

Minutes of the meeting of the
Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 10.00 am on 13 March 2020
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 Trevor Sadler
- * Cllr George Wilson

* In attendance

OPEN FORUM - INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from: Cllr Peter Clark, Cllr Steve Cosser, Cllr Trevor Sadler.

2/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

Cllr Jerry Hyman had circulated a letter to Members before the meeting commenced, dated 29 November 2010, concerning a Waverley planning application, to clarify comments he made at the previous Local Committee regarding modelling of Farnham Town Centre. The Chairman said that this was not an amendment to the minutes.

Minutes of the Waverley Local Committee on 13 December 2019 were agreed and approved as an accurate record.

3/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr Stephen Spence declared an interest regarding the Rights of Way items on the agenda: he is a member of the Ramblers Association. There were no other declarations of interest.

4/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 4]

The Chairman Mrs Victoria Young announced that the Waverley Local Committee will meet three times during the municipal year 2020/21 – June, November and March. Dates will be circulated soon.

5/20 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 Mr Malcolm Carter of the Beacon Hill Focus Group which contained 152 signatures and read:

"We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Change the speed limit to 30mph on the A287 through Beacon Hill.

We represent the residents of Beacon Hill village. We petition SCC to change the speed limit through the village to 30mph from the current 40mph. This is a village that has bus stops which the aged, disadvantaged and children use as well as access to essential services including the village school. This is the only village between Farnham and Haslemere where traffic is allowed to drive at 40mph through a built up area. We believe that as more people are cycling or walking that this is required urgently."

The petitioner spoke for the allotted three minutes and circulated some photographs to the Committee to illustrate his points, which included:

- “40 mph areas are seldom checked by the police for speeding vehicles.
- This has become a popular cyclist route.
- There is now a greater concern for the environment. Slower speed can only support this.
- This whole stretch of road is bordered by areas of outstanding natural beauty, so please help residents to do their part as a community.”

The petition response report was presented by the Senior Highway Engineer, on behalf of the Area Highway Manager.

Member discussion – key points:

The local divisional Member, Mr David Harmer, said that the 2020/21 highway money had already been allocated to Western Villages. The Senior Highway Engineer believed that a speed survey had now taken place on the A287 at Beacon Hill and he would forward the results to Mr Harmer.

The Chairman proposed that the petition subject be added to the Local Committee Decision Tracker, to monitor any progress. Members agreed.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

It would be at the discretion of the Western Villages Divisional Member Cllr David Harmer and this committee to prioritise and fund a scheme as part of the 2020/21 highway works programme.

6/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

Five Written Public Questions were received from:

- 1) Maxine Gale, Waverley Borough Councillor for Milford
- 2) Julian Wilson
- 3) Zoe Collier
- 4) Kathy Smyth
- 5) Phillip Law.

The questions and answers were published on the SCC Waverley Local Committee web pages before the 13 March Local Committee and were available at the meeting. The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1: Supplementary Question – Cllr Gale

“Are SCC the riparian owners of the said bridge? In which case, according to the riparian owners fact sheet, you should keep it clear to allow the free flow of water. If they are not the owner, who is and have they been in contact with them?”

The Area Highway Manager replied that he assumes SCC would be the riparian owner as it is a highway over the river. Unprecedented rainfall has hindered the work programme. Highways has been in touch with the Environment Agency but is unable to start work until the river level goes down. Machinery is required to remove the silt from under the bridge. Cllr Gale asked if funding was available once the weather improves and the Highway Manager replied that there was and that silt would be removed from under the bridge.

Question 4: Supplementary Question – Kathy Smyth, represented by Gillian McCalden

“When can we expect the cleansing team along the lane? The drains and gullies are completely blocked and can’t flow away. We were told it would be by 15 March.”

The Area Highway Manager replied that there has been a delay in the programme due to unprecedented weather, but cleaning would be done within the next three to four weeks.

Cllr Christine Baker asked the Chairman if she could make a comment. Cllr Baker said that she had spoken on the issue at the September 2019 Local Committee and she is alarmed that when things are flagged up with SCC, they are ignored.

Question 5: Supplementary Question – Phillip Law

Mr Law felt that the response did not answer his question. He requested that councillors consider not approving the recommendation at the present time.

The Divisional Member Mr David Harmer stated that he had discussed the matter with both Churt and Frensham Parish Councils.

7/20 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

No member questions were received.

8/20 RIGHT OF WAY: ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH OFF WOODSIDE ROAD, CHIDDINGFOLD (OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL FUNCTIONS) [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: Mr Stephen Spence declared that he is a member of the Ramblers Association.

Officer in attendance: Daniel Williams, SCC Countryside Access Officer.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

The Chairman reminded those present that there can be no public questions or petitions on the rights of way matters under discussion and that no new evidence can be presented at this stage.

One person registered to speak against the proposal in advance of the meeting.

Mr Haroon Khan, representing Reside Developments Ltd, spoke for the allotted three minutes against the proposal. He believed that the legal requirement had not been met.

The Countryside Access Officer presented the report and answered Member questions, noting that the legal requirement suggested by Mr Khan was the wrong one and that the Council did have a duty to examine the evidence.

Member discussion – key points:

- The officer was commended for the report and his explanation regarding the objections.
- Members believed that local residents wanted the proposal to be approved by this Committee.
- The history of footpath evidence helped persuade Members, including the Divisional Member, to approve the proposal.

The Chairman asked Members to vote on the recommendations:

- 1) 14 for
- 2) 0 against
- 3) 0 abstained

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

- i) Public Footpath rights are recognised over the route shown on drawing no. 3/1/4/H27 as alleged Public Footpath no. 557, Chiddingfold between points A – B – C – D – E and that a Map Modification Order under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 be made to modify the Definitive Map and Statement for Surrey.
- ii) In the event of the County Council being directed to make a Map Modification Order by the Secretary of State following an appeal by the claimant, the County Council as surveying authority will adopt a neutral stance at any Public Inquiry or Hearing, making all the evidence available to help the Inspector determine the case.

9/20 RIGHT OF WAY: FOOTPATH NOS. 64 AND 65 (ELSTEAD) PROPOSED DIVERSION (OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL FUNCTIONS) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: Mr Stephen Spence declared that he is a member of the Ramblers Association.

Officer in attendance: Daniel Williams, SCC Countryside Access Officer.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

The Chairman reminded those present that there can be no public questions or petitions on the rights of way matters under discussion and that no new evidence can be presented at this stage.

Three people registered to speak in advance of the meeting: two against the proposal and one in support.

David O'Connell spoke for the allotted three minutes against the proposal. He asked the Committee if SCC had properly surveyed the footpath. He believed that the proposed diversion was in the landowner's interest rather than in the public interest and that they had illegally obstructed part of footpath 65.

Julie Edwards was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. Due to the current health situation, as an exception the Chairman agreed to read out Julie Edwards' statement against the proposal, that she had sent via email. Mrs Edwards was concerned that future erosion of the river had not been fully considered and that the route of her permissive footpath should be considered instead.

Pat Murphy, Chairman, Elstead Parish Council, spoke for the allotted three minutes in support of the proposal. He believed that local residents were in favour of the proposed diversion on this popular route and that the diversion was in the public interest.

The Countryside Access Officer presented the report, arguing that overall this diversion order was the most sensible way to deal with the issue in one package, and he answered Member questions.

Member discussion – key points:

- Would people still be able to walk between B and C on the map? The officer replied that erosion on the river bend north of B is likely to worsen where two small waterways enter the river and are crossed by bridges. The proposal would mean that much of B - C would no longer be available.
- Is there any advantage to the landlord in the property by C, on the B – C section of the diversion? The officer replied that the landlord's property is just east of C. However, the landowner is objecting to the diversion proposal, so that would indicate that the proposed diversion is not particularly in her interest.
- The Divisional Member noted that the river constantly moves and the proposed diversion would give the probability of a long lasting route.

The Chairman asked Members to vote on the recommendations:

- 1) 14 for
- 2) 0 against
- 3) 0 abstained

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

A diversion order is made under section 119 of the Highways Act 1980 to divert Public Footpath Nos. 64 and 65 (Elstead) as shown on Drawing No. 3/1/8/H20a, and that if any objections are received and maintained to the Order that it is submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination.

10/20 SCC DEPUTY LEADER COLIN KEMP: SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS (SERVICE MONITORING & ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) (AGENDA ITEM ONLY) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None.

Presenter: SCC Deputy Leader Colin Kemp.

Officer in attendance: None.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

Mr Kemp provided information on Surrey Infrastructure Plans and an overview of Transport Development Planning (TDP) in Surrey County Council and how it operates.

The Chairman left the meeting at the start of the item and the Vice Chairman took the Chair.

Discussion included:

- Schemes are being identified as part of a Surrey infrastructure study, which will include local interests and smaller projects. SCC will work with all districts and boroughs.

- A 25 year plan is aimed for, with long term planning and short term action.
- Project managers will be brought in to work with Highways officers.
- Members requested that officers use local Members' knowledge.
- Farnham highway issues have been going on for years and the newly formed Farnham Project Board has been welcomed. Infrastructure planning would have been very welcomed before the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan was in place.
- Members welcomed change and hoped it is in a green direction. There is a challenge to reduce omissions in Surrey. There are air quality issues. SCC needs to lead the way for society's health and wellbeing and encourage more walking and cycling.
- Members said that infrastructure needs to be planned before housing development. In the Waverley Plan the east of the Borough will take 40% of Waverley's housing, in an area with only one main road route, no main town and no railway station.
- Could there be an electric tram or guided bus corridor?
- SCC is lobbying heavily to gain funding and needs to have detailed infrastructure plans in place for when funding may be available.
- There was an explanation regarding the body 'Transport for the South East'. Membership is spread across the region and includes SCC.

The Vice Chairman thanked Mr Kemp for attending and providing useful information to prompt future discussion.

Cllr Carole Cockburn left the meeting.

11/20 WAVERLEY ON-STREET PARKING REVIEW 2020 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None.

Officer in attendance: Jack Roberts, Engineer, Parking Strategy & Implementation Team.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

The officer introduced the item and informed Members that there had been over 130 requests regarding parking restrictions since the last on-street parking review.

- Members expressed their thanks to the officer and were in support of the proposals.
- Any resident concerns such as yellow lines can be made known during the 28 day consultation, when views and objections can be lodged – reference paragraph 4.3.
- The Vice Chairman asked the Chairmen of Churt and Frensham Parish Councils, who were present at the meeting in the public gallery, if he should withdraw Jumps Road from the resident consultation, referencing the written question received earlier in the meeting during item 6. They both replied 'no'.

- It was explained in answer to a Member query that any new parking request should be made to the SCC Parking Team so it can be considered for the following on-street parking review, due in June 2021.
- A Member felt that Network Rail should take more responsibility for commuter parking issues in Godalming and Farncombe.
- Members requested that SCC parking enforcement officers work more closely with Waverley Council. The Vice Chairman offered to talk to Godalming Members outside of the meeting to try to address Godalming parking issues.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE 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
- (ii) funding in the 2020/21 financial year will be required to implement the parking amendments and the committee will need to contribute a maximum of £9,000 from the 2018/19 parking surplus - as detailed in paragraph 5.1
- (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 is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made
- (iv) 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.

Reason: It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annex A. 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

Cllr Mark Merryweather left the meeting.

12/20 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None.

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

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

- Amendment: Page 94 – the table should be in paragraph 2.1.4, not 2.1.5.
- Amendment: Page 96 – 2.2.11: the figures in the first two lines of the table should read £66,240 (not £72,000) and £25,760 (not £28,000).
- Point of clarification: paragraph 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 – there is a distinction between Capital and Capital Maintenance in the budget allocation.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE:

- (i) To note the committee approved allocations and works progressed during 2019/20.
- (ii) To approve the recommendations made in this report for utilising the available highways budget for 2020/21. (Paragraph 2.1.3 - 2.1.5 refers.)
- (iii) To approve advertising for the proposed new signal crossing that is to be located outside of Woolmer Hill School on Woolmer Hill Road, Haslemere.
- (iv) To delegate to the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member, the ability to resolve any problems encountered, to facilitate scheme delivery throughout the year.

Reason: The committee is asked to agree the recommendations to enable progression of works orders and expenditure of the Committee budget during 2020/21.

13/20 CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT UPDATE TO COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None.

Officer in attendance: None.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

The report was provided for information. The Vice Chairman suggested that if Members have any queries on the report, they direct them to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport, Matt Furniss.

Members requested that this item be moved up the agenda for the next Local Committee meeting.

The Local Committee (Waverley) AGREED to note the briefing.

14/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer in attendance: Yvette Ortel, Partnership Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

Regarding the petition response from 13 December 2019 Local Committee, Mr Peter Martin confirmed that he has been informed the vehicle activated signs in Portsmouth Road would be installed in April 2020.

The Local Committee (Waverley) resolved to AGREE that:

Decision tracker items shall remain 'open'.

15/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2020-21 [Item 15]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officer in attendance: Yvette Ortel, Partnership Committee Officer

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None.

Member discussion – key points:

Dr Andrew Povey requested it be recorded that there had not been any consultation with Members regarding reducing the number of future meetings. It was suggested that this had been part of a presentation to the Local Committee at its informal meeting on 31 January 2020.

The forward programme was agreed. In addition, the following item was suggested:

- A discussion on the 2020-21 dates of the Waverley Local Committee.

A briefing session on the differences between local committees and joint committees was requested for an Informal/Private meeting.

16/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 16]

To be held on Friday 19th June 2020 at 10am in the Waverley Borough Council Chamber, The Burys, Godalming GU7 1HR.

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

Meeting ended at: 1.03 pm

Chairman



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY) 13 March 2020

Minutes Annex A: OPEN FORUM - PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Questions were received from:

1. Andrew Bolton

“Parking in the lower part of Frith Hill Road and Chalk Road – at an earlier meeting this committee agreed to introduce some parking restrictions, there seems to have been a delay. Can we have an update?”

Answer from Jack Roberts, Engineer, SCC Parking Team

“The agreed and advertised double yellow lines for Frith Hill Road and Chalk Road are still due for installation, but there has been a delay. Whilst most of the Frith Hill Road lines have been installed, the more crucial part towards the bottom of the hill is still due to be finished and Chalk Road has not yet been started. A bottleneck in ordering lines around the county, as well as the persistent wet weather since last autumn, has meant that many new parking review lines have not been completed as quickly as normal. There are several unfinished locations in Waverley but also in other boroughs as a result of this. This is in addition to the usual persistent parking issues seen where new restrictions are due.

The current situation is that many outstanding lining locations in Waverley are due to be swept by the borough council, in advance of 'out of hours' visits by our lining gang now that the evenings are getting lighter. I apologise for the long delay since these restrictions were agreed but it should hopefully not be too much longer before everything is completed, and that applies to other locations in Godalming and Waverley too.”

2. Andrew Bolton

“Charterhouse Road and Twycross Road junction – there is a roundabout, some members will be aware of this on the main road from the A3 into Godalming. The roundabout can be misused by motorists disobeying normal rules of the road. An on site meeting took place recently with local residents, officers and members. Can we have an update on improvements and their timetable?”

Answer from Adrian Selby, Senior Engineer, SCC Highways

“Following the meeting with the Frith Hill Residents Association, Surrey Highways carried out a speed survey on the Hurtmore Road on the approach to the Twycross

Road roundabout. The average speed was 32 mph. Highway Officers reported these findings to the Police, who are responsible for enforcing the local speed limits. The Police suggested that the average speed was within the permitted tolerances and that it was not deemed a cause of concern and that the Police would not prioritise this site for enforcement.

Some additional engineering measures were suggested during the site meeting, however, funding to carry out the work has not yet been identified. It would be at the discretion of Cllr Rivers whether she wished to prioritise the additional measures.”

3. Betty Ames

“Mine is a question of the principles of this Committee. When please are we going to be looking at the review long promised of the terms of reference of this Committee and in particular our interface with our neighbouring boroughs and counties and county principles interfacing the Health and Wellbeing Board, which has been promised for so long and still isn’t on the agenda. This is a very valued Committee and is much respected by the public. We really need to make the most of our links with the public.”

The Chairman asked the SCC Deputy Leader, Colin Kemp, to answer

Mr Kemp said that SCC is again reviewing local committees being transferred into joint committees, which has taken place in some Surrey areas. The work is on-going to look at the committees and how they can be made more relevant locally and across the area. In Waverley there is some continuity as the local Highways Manager also looks after neighbouring Guildford. If there is to be a joint committee the Borough needs to be on board as well. SCC will keep it under review.

Mr David Harmer added that the Waverley Local Committee is a committee of the county council to which certain powers are delegated and Waverley Members are equal partners from a voting point of view, but the committee is subject to the general rules of the county council. The discussion that has taken place is regarding various possibilities. Waverley Council and SCC could take a joint committee forward if they so wished. There is a separate discussion taking place looking at wider possibilities involving other public bodies and this could be a complicated discussion that needs further thought. Issues such as how to govern such arrangements are not straightforward, so this discussion could take some time. The government may also have views regarding how local government should be modified.