

Notice of Meeting

Farnham Board

**Date & time**

Friday, 25 March
2022
at 10.00 am

Place

Farnham Town
Council

Contact

Anna Miller, Business Manager
Tel
farnham.boardmeetings@surreycc.gov.uk

The purpose of the Board is to bring partners, residents and businesses together to ensure our deliverables are met and that Farnham maintains its position as a thriving community and town as set out in the adopted Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.

Specifically, the Board will:

1. Consider the Farnham Town Centre, A31 Hickley's Corner and A325 Wrecclesham Infrastructure Schemes, together with any related impacts
2. Determine and agree the specific outcomes and objectives for the Schemes
3. Ensure that the necessary resources from the various partners will be made available in a timely way
4. Set up specific task and finish working groups as required
5. Take evidence and advice from members of the community and representative bodies, as well as professional experts
6. Consider national initiatives and good practice in respect of the proposals to ensure the future prosperity of the town, especially in regard to business, retail, personal wellbeing and climate change
7. Consider and make recommendations on the projects, plans and resources to achieve the agreed outcomes and priorities
8. Seek to secure the capital and revenue investment to deliver agreed projects and plans, including from Government, LEP and other sources
9. Oversee the commissioning, procurement, sponsorship and delivery of agreed projects
10. Take cognisance of other planning and design processes for example the extant Master-planning process, the Waverley Local Plan and the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.

Member	Representing
Borough Councillor Paul Follows	Waverley Borough Council
Mr Jeremy Hunt MP	South West Surrey
County Councillor Matt Furniss	Surrey County Council
County Councillor Andy MacLeod	Surrey County Council
Town Councillor John Neale	Farnham Town Council
County Councillor Tim Oliver	Surrey County Council
County Councillor Michaela Martin	Surrey County Council
County Councillor Catherine Powell	Surrey County Council
Borough Councillor Peter Clark	Waverley Borough Council

AGENDA

- 1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION** (Pages 5 - 6)
 - a) Welcome
- 2 MINUTES OF MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE LAST BOARD** (Pages 7 - 14)
 - a) All to agree
- 3 SHORT AND MEDIUM-TERM INTERVENTIONS UPDATE**
 - a) Overview of completed and in-train interventions
 - b) Overview of next steps and Medium-Term Interventions Pipeline
- 4 TOWN CENTRE AND LCWIP UPDATE**
 - a) Overview of progress to date
 - b) Overview of next steps
 - c) Approach to planned public vote and consultation
- 5 FARNHAM A31 CORRIDOR UPDATE**
 - a) Overview of progress to date
 - b) Overview of next steps
- 6 OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS** (Pages 15 - 22)
 - a) Programme and key milestone update
 - b) Overview of key risks and issues
- 7 ENGAGEMENT**
 - a) Overview of engagement to date
 - b) Overview of future sessions
- 8 QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION**
 - a) Review of questions submitted in advance
- 9 A OB**

The next meeting will be held on Friday 17 June 2022

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive
Published: Date Not Specified

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda

Farnham Board

Date & Time:	25 March 2022, 10:00-11:30
Venue:	Hybrid Meeting - Farnham Town Council Office
Chair:	Cllr Tim Oliver
In attendance:	<p>Board Members Cllr Matt Furniss, Cllr Michaela Martin, Cllr Catherine Powell, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Cllr Paul Follows, Cllr Peter Clark, Cllr John Neale, Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt MP</p> <p>Attendees Tom Horwood, Zac Ellwood, Iain Lynch, Katie Stewart, Lee Parker, Yasmin Ahmed, Simon Duke, Elaine Martin, Chris Greenwood, Katie Ludvigsen</p>
Apologies:	

	Item	Who	Paper
1	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <p>a) Welcome</p>	TO	Verbal
2	<p>Minutes of meeting and matters arising from the last Board</p> <p>a) All to agree</p>	TO	Verbal
3	<p>Short and Medium-Term Interventions update</p> <p>a) Overview of completed and in-train interventions b) Overview of next steps and Medium-Term Interventions Pipeline</p>	EM / SD	Verbal
4	<p>Town Centre and LCWIP update</p> <p>a) Overview of progress to date b) Overview of next steps c) Approach to planned public vote and consultation</p>	EM / SD	Verbal

	Item	Who	Paper
5	Farnham A31 Corridor update a) Overview of progress to date b) Overview of next steps	EM / SD	Verbal
6	Overview of progress a) Programme and key milestone update b) Overview of key risks and issues	EM / SD	Y
7	Engagement a) Overview of engagement to date b) Overview of future sessions	BF	Verbal
8	Questions and discussion a) Review of questions submitted in advance	EM / SD	Verbal
9	AOB The next meeting will be held on Friday 17 June 2022	TO	Verbal

Farnham Board Minutes

Date & Time:	22 December 2021, 10:00-11:30
Venue:	Zoom
Chair:	Cllr Tim Oliver
In attendance:	Cllr Michaela Martin, Cllr Catherine Powell, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Cllr Paul Follows, Cllr Peter Clark, Cllr John Neale, Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt MP.
Observers:	Chris Greenwood, Alex Pye, Tom Horwood, Zac Ellwood, Iain Lynch, Peter Burch, Yasmin Ahmed, Jonathan Foster-Clark, Elaine Martin
Apologies:	

	Item
1	<p>Welcome and Introduction</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone and went through general housekeeping for the meeting and encouraged members to continue to push the message around vaccinations, face coverings and social distancing measures as the case of coronavirus continue to rise. He stressed the impact these cases will have on the NHS.</p>
2	<p>Minutes of the Meeting and Matters Arising from Last Board</p> <p>The Chair flagged that Paula Gough's name had been misspelled in the minutes. Baring this minor change, the minutes were approved.</p>
3	<p>Short and Medium-Term Interventions update</p> <p>Elaine Martin gave an update on project one stating that the signage has now been installed for the rerouting of the HGVS and the traffic regulation orders are now active. Progress is being made with National Highways on the installation of signage on the M3. The team is also working with the developer of the proposed Redfield Lane roundabout to have signage included within their development site.</p> <p>With regards to the reclassification of the A325, this is now been managed by the Department of Transport and the signs and road markings have been completed on site. The reclassification of East and West Street has been reported to Google Maps</p> <p>The Wayfinding Strategy report has been updated following feedback from our partners and the detailed designs now commenced based on the agreed placement strategy.</p> <p>The 20 mph zones and speed restrictions consultation started on the 25th concluding on the 3rd January next year.</p> <p>The medium term interventions pipeline of schemes has now been moderated based on the feedback provided in advance of and at the September board. A grouping and consolidation exercise is now being carried out as well as cost assessments and initial site surveys.</p> <p>Regarding project two; a workshop was held with members and we looked at Downing St, West St, Castle Street, South St, Victoria Road and Union Rd. The key themes emerging from the workshop across all the areas were provision of two way streets, better provision for</p>

	Item
	<p>pedestrians including widening and improved crossings, retention versus reallocation of the car parks away from the town centre. The team has started to engage with architects and started to develop a design scope for the initial options.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Town Centre and LCWIP update</p> <p>Elaine Martin presented the update stating that the next phase of the LCWIP has started following an initial study on the Optimised Infrastructure Plan (OIP); a long list of schemes have been developed.</p> <p>The next step to be taken for the town centre will be a feasibility study, a public consultation on the town centre and corridor provisionally planned for Summer 2022 and an aspirational public vote element mentioned at previous board meetings.</p> <p>Cllr Catherine Powell flagged that signage had not yet been put up on the A30/A331 roundabout which is an area of concern because that links with the signage on the M3 for the primary route.</p> <p>ACTION: Alex Pye responded that he would follow this up with Kier and come back to Cllr Powell with an update.</p> <p>She also asked what the strategy would be for the workshops taking place in the summer and how councillors will be involved. Elaine stated that workshops will take place every fortnight engaging with officers first and then members second.</p> <p>Cllr John Neale commented that the engagement between the town council and SCC could be better; the town council has a lot of influence with local organisations and could help the programme more with better partnership working.</p> <p>He also mentioned that the papers for this meeting state that the A325 rerouting has changed while he has found that the signage still signposts the route through town.</p> <p>Cllr Neale raised several concerns about Castle street including that the Town Council feels that the 20mph scheme should move further up Castle Hill that would improve health and safety and slow the traffic down before it got to Castle Street. He also expressed concerned about any street furniture additions there due to nearby listed buildings and structures. He gave further feedback from the Town Council stating a preference for painted rounders as opposed to speed humps. He recommended a carriageway restriction to strengthen the 20mph zone.</p> <p>Finally, he flagged that the Town Council councillors would like to see the 20mph scheme go to the A31 junction, futher up on the upper Hale area and further east to Queens Road. He concluded with the ask to see more school vicinity areas on the 20mph schemes.</p> <p>ACTION: The Chair thanked Cllr Neale for his comments and stated that Elaine and Simon Duke would pick them up as part of the feedback to the consultation.</p> <p>Jeremy Hunt MP took the opportunity to thank the team and expressed his personal opinion to say that it would be fantastic for Farnham to be a 20mph town for the reduction in pollution and for a simple message to encourage behaviour change. He also flagged that having up to date traffic modelling to inform the consultation would be helpful to express the changing traffic patterns we expect to see and he also strongly advocated for a public consultation trying to get everyone in Farnham’s view about what is being proposed.</p> <p>Simon Duke responded around traffic modelling to say that the model is being built, led by Will Brians as SCC’s Chief Traffic Engineer, and testing scenarios will start from early next</p>

	Item
	<p>year. So information to support those intelligence led decisions will be available for the public consultation for next year.</p> <p>Cllr Catherine Powell raised concerns around the LCWIP route proposed to Farnham Park, particularly the bottom end that comes down into Scholar's Way. A planning application has come in for an alternative route through the Hawthorns which has now made this a time bound issues. Waverly officers are aware of this and she wanted to flag to SCC officers. She also mentioned that the feasibility study on this route and any potential impacts for the Hawthorns development – which she pointed out is not included in the Farnham Neighbourhood Plans and that she would not support – is being prioritised.</p> <p>Cllr Peter Clark spoke on his approval for the plans around the workshops and engagement strategy.</p>
5	<p>Farnham A31 Corridor update</p> <p>Elaine Martin gave some background on this item as the Strategic Outline Business Case has now been submitted. Following on from discussion from September, discussions have been had with the Department of Transport and instead of it just being Hickleys Corner junction, it's actually being extended as a corridor approach from Shepherd and Flock roundabout including Water Lane through Hickleys Corner to the Cox Bridge roundabout.</p> <p>Issues that have been identified in this area are; traffic queuing, pedestrian and cyclist connectivity, air quality and active transport modes being less attractive than the private car. Improvements are then focussed around, easing congestion and delays, creation of transport network with prioritisation of the public transport, increasing cycling conditions and connections, facilitating development in Farnham and the A30 and A325 corridors to provide greater network resilience between the A3 and M3.</p> <p>The Strategic Outline Business Case that was approved at the September Board was submitted in November and served as a starting point with the Department for Transport for discussions and it's designed to secure a place in the SE scheme pipeline. The business case encompasses management, strategic, financial, commercial and economic dimensions and also has a local monitor model validation report, forecast traffic modelling and an option assessment.</p> <p>Next steps are to continue ongoing discussions with Department of Transport (DfT), developing the scope for the outline business case which links the early review of time constraints surveys and continuing transport modelling from Farnham and the wider area.</p> <p>Initial options have been identified and the team have done some engineering feasibility on five cases. These were cross checked with our partners and submitted to the DfT.</p> <p>ACTION: Cllr Catherine Powell asked if it would be possible to create a visual that shows the outputs for the proposals that are in discussion with DfT and how they feed into the work on the town centre, particularly with the LCWIP. Elaine confirmed that this is being worked on.</p>
6	<p>Western Link Road and Wrecclesham Relief Road policy alignment</p> <p>A policy review was undertaken in terms of the bypass alignment with national, regional and local policies and it was found that neither road project, on their own merits, would align with current structure which encourages people to take more sustainable forms of travel. It is, therefore, questionable if either scheme when considered as a stand alone project would be able to secure funding at this time but it is recognised that the two schemes address different connectivity issues within Farnham. The team suggests that these are considered as a separate projects.</p>

Item

The decision that is needed from Farnham Board members is to consider the following options:

- A) To cease work and develop an investigate on the Wrecclesham Bypass to review this against any emerging national regional and local policies
- B) Carry out an initial cost and environmental feasibility work Wrecclesham Bypass and report the conclusions and options to the board
- C) Following traffic modelling outcomes for the wider area to look at opportunities and create a smaller package of measures for Wrecclesham that address the negative safety and environmental impacts and traffic.

On the western bypass before the programme again commits more resource, the options are to:

- A) Cease work to develop and investigate the Western Bypass but again periodically to review against any emerging national, regional and local policies to see if the positions changed
- B) Carry out an initial cost and environmental feasibility work on the Western Bypass and report the conclusions and options to board
- C) Following traffic modelling outcomes for the wider area to look at the opportunity to develop smaller packages of measures for Farnham town centre and north Farnham that address the negative safety and environmental impacts of the traffic.

The Chair commented that we have to be realistic at the moment that neither of these longer term projects would fit with the government's current policy and welcomed thoughts and comments from board members on the options.

Jeremy Hunt MP expressed concern that if we carry on exploring the possibility of a Western Bypass it will make the whole project extremely controversial environmentally and opted for option A. For the Wrecclesham Bypass, he opted for option B because it would be good to see if there's any possible way to make a Wrecclesham Bypass consistent with national objectives.

Cllr John Neale advised that the Town Council would still like to go ahead with both schemes and would opt for option B for both. If that is not possible for the Western Bypass, he asked that it still be kept on the list for SCC and Hampshire for potential future schemes for major highway improvements.

Cllr Catherine Powell reminded the board that the current route through the town is the A287 which could not be reclassified. 8,000 new houses are being built in close proximity to this area that will have a huge impact on the A287. Improving the pedestrian experience would be the best thing to do but it will displace traffic and create more congestion especially around the train station. She also pointed out that the Wrecclesham Bypass is completely independent of the town centre in terms of impact and also questioned the "strong support" for this bypass as there was not strong support at a Local Liaison Forum for South Farnham where even one of the councillors spoke against it.

Regarding the environmental impacts of the Western Bypass, she also mentioned that the current state of play already has massive environmental impacts. She advocated that the team stop considering these two schemes as separate issues and concluded that if one is unable to go ahead, both should cease so that the limited funds could be spent responsibly. She commented that the wording of option C was questionable.

The Chair asked if option C would be her preferred option on both if the wording was changed and she elaborated that the words "opportunity" and "smaller measures" were the issue. It should not be about looking for an opportunity to develop smaller packages it should be about a solution being found to integrate a set of packages associated with the town centre proposals and it should funded together otherwise we could end up with a situation

Item

where the town centre is funded and the measures outside of the town are not. The impact of that would be unfair to people.

Cllr Michaela Martin commented that until there's an option on the table to alleviate traffic through both Wrecclesham and Farnham, both of these studies need to be kept on table (option B for both). She stated that work would need to be done to carry out initial cost and visibility work on the Wrecclesham Bypass as well as the Western relief road and agreed with Cllr Powell that if pedestrianisation is to take place, congestion will need to be alleviated.

Cllr Andy MacLeod commented that this was a highly emotive issue with the Western Bypass having been around for many years with the view that nothing can be done with the town centre without it. He mentioned that the distinction he sees between the two projects is that Wrecclesham Bypass is on the South East list for transport and the Western Bypass isn't. He also said he understood the motivation for the Wrecclesham Bypass as there were concerns about the safety of children on the bridge but noted that this isn't the only bridge in Surrey with this concern and suggested that a look for other measures could be had to mitigate these dangers.

He concluded that he could not make a definitive statement but recognised that without the Western Bypass, the town centre cannot be pedestrianised due to the impact of congestion. He advocated for it to not be taken off the table as a long term project and asked for Elaine and Simon's opinions as professionals. The Chair advised that the team would likely recommend the cessation of work to which Cllr MacLeod responded that their view should be taken into account.

Cllr Peter Clarke commented that the two schemes were vastly different in terms of the scale of upheaval. He mentioned a document that was sent out on the 5th December that was withdrawn; it painted a slightly different picture which favoured continuing work on the Wrecclesham Bypass and putting the Link Road on hold. He noted that pausing work on the Link Road would make it difficult to explain the Council's position and so thought further work on the link route would be worthwhile.

As a Waverly Councillor for Wrecclesham, he explained that the people in Wrecclesham live in fear due to the speed and volume of vehicles and also the constant strikes on the rail bridge. He noted that the Wrecclesham Bypass offers a firmer opportunity to secure funding and so he opted for option B for this scheme and would listen to the views of others for the decision on the Western Bypass.

Jeremy Hunt MP came back in and proposed a modified option B which allows the team to deprioritise funding those environmental sites but not take them off the table to find a compromise after hearing Cllrs Powell and MacLeod's input. This modified option would be for both the Wrecclesham Bypass and Western Bypass to continue feasibility and cost work on both projects but recognise that costs will have to be prioritised where they are most likely to get results in terms of national funding. Therefore, the project team can continue to prioritise their energy on the huge projects that we have still got in play to have a much clearer picture as to the impact on North Farnham and the town centre.

The Chair asked Simon Duke if options B & C could be conflated so that the environmental costing and feasibility work could be done at the same time as looking for other suitable measures. Simon confirmed that this could be done. Cllr Powell commented to say that this modified option would get her vote.

Zac Ellwood commented to opt for the modified option B and also mentioned that changing "smaller measures" to "localised measures" may invoke less emotion.

The Chair concluded that he would not be comfortable with taking either of the schemes off the table and noted that there seemed to be a consensus to combine options B & C.

	Item
	ACTION: Simon and Elaine will combine options B & C and will circulate it to the Board.
7	<p>Overview of progress</p> <p>Elaine Martin gave a general overview of progress to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The OIP report was published and issued on the 4th October - Rerouting of the HGVs is complete but there are outstanding elements which need to be progressed by National Highways on the M3 - The A325 reclassification is complete however Elaine will take on Cllr Powell's comments - The wayfinding strategy is on target but there is a slight issue, the chairman will be speaking to suppliers – information provided by Iain Lynch was very helpful around using other routes with procurment - There may be a potential installation date for the 20mph zone which is the end of this year. More information will be provided once feedback has been received - Medium term interventions are on target - Town centre and LCWIP have been brought forward to 25th October from 28th January based on board feedback - Farnham A31 corridor is on target - Wrecclesham Bypass went for testing to align more closely with public expectation. <p>Key risks and issues are the cost plan, the public engagement outcomes, student engagement and the historic street layout.</p> <p>ACTION??? Cllr Catherine Powell asked that the North Farnham and South Farnham studies are also listed with nine projects as part of that workflow.</p> <p>Cllr John Neale asked how many of the earlier short and medium interventions are likely to go ahead. Elaine Martin responded that there is a list that has been graded but it will need to be consulted on at the officer and then member workshops in the New Year and so she is unable to comment on it now.</p>
8	<p>Questions and discussion</p> <p>Two question from Cllr George Hesse regarding proposals for the town centre scheme.</p> <p>Elaine responded that she would be able to give an update on the timeline for this to be implemented. Chris Greenwood commented that there was a timeline of 2025 for a town centre scheme incorporating Cllr Hesse's proposals.</p>
9	<p>Local Liaison Forum update</p> <p>Cllr John Neale gave an update from the last LLF stating that it wasn't as successful as previous meetings due to a lack of major announcements. This led to some criticism where they stated that the team could have given more feedback on some of the answers as engagement felt lacking.</p> <p>He mentioned that he and Cllr MacLeod haven't been involved in any preparation for the next meeting yet and that he would be keen to have a discussion with the team on that as soon as possible as the next meeting is due to take place in Jan/Feb.</p> <p>Cllr Andy MacLeod identified the need to address the idea in the town that there isn't enough consultation taking place. He also spoke about a lack of understanding around the timescales for the FIP.</p>



	Item
	<p>Cllr Peter Clarke commented that it generally tends to be the same 40/50 people attending LLF meetings and it would be good to reach a wider audience.</p> <p>Cllr Paul Follows suggested refreshing the format of the meeting might help to reach a more diverse audience.</p> <p>Cllr Catherine Powell recommended a good workflow document to explain why things are being done in a particular order and why they take time, it will have a much better chance of getting people onside because they will understand the problem better.</p>
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>The Chair concluded the meeting by thanking the team and board members for their work this year and wished them a peaceful Christmas and Happy New Year.</p> <p>The Chair and Elaine Martin thanked Peter Burch his tireless work as this was his last board meeting today.</p> <p>The next meeting is 24 January 2022 and will be held at Farnham Town Council.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Farnham Infrastructure Programme

Farnham Board Meeting

AGENDA ITEM 06

DATE: 25 MARCH 2022

DOC NO: 4D476001-SCC-PRG-PAP-000026

REPORT OF: TIM OLIVER – BOARD CHAIRMAN

LEAD OFFICER: ELAINE MARTIN – PROGRAMME MANAGER

SUBJECT: PROGRESS UPDATE

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This paper has been drafted to summarise the activity and progress achieved since the December 2021 Board, including any matters of note arising during this period, and to outline the activity to be carried out up until the next Board in June 2021.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Notes the progress update provided; and
2. Notes the ongoing update to the Programme schedule and the associated revisions to forecast milestones.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

To ensure the Farnham Board (Sponsoring Group) is aware of the Programme progress to date and has visibility of future Programme activity.

DETAILS OF FARNHAM INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMME

1. Activities carried out since the previous Board in December 2021

- Development of a programme wide Engagement Activity Tracker.
- Development of Process Map for the Town Centre Project.
- Preparation for the Town Centre and Farnham A31 Corridor Consultations in Summer 2022.

Project 1 - Short and Medium-Term interventions

Re-routing of HGV's

- Engagement with National Highways regarding additional Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) restriction signage on the M3 and cost review of signage options.
- Review of alternative M3 signage area and commencement of design for signage for the A287/B3349 roundabout, saving c £400k.

Wayfinding Strategy

- Development of cartography for map-based products and detailed sign placements as part of Wayfinding Strategy.
- Procurement and instruction of the product supplier for wayfinding signage.

20mph Zones and Speed restrictions

- Conclusion of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) / Speed Limit Order (SLO) consultation on the 20mph zones and speed restrictions on Monday 3 January 2022 and review of statutory consultation feedback.
- Review of potential amendments to extend Upper Hale Road eastern boundary and include Green Lane as part of a possible second phase.
- Discussions with Surrey County Council (SCC) Heritage and Place teams regarding speed limit signage in Castle Street as part of proposals to ensure that heritage and quality of place is fully considered as part of any designs.

Removing A Road Category Status

- Further liaison with Google Maps regarding the declassification of the A325 through the Town Centre - Google Maps have undertaken a partial update to reflect the declassification.

Medium-term Interventions

- Review of the Stage 2 list of the Medium-Term Interventions (MTI) Pipeline schemes against the deliverables of Projects 2-4.
- Grouping exercise carried out to consider the delivery of these schemes within adjacent projects.
- Engagement with SCC Officers, SCC Members, Waverley Borough Council (WBC) and Farnham Town Council (FTC) on the highest scoring interventions from the residual list, and agreement of top 12 schemes to be taken forward to feasibility to develop concept designs, costs and delivery.
- Site visit for the Borelli Park and Stride, Scholars Greenway and Eastern Border Path schemes carried out on 22.02.22.
- Appointment of Project Manager to oversee the delivery of these schemes.

Project 2 - Town Centre

- Collection of base data and completion of topographical survey.
- Optioneering to create longlist of options for the Town Centre.
- Development of a Multi-criteria Evaluation Framework (MCAF) specific for the Town Centre project, used to sift longlist to shortlist.
- Engagement meeting with SCC and WBC Members and FTC on 14.02.22 on town centre options.
- Sifted shortlisted options selected to progress to public consultation in Summer 2022.
- Progression of feasibility designs for shortlisted options.

- Movement surveys commissioned for end of March 2022, focussing on non-motorised traffic.
- Transport modelling for base and future years forecasts.
- Briefing session with councillors

Project 2 - LCWIP

- Development of longlist of cycle routes and core walking zones for the Farnham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).
- Engagement with SCC, FTC and WBC Officers.
- Multi Criteria assessment Framework (MCAF) developed for shortlisting and review of MCAF methodology.

Project 3 - Farnham A31 Corridor

- Ongoing engagement with Transport for the Southeast (TfSE) and Department for Transport (DfT) as part of the Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC).
- Commencement of pre-Outline Business Case (OBC) activities.
- Transport modelling for base and future years forecasts.
- Briefing session with councillors

Project 4 - Western and Wrecclesham Bypasses

- Ongoing modelling.

2. Activity up until the next Board

Project 1 - Short and Medium-Term interventions

Re-routing of HGV's

- Development of designs for HGV restrictions signage on the A287/B3349 roundabout.

Wayfinding Strategy

- Review of Wayfinding Map Cartography feedback and finalisation of the mapping products.
- Completion of Wayfinding Sign Placement checklist.
- Development of signposting and catchment for each product.
- Delivery of Wayfinding Totems.

20mph Zones and Speed restrictions

- Progression of detailed design for the 20mph speed limit proposals and traffic calming measures and engagement with contractors.
- Scoping of phase 2/3

Removing A Road Category Status

- Further liaison with Google Maps.

Medium-term Interventions

- Scoping the agreed top 12 scoring Medium Term Interventions and development of programmes and cost estimates for Borelli Park and Stride, Eastern Border Path and Scholars Greenway.

Project 2 - Town Centre

- Preliminary design of shortlisted options for the Town Centre.
- Completion of movement surveys.
- Development of plans for consultation on shortlisted schemes.

Project 2 - LCWIP

- Finalisation of short lists of Farnham LCWIP cycle routes and walking zones, and development of design proposals.

Project 3 - Farnham A31 Corridor

- Review of modelling requirements and development of plan and priorities for strategic model.
- Mobilisation of environmental, modelling and appraisal and carbon management plan teams to begin work on time critical activities.
- Final response to DfT queries to be submitted.
- Confirmation of Public Consultation approach.

Project 4 - Western and Wrecclesham Bypasses

- Further modelling.

3. Overall, the Farnham Infrastructure Programme remains on schedule, with activity progressing in period broadly in line with expectation.

4. Key Milestones

The key milestone summary of the Programme schedule is provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Project [Sub-Project]	Milestone	Previous forecast	Current Forecast	Status/ Comments
Project 1 Rerouting of HGVs	Implementation	Sept-21	Oct-21	Main scheme completed. Additional signage on A287/B3349 roundabout
Project 1 Removing A road category status	Implementation	n/a	Oct-21	Completed
Project 1 Wayfinding Strategy	Implementation	Oct-22	May-22	
Project 1 20 mph Zones & Speed Restrictions	Implementation	May-22	Dec-22	
Project 1 Medium-term interventions	Budget allocation limit	Mar-23	Mar-23	
Project 2 Town Centre and LCWIP	Construction phase – finish	Jan-28	Oct-25	
Project 3 Farnham A31 Corridor	Construction phase – finish	Nov-27	Nov-27	

Project 4 Western & Wrecclesham Bypasses	Construction phase – finish	Feb-35	Jul-29	Paused - awaiting modelling outcomes
---	--------------------------------	--------	--------	---

5. Key Programme Risks

The current key risks for the Programme, based upon post-mitigation weighting, are provided in Table 2 below. These risks are actively managed through the Programme risk management approach.

Table 2

Risk title	Risk description
Funding Availability – Programme Wide	Risk of lack of funding available to deliver the full programme/scope.
Programme for A31 corridor delivery	As a result of the number of complex activities required, including planning, OBC, CPO, EIA, consultation etc, there is a risk that delivery requirements of DfT are not met prior to 2025.
Escalating Project Costs	Given the cost assumptions made to date, there are concerns that once the projects are more defined, they may become unaffordable for FIP.
Public Engagement outcomes	In order for the Programme to be deemed successful, the public need to be generally supportive of the proposals
Town Centre and A31 Farnham Corridor Public Consultation	Given the extremely tight timescales there is a risk that the maturity of the information presented at consultation may be compromised

6. Consultation

A public consultation for the Town Centre scheme is planned for summer 2022.

7. Risk management and implications

The Board has no statutory powers and as such any decisions requiring approval by the responsible authorities, in this case Surrey County Council, will have individual risk assessments.

8. Financial and value for money implications

The cost and value for money in respect of the works will be identified within the Surrey County Council Report.

9. Section 151 officer commentary

As proposals are developed that require necessary Surrey County Council approval, individual S151 approvals will be sought.

10. Legal implications – Monitoring Officer

The Board has no executive powers. Any decisions made would require Surrey County Council to follow its own legal advice and its approval procedures.

11. Equalities and diversity

A Programme-level Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) was carried out in August 2021. This was approved by the Programme Team at the September 2021 Programme Board and indicated that there are currently no substantive concerns associated with the Programme's proposals based upon the level of information available.

12. Other implications

There are no other implications in respect of this Report.

13. What happens next

FIP activity will continue in line with the summary provided above.

Contact Officer:

Elaine Martin
Programme Manager
Elaine.Martin@surreycc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank