

Minutes of the meeting of the
Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 10.00 am on 26 March 2021
at REMOTE.

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

Surrey County Council Members:

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

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Christine Baker
- * Cllr Carole Cockburn
- * Cllr Steve Cosser
- * Cllr John Gray
- * Cllr George Hesse
- * Cllr Jerry Hyman
- * Cllr Mark Merryweather
- * Cllr Trevor Sadler
- * Cllr George Wilson

* In attendance

41/20 PUBLIC FORUM [Item]

A public forum was held prior to the formal meeting. The notes of this are attached to these minutes as Annex A.

42/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllrs Carole Cockburn and George Wilson

43/20 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item2]

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 Nov 2020 were agreed as a true record of the meeting.

44/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations made at the meeting.

45/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item4]

The Chairman stated that this would be her last meeting as a county councillor. She wanted to thank Yvette Ortel for all her help in her role as a Chairman of the committee. In addition, she wanted to wish everyone well in the forthcoming elections.

46/20 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: None.

Officer in attendance: Frank Apicella, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: One, as detailed

A petition was received from Witley Parish Council to “Install a speed VAS and a junction warning VAS, and to implement some improvements to signage, road markings and speed limit locations on the A283, along with some changes to the New Road junction”

The Lead Petitioner, Steve Dale (Witley Parish Council, Lead Member for Highways) introduced the report by stating that residents were concerned about the A283 between Witley and Chiddingfold, including where there is a private access to Orchard Farm.

The 3 Parish Councils expressed a view that they would like a 40mph speed limit through the section of road. He stated that there had been good liaison with Surrey County Council Highways and Surrey Police and 3 speed assessments had been undertaken where the outcomes were that the speed limits were appropriate. However, it was deemed appropriate for VAS signs to be installed. The Parish Councils, would however, still like to see a speed limit reduction. Where the A283 leaves Witley the speed is 30mph, this moves to a 40mph, then 50 mph before reducing to 30mph at Chiddingfold.

There were particular areas of concern:

New Road junction – poor visibility obscured with hedges. Officers recommended a VAS sign to highlight the junction which would be £15,000.

Wormley Hill itself – the crest of the hill – concern with speeding over the crest – Officers suggested moving the 40mph limit to further down the hill and including solid white lines to advise drivers of the situation.

The petitioner noted that although most of the drivers were within the correct speed limits, it would only take one person driving inappropriately to cause an issue.

Peter Martin, divisional member, noted the officers report and supported the VAS signage for the New Road junction and the need to explore how to find the £15,000 required (although the cost seemed

high). He asked Officers to look again at the requests, as could this area could be an exception to the current speed limit policy and the Chair and Vice Chair could ask Cllr Furniss (Cabinet Member) to see whether an exception might be made.

The Chair noted the wish to ask Cllr Furniss to consider this area for an exception. She added that Duncan Knox was leading on a project to lower national speed limits in some areas.

Members also noted that the New Road junction with the A283 was dangerous as sightlines to the south were virtually non-existent and the need for Surrey Police to provide more resources to enforce speed limits.

The local committee agreed:

That the Chair and the Divisional member write to the Cabinet Member (Highways) on this issue.

47/20 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 6]

One written question was received from Nansi Taylor on behalf of the Godalming Soroptimists regarding on street safety.

The written question and the answer given were published on a supplementary agenda.

It was noted that the questioner was happy with the response provided and would pick up the issue with the Community Safety team to see what could be implemented.

It was noted that there were three other questions that were going to receive a response outside of the meeting and these would be referred to the next committee if requested.

48/20 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

3 written member questions were received from:

Cllr John Gray
Cllr Penny Rivers
Cllr Jerry Hyman

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

The following supplementary questions were asked:

Question 1: Supplementary Question from Cllr John Gray

The main thrust of the question was to ask when will this road be repaired and this wasn't answered. The issue was a concern to residents. Last time there were 26 pothole repairs needed, so we would like a greater clarity about looking at an overview of the issues relating to the road.

The Area Highways Manager replied that: this was a tricky site as there were very few opportunities for redirection of traffic if you shut the road, having said this, the team were committed to ensuring that the road was kept in good useable condition.

Question 2: Supplementary Question from Cllr Penny Rivers

Are there any intentions to put up signage at the Brighton Road junction to indicate that the right hand turn is for right turn only. In addition some residents report the green filter arrow for traffic turning right into Wharf Street. I would ask that this is looked into.

Cllr Martin supported the points raised by Cllr Rivers, stating that the junction was dangerous and needed to be reviewed. In addition he mentioned that the traffic flow along Flambard Way was currently working well, but that when traffic flow returned to pre-Covid levels, there would be a need for linked traffic signals. He stated that he didn't feel that Surrey County Council Highways team had been involved in the decisions taken under the S278 for the key development site to an appropriate level.

The Area Highways Manager agreed: to request that the Traffics Signals team look at this and check these issues.

Question 3: Supplementary Question from Cllr Jerry Hyman

"I'm surprised by the answer, that this was a question for the Farnham Board. The proposals mentioned in the question are the key elements about the infrastructure within Farnham, therefore Surrey County Council Highways team should be able to answer the question about the modelling within Farnham."

The Chairman responded reminding Cllr Hyman that the committee had discussed this in depth previously. He had been referred to the Farnham Board as this was the Board that was leading on the infrastructure within the Farnham town, with several members of this committee as members as well as the Leader of the County Council.

It was agreed that the Divisional Member and Cllr Hyman would meet to discuss this issue outside of the committee.

49/20 HIGHWAYS BUDGET UPDATE FOR 2021/22 [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest: None.

Officer in attendance: Frank Apicella, Area Highways Manager.

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

The Chairman introduced the item stating that report set out the proposals for how the highways budget could be allocated for the 2021/22 financial year.

Officers attending:

Frank Apicella, Area Highways Manager
Adrian Selby, Senior Traffic Engineer

Key points made during the discussion:

- The members welcomed the additional funding from Surrey County Council for highways projects in the current financial year and the additional projects that this would support; and would like these to be progressed as quickly as possible for improvements for residents.
- It was recognised that no income had been generated from parking enforcement so there was no parking surplus to be allocated to be used for highways projects.
- There was a discussion about the disparity of funding being allocated to Farnham this year. It was noted that in recognition of the £500k that is being directed towards Farnham at the current time through the Farnham Board, the Farnham members had requested that due to the remainder of the local committee funding be allocated across the rest of Waverley and not in Farnham. Members were supportive of this approach.
- Clarification was requested on the funding that is being spent in Farnham. It was noted that the £500k was being allocated to a project to consult and develop proposals for infrastructure improvements in Farnham. There was a discussion regarding whether this should be transferred to the Farnham Board. It was noted that currently there were smaller projects being carried out in the town, this funding was being held back from previous years to contribute to this larger holistic project. There was a need to transfer the funding so that the projects could be identified and carried out in a timely fashion.
- It was noted that the funding relating to the Farnham area was identified within the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan and was connected with making the most out of the Brightwells development within Farnham.
- It was noted that the annexes to the report could be more linked up and easier to read, and it was accepted that this would be looked into for future meetings.
- Cllr Harmer requested that it was noted that the Area Highways Manager would amend one of the projects in Annex A identified Linkside North to be retitled Linkside, so that this could be allocated against the area along that road most in need.
- Two members abstained from agreeing the recommendations

The Local Committee (Waverley) agreed:

- (i) To note the committee approved allocations and works progressed during 2020/21
- (ii) To agree the recommendations made in this report for utilising the available highways budget for 2021/22. (Paragraph 2.1.8 - 2.1.16 refers.)
- (iii) To agree to allocate the £500,000 parking surplus fund reserved for Farnham to the Farnham Board.
- (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.

50/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

The decision tracker was noted with the following comments:-

Potters Gate school – the funding for this would transfer upon the building of a certain number of houses. An update would be sought for the next committee.

Petition for weight restriction – A survey was carried out in December 2020 – approx. 509 vehicles per day used Salt Lane / Markwick lane, increasing to 547 vehicles weekdays – this included a total of 46 HGVs over the seven day monitoring period. (about 6 HGVs per day in both directions). Of those 46 HGVs, 5 of them were deemed to be carrying out local deliveries. Officers apologised that a full update report had not been provided for the meeting as the data had been delayed coming in and details would be circulated to Members and reported at the next meeting.

Electric Vehicle Charging points – member requested an update at a private meeting, rather than waiting for the next committee.

51/20 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2021-22 [Item 10]

The forward plan was noted, with the following points raised

An update on existing trial for Electric Vehicle charging points would also be added (following private update for Members).

Active travel in Waverley – this needed to include Local Cycling and walking plans.

52/20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

The next meeting of the Waverley local committee would be held on Friday 18 June 2021.

The Chair and Officers were thanked for their work on behalf of all the Members standing down at the next elections.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

Chairman

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

26 March 2021

Minutes Annex A: INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Three questions were asked as follows:

Question 1 - Andrew Bolton, local resident:

It has recently been identified in the press that Godalming Town Council will be requesting a 20mph speed limit across the town. How much would this cost and what would be the timescales involved?"

The Senior Traffic Engineer responded stating that: it would depend on the size and length of the speed limit area proposed. Surrey Police would also need to support any proposals.

An areawide scheme would likely cost in the £10,000s for an initial speed limit assessment. In addition, implementation would require a Traffic Regulation Order and signage in every road where speeds were found to be 24mph or less. If the average speed was higher, then additional speed reduction methods would be required at an additional cost, as well as consultation work and residents approval for the infrastructure required.

The Chairman stated that: Godalming Town Council should consider that they would be looking at roughly £25,000 for an areawide survey and £50,000 - £100,000 for implementation.

Question 2 – Arianna Pisetti, Godalming Cycle Forum

Local people in Godalming will remember the sad death at the Meadow site. I see that there is a scheme for a cycle path at this site. I would like to know what the timescales are for implementation on this scheme and if so, have the Godalming Cycle Forum been consulted?

The Senior Traffic Engineer responded stating that: The Godalming to Guildford Greenway were looking at measures to improve cycle ways across both boroughs and were looking at a feasibility study for the Cattershall junction. Holisitically, it was a high value scheme and proposals were currently in design and as far as he was aware the Cycle Forum were being consulted on the proposals.

Question 3 - Chris Meakes, local resident

Where there are temporary road closures, is there the opportunity for improved signage at the point of diversion so cyclists are clear about how they can navigate the new measures.

The Chairman and Vice Chairman stated that: they had sympathy with the questioner and would like to have clearer signage when temporary changes are in place. However, it is not always possible - as with the Tilford East Bridge closure - due to pressures outside of Surrey County Council's control.

The Area Highways Manager stated that 99.9% of the time, the roads were open for cyclists and pedestrians. Where they were closed, then yes, there should be direction/signage to show where cyclists can navigate the measures.