



LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSES**

13 DECEMBER 2013

1. From Mrs Celia Sandars (Farnham)

When and where does Surrey County Council intend to site, and/or facilitate provision of, a new secondary school in Farnham, in view of the existing shortfall in Farnham's secondary school places and the need to meet the ever-increasing demands for school places in Farnham, against the background of plans to considerably expand housing in and around the town ?

Response

- Surrey County Council is working closely with the Local Planning officers at Waverley Borough Council to ensure that timely action is taken to mitigate the impact of any new housing across the borough. The potential impact of planning applications is discussed and appropriate financial contributions are requested from developers towards education infrastructure to mitigate the expected impact.
- Surrey County Council is also working with all local schools and academies in the Farnham area to discuss future requirements for places and what action can be taken to meet any shortfall.
- To meet the need for secondary places in the area, Weydon Academy has already begun an expansion programme that will increase their provision by two forms of entry (one form of entry is 30 places) by September 2016.
- We expect to require further secondary places in the Farnham area by September 2018 and are beginning discussions with local secondary schools to determine how this need can be met.

2. From Mr Martin Price (Frith Hill Area Residents Association: Godalming)

Now that Frith Hill Road has been designated for resurfacing in 2013/2014, will Surrey County Council also take the opportunity to improve the safety for drivers

and pedestrians at the junction with Deanery Road when painting new priority lines, for which FHARA has been campaigning since 1977 ?

Response

In recent years Frith Hill Area Residents Association representatives have corresponded with the highways area team on this subject on a number of occasions and will be aware that the Area Manager and Police consider that a change of priority at this junction would not be in the interest of road safety. Give-way arrangements will remain as they are following re-surfacing.

3. From Mrs Elaine Felton (on behalf of Thursley Parish Council)

At the Hindhead Tunnel Public Inquiry detailed arrangements were agreed for diversions in the case of a required tunnel closure in order to provide a smooth flow of vehicles at various points on the way towards the tunnel in either direction – north- and southbound. There have been many instances when the tunnel has been closed for both planned and unplanned instances and traffic chaos has reigned supreme, much to the detriment of the residents of Thursley Parish. The Police tell us that the responsibility for implementing these arrangements lies with Surrey County Council (or possibly Hampshire for most northbound traffic). Surrey County Council informs us that that the responsibility lies with the Highways Agency and the Highways Agency keep very quiet on the matter. Which department of government will take responsibility for these arrangements ?

Response

Management of the formal diversion route for the Hindhead Tunnel is an issue for the Highway Agency in consultation with and the agreement of both Surrey County Council and Hampshire County Council.

There is the responsibility for formal operational plans, mechanisms of co-ordination and appropriate signs to be in place. However, the recent network disruptions have highlighted that working arrangement (including co-ordination and signage) may need to be improved.

Surrey County Council will therefore be requesting a meeting with all parties to review lessons learned and identify any improvements that can be made to the management of future formal diversions.

4. From Mr David Beaman (Farnham)

At the Cabinet meeting that was held on Tuesday 24 September the final report of the Surrey Rail Strategy was considered and decisions made which include giving approval for officers to work on developing options for Surrey County Council involvement in specific projects and initiatives. One of the recommendations of the Surrey Rail Strategy as a medium term objective is the introduction of a new direct rail service between Alton and Guildford with two trains per hour (i.e. every 30 minutes). If this recommendation is pursued for more detailed evaluation I would be grateful for reassurance that this evaluation would include the wider transport implications of the introduction of such a new rail service and, in particular, the effect of traffic in Farnham arising from the consequential longer period of time that the level crossing at Farnham station would have to be closed. In addition, I would also request that in undertaking any

evaluation of any new direct rail service between Alton and Guildford consideration is also given to evaluating a bus alternative and in particular enhancing the operation of the existing 65 bus service that operates between Alton and Guildford.

Response

Poor access between Alton/ Farnham and Guildford was identified as an issue during the development of the Surrey Rail Strategy. It was considered that an improved service could relieve congestion on the A31 and A3 and improve access to employment opportunities in Guildford. Therefore the strategy included a recommendation to confirm the business case for two trains per hour from Alton to Guildford and that the council and partners then lobby the Department for Transport to include the scheme in the next South West Trains franchise.

As with any rail project, any evaluation – business case – would need to consider wider transport implications as highlighted in the question. This would include the impact on level crossing down times, any signalling improvements needed and the impact on local bus services.

At the moment there are no plans to undertake a business case.

Stagecoach continues to keep its bus network under review and will always consider increasing its provision if there is a robust business case. Surrey County Council is always keen to work with bus operators who seek to enhance their services on a commercial basis.

5. From Mr David Wylde (Farnham)

It is very concerning that, at a time when cutbacks in Government grants are forcing local councils to identify and implement cost savings, Waverley Borough Council has decided to spend £30,000 of scarce money on a feasibility study for relocating Farnham's Brightwells Gostrey Centre, which provides essential and valued services for elderly residents from its present town centre site, to the Memorial Hall in West Street. The Council found itself in trouble with the provision of the proposed new Gostrey Centre in the town centre because it allowed the developers of Farnham's East Street/Brightwells development scheme an amendment to the original plan to include additional facilities, which undermined the working of the new old people's centre. Those elderly residents who currently have a degree of personal independence and are able to use public transport will find great difficulty in using public transport to travel to the Memorial Hall which is located 0.6 miles from the town centre and only served by two bus routes. In contrast the present town centre site is located within short walking distances of two of the town's main bus stops on East Street and South Street that are used by bus routes which serve virtually every part of Farnham. Surrey County Council has an overall responsibility for adult social care and before any money is spent on any feasibility of physically relocating the Gostrey Centre to the Memorial Hall could both Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council give consideration to accessibility issues which to date do not appear to have been given sufficient thought.

Response

The Chairman of the Local Committee will undertake to ensure that the County Council considers the accessibility issues raised in the question and to encourage Waverley Borough Council to do likewise.

6. From Ms Caroline Homfray (Farncombe)

I would like to thank the Council for its ongoing support for the Marshall Road Cycle Route Project. I see that a construction date of February/March is given in the meeting agenda. Can the Council give me the planned completion date for the work ?

Response

Design work for this scheme is complete, an order has been placed with the County Council's term contractor who has resources programmed for February and March to complete construction by the end of the financial year, so the end of March 2014. This is subject to completing a legal agreement with Jewsons who are contributing land to enable widening of the existing footway. The negotiation of this agreement by the County Council's legal team is well advanced and it is expected to be in place in January, enabling a February start as planned. Progress of the works themselves are of course subject to delay due to adverse weather.

7. From Jane Thomson (Waverley Borough and Godalming Town Councillor: Ockford and Central Ward), Mike Poulter (Chairman of Godalming Together CIC), Giles Pattison (Chairman of Victoria Road and Catteshall Residents' Association), Christopher Robinson (Chairman of Godalming Old Town Residents' Association)

We ask the Committee to confirm its support for the principle of locally designed solutions and to confirm that it will allow these proposals, generated by local people in consultation with County Council officers, to be put out for public consultation.

Response

In support of the principle of localism the Committee will always examine, and where possible support, local solutions to all issues.

8. From Mrs Victoria Leake (Haslemere)

We would like the Waverley Local Committee members to know that the parking scheme that was introduced in Haslemere town centre in the summer of 2013 has had an adverse impact on the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill, with many residents having to walk over 800 yards to get from their cars to their homes, many with young children in tow in all types of weather. If town parking was at a premium before, it is now non-existent for those local residents who were excluded from Phase 1. To be clear, this is no fault at all of those residents who have been offered Residents Only Parking Schemes. They were perfectly entitled to petition and they have waited too long for Surrey County Council to come up with any kind of solution. But their neighbours in adjacent roads suffer exactly the same difficulty in finding on-road parking in Haslemere. For example, a neighbour of ours who is a nurse and works shifts, has to drive around Haslemere for around 15 minutes before she can find a parking space. When her elderly mother visits, she visits by train because she cannot find a place to park.

When our neighbour visits her mother she often stays overnight because if she returns home in the afternoon, she can't find a parking space. You have just made her life even more difficult. There are many other similar stories.

Please could the Waverley Local Committee members consider the impact of the Residents Only Parking Schemes introduced in Haslemere in the summer on the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill and let us know how they plan to proceed in Phase 2 for the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill ?

Would the Waverley Local Committee members not consider and consult on, a curfew parking scheme in a zone around the town centre, whereby for one hour a day, only residents would be allowed to park ? That would mean visiting commuters would have to park outside the town centre. It would not be as beneficial to residents who would have received a Residents Only Parking Scheme in Phase 1, but it would be of benefit to all residents.

Response

A number of residents' parking schemes were introduced in Haslemere during the summer of 2013 (in what was termed Phase 1) and the majority of these have settled down and are working well. We recognised at the time that this first tranche of schemes may need adjusting and that it did not cater for some residents in the town centre area (such as Lower Street and Shepherds Hill). We planned to look at a more encompassing residents parking solution in Phase 2. This will also be linked to parking provision at the station and displacement. The outcome of a public inquiry in April 2014 about Waverley Borough Council plans for charging on the Weyhill Fairground site is also a consideration.

The residents' schemes introduced in Phase 1 have become established and we now have a clearer picture of their usage and the demand for permits. Some locations are well used by permit holders and others are generally under-utilised (for example the bays opposite the fire station in West Street, Sandrock and the bays outside Houghton House in Courts Hill Road). There is an opportunity to make small adjustments to make better use of the road space in this parking review (i.e. December 2013), but a Phase 2 review of residents' parking will need more thorough and wider consultation and cannot be achieved in the time scales for this review. There is also demand for residents' parking in other roads such as Museum Hill, but rather than adding residents' schemes in a piecemeal way, a wider town centre review is likely to provide the best solution.

It is therefore planned to carry out a consultation about residents' parking in the Haslemere town centre area during 2014 in a separate process to this review. Possible options and issues could include:

1. Creating a town centre residents parking zone. This could mean allocating all available parking space (except for shoppers) to residents parking in and around the town centre. Eligibility for residents' permits could be opened up to all residents in the zone who met the criteria and there may need to be a waiting list if demand exceeds the space available.
2. Providing more, but retaining street specific residents' parking areas.
3. How to cater for local workers ?
4. Minimising displacement.
5. Making the best use of the available road space.

A curfew parking zone can be considered but is perhaps not the most suitable arrangement near a town centre where shoppers would take up residents' spaces outside of the curfew period.

9. From Mr David Boyd (Haslemere)

I would like to raise two points under **Item 8: Annual Review of on-street parking in Waverley.**

With respect to 3.8: Weydown Road, it should also be noted that significant consultation has been undertaken by the Residents' Association with the residents in the road and a survey concluded that over 90% were in favour of these proposals.

With respect to 3.8: Derby Road, it should be noted that the Residents' Association, St Bartholomew's School, and the chair of The Parents of St Bartholomew's have all liaised on these proposals and are supportive of them as they are designed to improve road and pedestrian safety at the junction which is used by probably half the school. However, two minor adjustments which were discussed and agreed upon are missing and we would like them included before publication. They are best explained via the Map 24050 in the pack.:

1. The south red line - no waiting at anytime should be extended west to align itself with that on the north. That improves safety on the corner and rather helpfully there is already a post there with a parking restriction sign.
2. The existing double yellow lines at the junction of Derby Road and Church Road should be extended another 10 metres southwards to improve road and pedestrian safety on the corner from this direction. This would then match with the length of 'no waiting at any time' in (1) above.

I hope I have explained this clearly and that you will accept these changes. St Bartholomew's, the Parents of St Bartholomew's and the residents are all looking forward to this major school crossing becoming much safer.

Response

We would like to thank David Boyd for his involvement in the development of the proposed parking restrictions in Derby and Weydown Roads on behalf of the Residents' Association. The suggested changes at the junction of Derby and Church Roads highlighted above have been discussed and can be incorporated in our proposals for statutory consultation.

10. From Mr David Pope on behalf of Ms Jane Godden (Haslemere)

We urge the Committee to examine the detail of the proposed changes for Courts Hill Road (CHR) West before public consultation. We believe the changes go beyond "adjustments", run counter to the principles of the scheme and are unsafe. The majority of residents in this part of the road have not been consulted in the preparation of the proposals.

In these circumstances, we ask the Committee to reject the proposal to revoke the Haughton House Permit Holder's bay on the following grounds:

- During the working day this bay is no more lightly used than the schemes in Longdene Road and Sandrock. Furthermore, Haughton House puts unique parking demands on the road through its need for supply and maintenance vehicles, which arrive after commuters, and through the Hopper bus which needs somewhere to stop safely. We do not object to relaxing the eligibility requirements for parking permits for some residents, but it seems odd to increase the number of permits and then restrict where they may park. We have no desire to inflict problems on our neighbours in CHR East, but to argue that their problems are caused by the Haughton House residents parking bay is not sustainable. We fully support CHR East residents who want our comprehensive scheme extended to them.
- The Haughton House bay is currently marked on the ground by a cage and statutory controls govern the type and size of vehicles using it. Cages are an effective and integral part of the CHR West scheme, which is comprehensive, coherent and well engineered. The Haughton House bay is in a particularly narrow and vulnerable part of CHR, being bounded at one end by a blind corner and facing an increasingly developed and important side road at the other. Experience shows that abandoning controls and markings will lead to undisciplined parking and parking by oversized vehicles to the detriment of access and safety: precisely the situation the scheme is successful in overcoming.

Although we believe the bay should be retained for permit holders, we believe it should be reduced at its eastern end by at least one vehicle space, on safety grounds. Extending the double yellow lines leading into the blind corner with Courts Mount Road has been beneficial. But it is still a dangerous corner and will be more so if the Parking Review proposals are adopted. At present the lines are only two thirds as long as the corresponding lines in CHR East. Yet it is eastbound traffic which needs to face quickly moving westbound traffic from around the corner head-on on the “wrong” side of the road. Traffic, in both directions, now includes more cycles since the road has been signed as a cycle route to the South Downs National Park. A reduction will also enable residents at No 25 CHR to access the road more safely: to everyone’s benefit.

Response

The parking restrictions introduced into Courts Hill Road during the summer have generally been a success and helped residents and visitors to park nearer their homes and/or access their driveways more easily. Vehicular movement along the road has also improved with the introduction of more passing spaces.

A seven-space permit bay was introduced adjacent to Haughton House, but observations indicate that it is very rarely used during the operational hours of the scheme (0830-1730, Monday-Friday). It is therefore proposed to make it an unrestricted bay to make better use of the road space and help absorb some of the parking in the eastern part of the road.

There are a further ten residents’ permit bays in the western part of the road and ten residents’ permits have been allocated to adjacent properties. During the operational hours some residents are out so residents’ bays are not all used. At the weekends and evenings (outside the operational hours) when residents tend to be at home there are far fewer commuter vehicles, creating more space for residents.

The bay markings will be retained regardless of the eventual restriction that is agreed for its use. This means it could only be used by vehicles that can fit into it.

We will look at all the comments received in response to the statutory consultation before deciding what changes are appropriate.