion route was implemented due to either planned or unplanned work. Below is a summary:

- There were 3 full bore closures on dates that matched, the average duration of these closures were 7 minutes. Traffic would have been held at the entry to the tunnel, the diversion route was not used as it is only considered for incidents that last 30 minutes or more.
- There were 14 incident plans active on dates that match; on 10 dates there was lane closures in place, on 1 date the tunnel was running at 40 mph. For 1 date, closure details could not be confirmed.
- 22 Bridge Strikes do not match dates on the register.

Therefore, from this analysis the officer concluded that there is no link between bridge strikes occurring as a result of the diversion route being active, following either a planned or unplanned incident at the tunnel.

**Future Technology Schemes**

The officer gave an overview of future schemes that Highways England are delivering at the tunnel:

- Uninterrupted Power Supply - manages the power supply to the tunnel and its batteries acts as a backup should there be a power fault.

- Obsolete Beldin Switch Solution – replacement of switches.
- Obsolete Kenton Modem Solution - replacement of switches.
- Hindhead Diversion Route Signs – Installing Variable Message Signs to replace the fixed text signage on the A3. This will give more flexibility over the messages that can be displayed to the public.
- Wig-Wag Replacement – replace the barrier on tunnel approaches. Unlikely to happen before March 2020, due to procurement.
- Repeater Signs – replacement of speed signs within the tunnel bores.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

- (i) Highways England continued commitment to ensuring operational improvements are made at the tunnel through maintenance and renewal schemes.
- (ii) Highways England and its Service Provider, Kier, have robust measures in place to manage planned bore closures and full closures of the tunnel.
- (iii) Highways England will continue to work with its stakeholders to ensure they have correct and up to date information relating to Hindhead Tunnel.

### **37/19 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** Frank Apicella, Area Highway Manager (South West).

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None.

#### **Member discussion – key points:**

On the Section 106 list, it was noted that Upper Hale did not include the £50,000 allocation from Folly Hill for a traffic island on Upper Hale Road and this would be investigated. The £1.1million from Bordon also needed to be included.

The S106 funds for Cranleigh were welcomed and parish councillors were looking forward to working with the Borough on investments in the High Street. £40,000 had been agreed for Crest Nicholson to undertake a feasibility study and councillors reiterated the need for work to be in keeping with the Conservation area status of Cranleigh High Street. The need to link the Downs Link path with any cycle routes was also stressed.

It was noted that Highways would be developing a strategy for planting trees and hedges but needed to be mindful of vehicle sightlines. Local knowledge was key and joint work with the Borough would be needed.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE:

- (i) To note the committee approved allocations and works being progressed during 2019/20.

**38/19 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION)  
[Item 11]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None.

**Officer in attendance:** None

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE:

- (i) One Surrey County Council Member (Andy MacLeod) be appointed to the 40 Degreez Centre for Young People, Farnham, as detailed in the report, section 2.2.
- (ii) The Member be allowed to bring update reports from the 40 Degreez Centre, when relevant.

**39/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer in attendance:** Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Partnership Committee Officer

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

Decision tracker items shall remain 'open'.

**40/19 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2019-20 [Item 13]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer in attendance:** Nikkie Thornton-Bryar, Partnership Committee Officer

**Petitions, Public Questions/Statements:** None.

The forward programme was agreed, with the following additions:

- 20mph speed limits.
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy to come to the next informal meeting on 8 Nov.
- Highways England to be invited to an informal / formal regarding the A3.

**41/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 14]**

To be held on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2019 at 10am in the Waverley Borough Council Chamber, The Burys, Godalming GU7 1HR.

(10am – 10.30am: Open Public Questions Forum)

Meeting ended at: 12.03 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank



## SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY) 27 Sept 2019

### **Minutes Annex A: OPEN FORUM - PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

One question was received from a Waverley resident:

1. *Barry Hartop, Farnham Resident*

“20 is plenty for us

I have held a number of Private Sector appointments and have also been a senior civil servant in both Conservative and Labour Administrations

I understand that most of the request to Surrey County Council asking for some speed reduction measures (41 petitions countywide received by the Council in the last 5 years) have failed to materialise in any results on the ground.

Surrey County Council’s own policy – Setting Local Speed Limits – dated 2014 states “within the latest central government guidance issued by the Department of Transport (Circular 01 – 2013) there is greater encouragement for local authorities to introduce more 20mph schemes (limits and zones) in urban areas and built up village streets that are primary residential, to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists”.

It would seem that policy and practice are not aligned.

In the light of this apparent failure to adequately respond to the concerns of residents across the County, are Surrey County Councillors worried that they may be voted out of office at the next election, as evidenced by the recent changes in the political makeup of both Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils?

I am reluctant to gain a greater understanding by asking for a Freedom of Information analysis of these 41 petitions as this would take up valuable Officer time and resource.

I do ask for firm reassurance that in future in this area that practice is aligned with Policy. Also to understand the actions that will be taken and the Officials responsible for fully implementing the SCC Policy.

Should the reason for the non-alignment be obstructive officials rather than an informal move by the Council to sideline its own policy, then they should be instructed to properly implement Council Policy.”

It was noted that there have been some speed reductions implemented. The policy is the backbone which is used in consultation with the Police, who are responsible for

speed enforcement. The Committee decides these on a case by case basis, based on justification, impact and funding implications.

The Chairman replied that she would consider 20mph speed limits as a future agenda item.