

DRAFT MINUTES TO BE FORMALLY AGREED AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE



Minutes of meeting

LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

Date: FRIDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 2012

Time: 2.00PM

Place: HASLEMERE HALL, HASLEMERE

Members present:

Surrey County Council

Mrs P Frost (Farnham Central) (Chairman)
Mr S Renshaw (Haslemere) (Vice-Chairman)
Mr S Cosser (Godalming North)
Mr D Harmer (Waverley Western Villages)
Mr P Martin (Godalming South, Milford and Witley)
Mr D Munro (Farnham South)
Dr A Povey (Waverley Eastern Villages)

Waverley Borough Council

Mr Brian Adams (Frensham, Dockenfield and Tilford)
Mrs Elizabeth Cable (Witley and Hambledon)
Mrs Carole Cockburn (Farnham Bourne)
Mr Brian Ellis (Cranleigh West)
Mr Robert Knowles (Haslemere East and Grayswood)
Mr Bryn Morgan (Elstead and Thursley)
Ms Julia Potts (Farnham Upper Hale)
Mr Brett Vorley (Cranleigh East)
Mr Keith Webster (Haslemere East and Grayswood)

All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting.

The Chairman opened the meeting by expressing sympathy for the victims of the recent road accident on the A3 and their families and paying tribute to the work of the emergency services and council staff who attended the site and provided support.

48/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS (Item 1)

Apologies were received from Ms D Le Gal, Mr A Young and Mr S Thornton. Mrs E Cable was present as a substitute for Mr S Thornton..

49/12 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING: 22 June 2012 (Item 2)

The minutes were agreed to be a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

50/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 3)

Mr R Knowles declared that he had registered a pecuniary interest in a property in Beech Road, Haslemere and that he would therefore take no part in Item 7.

51/12 PETITIONS (Item 4)

Two petitions were received: details are set out at **Annex 1**.

In relation to Spring Grove, Farncombe Mr S Cosser reported that he had received the assurance requested by the petitioners that, in the light of its rapid recent deterioration, the road would be included in the maintenance programme for the current year and completed by the end of 2012. Mr Cosser had been asked by the residents to convey their thanks to the County Council.

52/12 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Item 5)

The responses to public questions received are set out at **Annex 2**.

[Mr Brian Ellis joined the meeting during this item.]

53/12 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS (Item 6)

One member's question was received: the response is set out at **Annex 3**.

[Mr R Knowles left the meeting before Item 7.]

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS

54/12 REVIEW OF ON-STREET PARKING IN HASLEMERE: PHASE 1 – RESPONSE TO PETITIONS (Item 7)

Representatives of the groups of residents who had petitioned the Committee at the previous meeting were invited to address the Committee. Mr A Blinder (St Christopher's Green), Mrs D Keeley (Bunch Lane – South) and Mr G Spratley (Popes Mead/West Street) thanked the Committee for its response to their petitions and indicated their support for the recommendations.

Officers responded to matters raised in the informal question time and as supplementary questions under Item 5. In relation to Courts Hill Road, it had not been the intention to mark out formal bays in the unrestricted section, but this could be formalised if the Committee wished to do so. Haughton House had been consulted previously and it was recognised that there are concerns about visitor parking. The proposed allocation of permits in Beech Road would be in line with the published guidance. It was felt that the reduced scale of the current proposals, as compared with those presented in March 2012, indicated that the Council had learned from experience and consultation within the town will continue through further engagements in Phases 2 and 3. Shepherds Hill and Lower Street will be included in Phase 2, although it is believed that sufficient space will remain for residents to park in surrounding streets after Phase 1. The level of displacement generated by Phase 1 had been assessed by surveys and monitoring and supported by data provided by Haslemere Town Council.

Members noted the range of views expressed by residents and the difficulty of assessing levels of support from a variety of consultation media and representations. There was support for the phased approach and recognition that the period of statutory advertisement which would follow approval of the recommendations would allow a further opportunity for views to be submitted. Members were sympathetic to the position of residents in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill, where on-street parking is not possible, and hoped that early consideration could be given to addressing their concerns; officers pointed out, however, that it would not be possible to develop proposals for these roads in isolation in advance of Phase 2.

A request from residents of Sandrock had been received to extend the proposed restrictions to cover the period Monday-Saturday and it was felt that it would be appropriate to advertise this, as this could be scaled back in the light of any comments received during the statutory advertisement.

Officers indicated that, subject to the outcome of statutory advertisement, the Phase 1 schemes could be implemented in early 2013. There was a request that advertisements should be as accessible as possible.

The officer recommendations were amended to reflect requests from Courts Hill Road and Sandrock (as above) and, with these amendments, were carried by 14 votes to none, with one abstention.

Resolved:

(i) That residents' parking schemes are approved for formal advertisement and statutory consultation in the following roads in Haslemere:

- Beech Road
- Chestnut Avenue
- Courts Hill Road (as amended such that the unlimited parking bays are supported by a Traffic Regulation Order))
- Derby Road (between Church Road and High Lane)
- Kings Road
- Longdene Road
- Popes Mead/ West Street (near the fire station)

- Sandrock (as amended such that the operational times are extended to run from Monday to Saturday)
- St Christopher's Green
- Tanners Lane (between Church Road and Church Lane)

Plans of the proposals were shown in **Annex 4** of the report.

- (ii) That the allocation and cost of residents' and visitors' permits in these schemes is as described in paragraphs 3.21 and 3.22 of the report.
- (iii) That road safety and other parking control schemes are approved for formal advertisement and statutory consultation in the following roads in Haslemere:

- Bunch Lane
- Farnham Lane
- Courts Mount Road
- West Street
- High Street
- Grayswood Road
- Church Lane
- Three Gates Lane
- Lion Lane
- Lion Mead
- Lion Green/Junction Place
- Liphook Road
- Hedgehog Lane
- College Hill
- Hill Road
- Wey Hill

Plans of the proposals were shown in **Annex 4** of the report.

- (iv) That the advertisement and statutory consultation are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the relevant legislation.
- (v) That the resolution of any objections made in response to the advertisement and statutory consultation is decided in line with the Council's constitution by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee and the County Councillor for Haslemere; unless the Parking Team Manager, with the agreement of the Chairman of the Committee, decides it would be more appropriate for the objections to be reported back to the full Committee.

Reason for decision:

The introduction of parking controls can help improve road safety, reduce obstructive parking and improve sight lines at junctions and accesses. Resident permit parking helps those residents find parking spaces near to where they live, particularly those with limited or no off- street parking.

The Chairman announced that Item 12 would be considered at this point.

55/12 **RESPONSE TO PETITION: DUNSFOLD ROAD, ALFOLD (Item 12)**

Mr M Padfield was invited to respond on behalf of the original petitioners and referred again to the risks to safety and the impact on their quality of life and environment felt by residents. While recognising the value of the businesses at Dunsfold Park to the local area as major employers, residents wished to see Dunsfold Road restored to its historical status as a peaceful rural by-road.

Dr A Povey expressed his disappointment at the recommended response and endorsed the petitioners' request to reconsider this in the light of all the concerns expressed, i.e. the impact on residents, other road users and the road itself. He questioned the linkage implied in the report between employment and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) and noted that the request had been for non-statutory signage.

While sympathetic to the experience of residents, other members felt that HGV traffic is an unavoidable aspect of modern life and were reluctant to make a special case; it would be difficult to enforce non-statutory signage. The hope was expressed that, as work on Waverley Borough Council's Core Strategy progresses, the improvement of employment opportunities at Dunsfold Park might include the development of alternative access arrangements.

The Committee agreed the recommended response with Dr Povey requesting that his opposition be noted.

Resolved not to introduce any restriction on HGVs' use of Dunsfold Road and Three Compasses Lane, Alfold.

Reason for decision:

In view of the significance of Dunsfold Park as a centre for employment, it was not recommended that any form of restriction on HGVs' use of Dunsfold Road and Three Compasses Lane is introduced.

56/12 **WAVERLEY PARKING REVIEW 2011: CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS FOR RE-ADVERTISED PROPOSALS (Item 8)**

The Committee was informed that, in addition to the parking restriction amendments approved at its June 2012 meeting, the Parking Team also took the opportunity to advertise the revocation of the one hour restriction in parts of Hare Lane and St John's Street, Farncombe, as approved by the Committee on 16 March 2012. There were no objections received to these proposals, which are to proceed as advertised for implementation on the ground.

Officers' attention was drawn to escalating parking problems in Summers Road, Farncombe related to the opening of the new leisure centre and it was requested that they liaise closely with Waverley Borough Council colleagues to ensure that implementation of the proposed parking restrictions does not precede completion of the new car park at the centre.

Officers noted the need for signage in Middle Church Lane to be appropriate to the conservation area and undertook to press their contractors for prompt implementation of all schemes agreed under this item.

Resolved that the proposals in this report are implemented on the ground and the legal order is made.

Reason for decision:

Officers have considered all objections and it is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as originally advertised. They will make a positive impact towards road safety, access for emergency and refuse vehicles, easing traffic congestion, better regulated parking.

57/12 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (Item 9)

Mr S Cosser felt that the further delay to the Marshall Road cycleway was unacceptable: this is one of the few cycling schemes being promoted in the borough and he hoped that an apology could be issued to those Cycling Forum members who had worked on the development of this. Frustration was expressed by other members at the delayed implementation of schemes, although the progress of the resurfacing programme was acknowledged.

The Area Highways Manager regretted the slippage in the programme. In relation to local resurfacing schemes, some members had proposed more than one priority and he had sought to be equitable in identifying schemes to go forward within the original budget. However, if given the flexibility to reallocate funding to ensure its expenditure in full by the end of the financial year, he can ensure that the additional resurfacing schemes are delivered. He noted a concern about the rate of progress in response to residents' representations and subsequent voluntary efforts in Rowledge and reported that the safety audit is in preparation. In response to a question about progress of the centrally-funded resurfacing scheme on the A287 in Churt (and subsequent installation of the 30mph signage), he expected the work to be completed during the autumn.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note progress on highway improvement schemes.
- (ii) Agree to re-direct £195,000 of ITS funding assigned to construction towards LSR schemes.
- (iii) Note that all 2012/13 ITS schemes will be progressed towards the earliest implementation, and agree to prioritise those schemes that are not implemented by the end of March for funding in 2013/14.
- (iv) Delegate authority to the Area Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and locally affected members to amend budgets throughout the year if required to ensure the budget is allocated in a timely manner.

Reason for decision:

The Committee wishes to receive regular updates on the progress of its programme and to ensure that its budgets are allocated in a timely manner.

[Mr B Vorley left the meeting during this item.]

58/12 **WAVERLEY SPEED LIMIT ASSESSMENT (Item 10)**

With respect to the proposal for the A283 Petworth Road, Milford, local members were strongly in favour of a continuous 30mph limit southwards from the Cherry Tree roundabout. The Area Highways Manager reinforced the position stated in the report: the section of road is lit and, in the consequent absence of repeater signs, the proposed 30mph terminal sign adjacent to the junction with Milford Heath Road would be more likely to impact on drivers.

There were opposing views on the reduced limit proposed for the A31 on both carriageways west of the Shepherd and Flock roundabout, Farnham. On the one hand the proposal was welcomed, on the other it was felt that the road was designed for fast movement and that there was insufficient evidence that accidents here are speed-related.

The Committee agreed the recommendations; a vote was taken on those relating to Petworth Road, Milford (carried by eight votes to four) and the Farnham By-Pass (carried by nine votes to three).

Resolved to:

- (i) Note the results of the speed limit assessments.
- (ii) Agree that speed limits should be changed as follows:
 - a) **Bell Road, Haslemere.** Reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph (30mph limit had been requested).
 - b) **Petworth Road, Milford:** Reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph (30mph limit had been requested).
 - c) **Manley Bridge Road, Farnham:** Reduce the speed limit from National to 30mph (30mph had been requested).
 - d) **Farnham By-Pass:** Reduce the speed limit from National to 50mph (50mph had been requested).
- (iii) Authorise the advertisement of a notice in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effects of which will be to implement the proposed speed limit changes and revoke any existing traffic orders necessary to implement the changes, and, subject to no objections being upheld, agree that the Order be made.
- (iv) Authorise delegation of authority to the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and the local Divisional Member to resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals.

Reason for decision:

Recommendations were made based upon existing policy, in consultation with Surrey Police.

[Mr B Ellis and Mr B Morgan left the meeting during this item.]

59/12 **RESPONSE TO PETITION: PUBLIC FOOTPATH 112 FARNHAM (Item 11)**

The Countryside Access Officer reported that he had met Ms D Le Gal, as the divisional County Councillor on site, and had now undertaken the action set out in recommendation (i). Although the improvements database for rights of way is very long, he undertook to add this location and to investigate possible additional sources of funding, e.g. from S106 contributions.

Resolved to:

- (i) Note that the Countryside Access Officer will arrange further reactive cuts to the footpath to resolve any recurring vegetation issues and will contact the garden nursery to address the encroachment of its boundary fence.
- (ii) Agree that no additional action be taken in this matter.

Reason for decision:

Footpath 112 already meets the Council's' statutory requirement for use by pedestrians.

60/12 **COMMUNITY PRIDE FUND (Item 13)**

Corrections to the published report were issued as follows: (i) the title at section 1.0 should read "August 2012"; (ii) Ms D Le Gal's expenditure on the lamp post should read £2600, leaving a balance of £2400. Mr S Cosser pressed for urgent completion of the signage in Charterhouse Road, Godalming.

Members were encouraged to identify projects to commit their remaining budgets as soon as possible.

Resolved to note committed expenditure to date.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has requested regular reports.

61/12 **MONITORING OF APPLICATIONS FOR GOODS VEHICLE OPERATORS' LICENSES: ANNUAL REVIEW (Item 14)**

The Committee welcomed the report and the information presented. Members requested further information in future reports on the outcome of objections and details of any conditions imposed. It was noted that efforts are routinely made to impose conditions on applications from operators at Dunsfold Park to minimise movements at unsocial times. The Committee was reassured that liaison between the County Council and Waverley Borough Council officers had become more effective.

Resolved to note:

- (i) The continued operation of the system for notifying and consulting members on applications in their divisions.
- (ii) The contents of this annual information report.

Reason for decision:

The Committee has requested an annual update.

[Dr A Povey left the meeting.]

The Chairman announced that Item 17 would be considered at this point.

62/12 TWO NATIONAL PARKS LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUNDING: NOMINATION OF CHAMPION (Item 17)

It was noted that, in addition to the situation in the vicinity of Haslemere, the boundary of the South Downs National Park is contiguous with that of Surrey in the Rowledge and Dockenfield area.

Resolved to nominate the divisional member for Haslemere, Mr Steve Renshaw, as champion for the Two National Parks LSTF project.

Reason for decision:

The Two National Parks project provides an opportunity for Surrey County Council to influence the project and include Haslemere as a gateway to the South Downs National Park. The inclusion of a nominated member as champion will assist the County Council's influence and commitment to this project.

63/12 LOCAL PREVENTION COMMISSIONING 2012/13 (Item 15)

The Committee was reminded that the Local Prevention Framework contract for Waverley has been let to Catch 22.

Resolved to:

- (i) Extend the Local Prevention contract for five months to 31 August 2013.
- (ii) Extend the remit of the Youth Task Group to remain constituted up until the first Local Committee meeting of the municipal year.
- (iii) Delegate the ability to appoint members to the Youth Task Group to the Assistant Director for Young People in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee to replace any members who are no longer councillors as a result of the elections.

Reason for decision:

The local needs assessment for at risk young people has not changed, there are no significant performance concerns with the current provider, the quality of the delivery plan is an improvement on the original bid and the

recommendations in this report address specific member feedback. The benefits of the amended timetable include a longer period of time for providers to prove their performance, at least nine months, evidence for members to evaluate before making longer term strategic commissioning decisions, more time for market development and the alignment of the commissioning cycle with the academic year which will provide greater consistency of service to young people.

64/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE BUDGETS (Item 16)

Attention was drawn to the amended recommendations, including at (iii) applications for funding from the Youth Small Grants fund which had been tabled at the meeting. Members recognised a need to improve publicity for this fund and requested that they be advised of applications for projects within their division.

Resolved to:

- (i) Agree the items presented for funding from the Local Committee's 2012/13 **revenue** and **capital** funding as set out in paragraph 2 (2.2, 2.3 & 2.4) of this report and annexed to this report (Annexes B, C & D).
- (ii) Note the expenditure approved since the last Committee by the Community Partnerships Manager and the Community Partnerships Team Leader under delegated powers, as set out in paragraph 3.
- (iii) Approve the officer recommendations in additional Annexes E and F on the award of Youth Small Grants.

Reason for decision:

The Committee was asked to decide on these bids so that the Community Partnerships Team can process the bids in line with the wishes of the Committee.

65/12 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Item 18)

Resolved to note the proposed contents of the Forward Programme.

Reason for decision:

The Committee wishes to plan its business effectively.

The meeting closed at 5.15pm

..... (Chairman)

Contact:

David North (Community Partnership and Committee Officer)
01483 517530 d.north@surreycc.gov.uk

ANNEX 1: PETITIONS

1. From Mr I Sutch on behalf of residents of Beech Road, Haslemere

The petition expressed their support of the County Council's proposals for a controlled parking zone in Beech Road.

2. From Mr Tom Hawksley on behalf of residents of Spring Grove, Farncombe

"We the undersigned are seriously concerned about the state of repair of the road Spring Grove in Farncombe. The road contains 69 pot-holes, which makes it unsafe for cyclists and harmful to cars. Furthermore we believe the underlying concrete structure is fractured so the road is also potentially dangerous for motorists.

Even though Spring Grove has been identified by our County Councillor, Steve Cosser, as the road most in need of repair in this area, there is still no information for residents on when repair work will take place.

We believe the County Council has a duty to keep our roads in a reasonable state and so call upon the Local Committee to give an undertaking in writing to our County Councillor that repair work on Spring Grove will be undertaken in the very near future."

ANNEX 2: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1 From Mr Kevin Garvey (on behalf of Wonersh Parish Council)

The residents of Blackheath and Wonersh Parish Council are grateful to Surrey Highways for recognising a year ago that flood mitigation works in Blackheath Lane is a high priority. However, our community is concerned about the lack of progress in installing the required drainage and soakaway infrastructure, despite Surrey Highways ring-fencing the necessary financial resources. Heavy rain in the spring and summer have once again regularly made this essential link between the villages of Blackheath and Wonersh hazardous or impassable for all pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and most car drivers. We would be grateful for an assurance that the necessary works will be undertaken before the onset of autumn/winter this year.

Committee Response

Options for addressing flooding at the elevated low point in Blackheath Lane just outside the village have been explored, and the preferred solution is now being progressed towards implementation this autumn. This will involve raising the road surface by approximately 500mm at the elevated low point to achieve a continuously longitudinal fall from Barnett Hill towards the village. The existing passing places will be preserved. The road is very narrow and it will be necessary to close the working area in Blackheath Lane to both traffic and pedestrians for a period of between one and two weeks, during which time diversion routes will be signed for both sets of users. The temporary closure is advertised in this week's local newspapers and work is expected to start during October.

Supplementary question

Mr Richard Bawden, on behalf of the Parish Council, while grateful for the response expressed surprise at the proposed solution, as it was understood that a soakaway had been envisaged, and a concern that the flooding would now occur elsewhere. He requested an explanation for the change of plan. The Area Highways Manager explained that, owing to a high silt content, a soakaway would drain poorly and carry an ongoing maintenance liability – it would also need to be on private land. It was felt that the existing drainage arrangements would be able to cope with any increased pressure consequent upon the proposed intervention.

2 From Cllr David Beaman (Farnham)

Will Surrey County Council make every effort to persuade Stagecoach to restore the "old" timetable on Route 18 that provided a regular 30 minute Monday to Saturday daytime service timed to connect at Farnham with all trains to and from London for the residents of Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham? I have proposals as to how this could be practically achieved which would also continue to provide services to Rowledge without costing any additional resources and which I would be happy to make available to Surrey County Council as a potential basis for discussion with Stagecoach.

Background

The changes to bus services operating in Waverley and Guildford arising from the Surrey Bus Review were implemented from Sunday 2 September and, although it has been possible for the bus network to remain relatively unchanged, there have been significant timetable changes to the bus service provided to the Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham areas of Farnham served by Stagecoach Route 18 that operates between Aldershot, Farnham, Whitehill and Haslemere. These timetable changes have resulted in these particular areas now being served by a timetable that is confusing and less attractive to passengers and which will not encourage more people to use public transport. Up until Saturday 1 September Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham were served by a Monday to Saturday daytime service that operated every 30 minutes apart and which were timed to connect at Farnham with train arrivals and departures to and from London. With the new timetable that was introduced from Monday 3 September -- whilst both Weydon Estate and Wrecclesham continue to be served by 2 buses per hour -- the regular 30 minute service and the connections with all trains to and from London have been lost. Weydon Estate is now served by buses which depart 20 and 40 minutes apart whilst Wrecclesham is now served by buses to Farnham 8 and 52 minutes apart. The situation in Wrecclesham is now even more confusing to passengers since, if a passenger misses the first bus, they then have to cross the road since the second bus that departs 8 minutes later to Farnham operates via Rowledge in the opposite direction. This situation has arisen because Stagecoach have decided to co-ordinate the times of routes 18 and 19 to provide a regular 20 minute, rather than 30 minute, service between Aldershot and Farnham via Weybourne, but this "improvement" is of little overall benefit given that there is a second route between Aldershot and Farnham via Sandy Hill (Routes 4 and 5) that continues to operate every 15 minutes Monday to Saturday daytime. The situation in Wrecclesham has not been further helped by operating certain Route 18 journeys (now numbered 17) via Rowledge to replace journeys on Route 16 that have been withdrawn. It is appreciated that these Monday to Saturday daytime services are operated by Stagecoach commercially over which Surrey County Council has no direct control.

Committee response

As part of the bus review process officers have worked with local bus operators to encourage commercial opportunities and ultimately to offer an as similar level of service to communities as the previous timetable, within the smaller support budget available.

In Waverley Stagecoach decided to reduce their commercial route 18 Aldershot-Farnham-Bordon-Haslemere, to hourly Aldershot-Bordon (and extend the Haslemere with the support of Hampshire County Council). This service was not subsidised by the County Council and the change was not part of the County Council's Bus Review. This change has led to the creation of new route 17, which provides some replacement over the Surrey section of route.

The timetables for routes 17/18/19 were designed by Stagecoach. In order to offer a 20-minute frequency between Farnham and Aldershot, Stagecoach have used a combination of the three different hourly services. Commercially, they wished to maintain two buses per hour for Weydon Estate, so if two of the three hourly services are routed that way, it is inevitable that there will be a 20/40 minute interval split through Weydon Estate. Whilst not as ideal as the old 30-minute even split offered by route 18, this is a better outcome than their original proposal of only one bus per hour.

Surrey County Council encouraged the provision by Stagecoach of route 17 as it also provides the main link for Shortheath and Rowledge, including the re-instatement of a through service for those communities to Aldershot. Service 16, which has been reduced to run less frequently on Mondays to Fridays only, maintains a service for roads in south Farnham, which are not now covered by route 17. The 16 also maintains a shoppers link from Dockenfield / Rowledge / Shortheath to Sainsbury's in Water Lane.

The close gap between the two hourly services through Wrecclesham village is unfortunate, but unavoidable if the services are going to be equally spaced between Farnham and Aldershot, which is Stagecoach's commercial wish for the route through Weybourne.

This interface between Stagecoach's commercial services and those supported by Surrey County Council is a good example of partnership working to secure better value whilst enabling as many people as possible to continue to make essential journeys. The County Council's Passenger Transport Group will monitor the revised services with Stagecoach and can agree to discuss any suggested changes that are felt to be beneficial, acceptable to both parties and sustainable in the longer term, without imposing an additional financial support requirement on the public purse.

Supplementary question

Cllr Beaman expressed his disappointment at the response and asked for the matter to be reconsidered. The Chairman confirmed that officers would be asked to review the situation.

The Chairman explained that responses to supplementary questions relating to parking proposals in Haslemere would be addressed at Item 7.

3(a) From Mr Jeremy Leake (Haslemere)

Despite assurances by both Surrey County Council councillors and officers that Shepherds Hill and Lower Street would be included in a parking solution for Haslemere, why were both roads excluded from parking proposals put forward by the Council at the exhibition on 9 August which would materially and adversely affect parking for residents in those roads ?

3(b) From Mrs Victoria Leake (Haslemere)

Surrey County Council admitted both in public and in private meetings that they had only focused on the roads in Haslemere that had off-street parking and had forgotten to include roads in the town centre that had limited parking or indeed no parking. Does the Committee think that that is a sensible way to implement a parking scheme in Haslemere or indeed any town centre ?

Background material relating to Questions 3(a) and 3(b)

The assurances received from Surrey County Council are summarised below for the Committee's information:

1) Mr Steve Renshaw (County Councillor) - Public meeting held the 21st January 2012 in Haslemere Town Hall on page 7 of 38 of the minutes.

Question: "Why are there no proposals for residents of the Town Centre who do not have access to road frontage such as Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill to have permits to park in other roads?"

Mr Renshaw's response: **"I admit this was an oversight. We hadn't picked it up and I'm working with officers to provide a solution for those residents because it is unacceptable not to give them that option."**

2) Steve Renshaw's comments on Lower Street/Shepherds Hill Residents' Only Parking Scheme - article from the **Haslemere Herald** (19 February 2012):

"Residents in Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill, who only have limited parking, have said they were left out of the original consultation, but want to be included if residents' permits are adopted by the county. They have since met with Mr Renshaw, who said he accepted that Surrey County Council had "overlooked them", **but would seek to rectify the matter.**"

3) Email from Parking Team Manager (**in bold**)

Dear Victoria

Thank you for your recent emails in response to the County Council's consultation about on-street parking arrangements in Haslemere. We have received a number of comments from residents in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill Road and I understand Cllr Renshaw attended a meeting with you recently to discuss your problems.

You have highlighted that residents in Lower Street have very limited parking facilities and many park in neighbouring roads. **Following the consultation we will look at what changes may be needed to allow Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill Road residents be accommodated in residents parking schemes in surrounding roads.**

4) Email from Local Highway Services Group Manager citing that Lower Street and Shepherds Hill are **critical stakeholders (in bold)**

Dear Victoria

An initial meeting is provisionally planned for later this week. This is an SCC Officer led meeting and is not viewed as mechanism for engaging with all stakeholders, it is scoping only.

Please be assured that the County Council is fully aware that the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill (amongst others) are critical stakeholders and you will be fully engaged / consulted before anything is agreed.

Supplementary question

Mrs Leake asked whether it was a good idea to implement a parking scheme when a councillor had admitted that certain roads had been omitted.

3(c) From Ms Margaret Dowdles (Haslemere)

Please explain in very clear and unambiguous terms on what legitimate basis can Surrey County Council (and indeed Waverley Borough Council so far as their involvement is concerned) now (given the numerous different assurances that have been given and representations made, and upon which residents of Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill took comfort and were relying on, during and following the first flawed consultation process) or indeed in any

event, irrespective, treat Lower Street and Shepherd's Hill residents differently from and blatantly prejudicially to the interests of other residents in Haslemere, particularly when we all pay Council tax and road tax. We are talking about public roads and no resident currently has a greater entitlement to park on any public road than any other and we are all experiencing the same problem, but for different reasons, and any preference given to some residents (which is exactly what we have been arguing about) will clearly be at the expense and to the detriment of ourselves, resulting in some residents having "the best of both worlds," being able to exclude others from their roads yet continue to park elsewhere and us being deprived of any prima facie right to park anywhere in priority to others. How can that be anything other than unfairly discriminatory and a breach of natural justice and why is it even being contemplated (as appears to be the case) in the first place if we are continually being told that everyone is keen to look for a "holistic approach" and we are all, I believe, agreed that the problems rest primarily with commuters and not between residents (except of course by virtue of commuter displacement) and therefore that residents' needs as a whole should be put above commuters ?

3(d) Ms Solveig Lister (Haslemere)

Please can you let me know what parking provisions are being made for the residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill. ? There is enough written evidence floating around that everyone in the decision making process is aware of the omission of the above to date so I will not yet again attach all the documentation.

Please can you just include all affected residents and find a solution, otherwise the problem will not go away and made worse.

Committee response

Lower Street (B2131) and Shepherds Hill (A286) are busy through routes having double yellow lines in most places for many years. It is not possible to introduce parking places in either road without causing major traffic disruption. Some properties in these roads have off-street parking, but many do not and residents park their vehicles in surrounding roads. Residents are also able to purchase discounted permits for Waverley Borough car parks in the town.

At the public exhibition on 9 August there were plans showing the layout in roads in which permit schemes and bays were proposed. As nothing was proposed to be installed in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill these roads were not part of the exhibition, but residents in the roads were invited to respond to the consultation. The response rate was quite low (20% Lower Street, 38% Shepherds Hill) and although respondents were marginally in favour of residents' parking, it was not an overwhelming expression of support.

There will still be unrestricted parking in several roads close to the centre of Haslemere which can be used by Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents. In addition the proposed operational hours for the residents parking schemes are 8.30am-5.30pm Monday to Friday (or Saturday). Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents will be able to park in these roads outside these times. Although residents in Lower Street and Shepherds Hill are not being offered residents permits as part of the current proposals, as mentioned in the

report in item 7, parking provision for residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill will be considered as part of 'Phase 2' in 2013.

Although there is unlikely to be any significant parking displacement caused by the introduction of residents parking in the roads listed in Item 7, the allocation of residents' parking in Tanners Lane and Hill Road, could lead to parking displacement so it is considered that this should also be left to 'Phase 2' when the options for additional off-street parking provision in the town should be clearer.

4. Geoff Tafft (Haslemere)

The residents of Kings Road are disappointed that the recent Surrey County Council circulation of the parking proposals did not get a better response, due to many residents being away on holiday. We would therefore like consideration to be given to the fact that in a previous survey, which was forwarded to the County Council, 92% of the residents voted for residents' parking only. Will the Committee therefore take this into consideration and vote for the proposals to go forward for formal advertisement and statutory consultation, as outlined in 8.1 of the report at Item 7 ?

Committee response

This is mentioned in the report and these comments will be taken into account by the Committee.

Supplementary question

Mr Tafft asked if the Committee would give urgent attention to addressing parking which had very recently started to take place in the section of Kings Road leading to The Herons, but not in such a way as to delay the proposed scheme for the remainder of the road.

5. Mr Kevin Thomas (Haslemere)

Further to the proposed introduction of a residents' parking zone in Courts Hill Road (CHR), could the Committee please confirm that, of the residents in CHR who currently regularly require on-street parking, how many have expressed support for the introduction of a residents' parking zone ? (As against residents who have no need to park on-street who may be "in favour", but on whom such an introduction would have no impact.)

Committee response

The residents' parking survey had a good response rate (42 from 74 or 57% refer to Item 7 Annex 3). 64% were in favour, and three residents claimed to have no off-street parking. Of these two were against residents' parking. It is proposed to leave some unrestricted spaces in Courts Hill Road and these can be used by residents who do not wish to purchase permits.

Supplementary question

Mr Thomas asked for an explanation of the difference between Courts Hill Road and Beech Road in relation to the assessment of residents who do not require on-street parking (e.g those living in Haughton House) ?

6. Mr Chris Cook (Haslemere)

The residents of Longdene Road were disappointed that overall there was a relatively low response to the more recent survey from Surrey County Council, in all likelihood due to a combination of survey fatigue and the summer holiday period. However, officers know that, with their help and support, considerable effort was invested on the part of Longdene Road representatives to collect very detailed views from all residents on parking issues and provide a comprehensive majority result in favour of a residents' parking scheme, which was previously submitted to the County Council. Will the Committee please recognise and include the original submissions in their discussion and agree to move to formal consultation on the matter ?

Background material relating to Question 9

Communication to Parking Team 15/08/92

Further to our original email of 9 February 2012 (see below), we are writing again on behalf of the majority of residents of Longdene Road, who are strongly in favour of parking controls to limit non-residents, so that we can park near to our homes.

We recognise that due to the narrow nature of the road, there is insufficient scope to accommodate parking for residents, commuters and visitors and believe residents should be given priority to park over commuters.

The available spaces on Longdene should ideally be sufficient to enable those residents who wish to park on the road to do so. However, we are more constrained than the residents of either Courts Hill Road, or Kings Road due to the nature of the road and hence it is possible that a small number of residents may on occasion need to park on nearby roads, particularly on Courts Hill.

We understand that some residents of other roads are requesting that permits for residents should be restricted to a specific road. We wish to state that we strongly support the proposals for zoning, as advertised. Any decision to disallow zoning will only mean that we, as residents may have to pay additionally to park on surrounding roads, when we have already paid for a permit, which seems to us to be most unfair and illogical.

[With regards to the new suggestion on the recent survey regarding individuals without permits being allowed 1 or 2 hours free parking, we did not collect responses on this from our road, although we have reminded individuals to complete the questionnaire. However, we would like to state that because of Stricklands Dental practice at the bottom of Longdene Road, it would seem likely that if this option were available, parking would still be difficult for the residents. Therefore we would suggest that visitors should require a visitors permit to park during restricted hours (which we understand we will be able to purchase as residents, to pass to friends or workmen as appropriate). Furthermore, we understand that commuters claim spaces are not available in the local car parks, which is why they need to park on our road. From our experience of the car parks there are spaces available throughout the day, particularly in the Weyhill car park which is located just past the bridge nearest the station.]

There was no support for the plans to including drive/ garage access in the parking bays and we appreciate the confirmation we have received from you that this will not be adopted. We thank you for allowing individuals to choose their preference in terms of single white lines or double yellow lines in front of their access.

We feel that the proposals outlined above would make best use of the off-road and

on-road spaces in Longdene Road and maximise the chances of residents' vehicles being accommodated in our own road. Retaining the proposed zoning with Kings Road and Courts Hill Road would provide the extra flexibility of opportunities to use parking spaces in surrounding roads if necessary during occasional periods of high demand in Longdene Road. Adopting this approach would maximise support for parking controls amongst residents.

We would also like to include some comment on the spread of the bays, **although if this will mean that we need to go further into consultation and would delay things further, we would prefer to adopt the plans as described in your current proposals.** We had previously reviewed the original SCC plans for bays and proposed to make the following slightly revised suggestions to Surrey as to how the ROP spaces might best be located, working from the bottom of the hill (and lower numbers) upwards (this gives us one additional space compared to your plans and was agreed with the road):

Bay 1 (original extent from 15 to 25): Amend this to two bays of 3 spaces each to avoid blocking garages and off-street parking areas - as below.

Bay 1a to run from the downhill building line of 19 to the uphill building line of 21 (15m and 3 spaces) - no change to current

Bay 1b to run from 1m uphill of the steps from 25 for 16m (3 spaces), ending 4m downhill of the entrance splay to 25 to 29 [the double yellows currently in front of 25 are excessive]

Bay 2 (original extent from line of 27/29 boundary to line of 26/28 boundary, 6 spaces): Amend to avoid blocking 24 by moving the lower end up the hill by 2m and extending the upper end up the hill by 2m.

Bay 3 (original extent from middle of 35 plot to 42/43 boundary): Amend to divide into three bays to avoid bays in front of garages and off-street parking areas.

Bay 3a to run from middle of 35 plot (current end of DYL) for 10m to 35/37 boundary line (2 spaces).

Bay 3b to run from 39/41 boundary line for 5m (1 space).

Bay 3c to run from just uphill of 41 garage for 5m to current start of DYL (1 space).

This will provide a total of **17** ROP spaces.

[Mon-Friday restrictions were preferred by the majority of residents noted below who expressed a preference.]

Communication to Parking Team 08/02/12

We are writing on behalf of the majority of residents of Longdene Road, who are strongly in favour of parking controls to limit non-residents [Mon-Friday 9am - 5pm*], so that we can park near to our homes.

We recognise that due to the narrow nature of the road, there is insufficient scope to accommodate parking for residents, commuters and visitors and believe residents should be given priority to park over commuters.

The available spaces on Longdene should ideally be sufficient to enable those residents who wish to park on the road to do so. However, we are more constrained than the residents of either Courts Hill Road, or Kings Road due to the nature of the road and hence it is possible that a small number of residents may on occasion need to park on nearby roads, particularly on Courts Hill.

We understand that some residents of other roads are requesting that permits for residents should be restricted to a specific road. We wish to state that we strongly support the proposals for zoning, as advertised. Any decision to disallow zoning will only mean that we, as residents may have to pay additionally to park on surrounding

roads, when we have already paid for a permit, which seems to us to be most unfair and illogical.

We endorse Steve Renshaw's confirmation at the meeting in Haslemere Hall on Tuesday 24 January, that the proposal that parking bays be placed across some drive/ garage access will be modified to ensure that individual households maintain the right to decide the solution that suits them best.

We feel that the proposals outlined above would make best use of the off-road and on-road spaces in Longdene Road and maximise the chances of residents' vehicles being accommodated in our own road. Retaining the proposed zoning with Kings Road and Courts Hill Road would provide the extra flexibility of opportunities to use parking spaces in surrounding roads if necessary during occasional periods of high demand in Longdene Road. Adopting this approach would maximise support for parking controls amongst residents.

[*Mon-Friday restrictions were preferred by the majority of residents noted below who expressed a preference.]

Committee response

The Committee will consider the information you have provided in this question as part of their deliberations for Item 7.

7. Mr John Cox (Haslemere)

The residents of Sandrock are appreciative of the support that they have received from Surrey County Council in discussing their wish for residents only parking permits. However, because this is a small, quiet and narrow cul-de-sac, we have previously written to the Council's Parking Team and requested that the restrictions should apply at all times. We do not want rail travellers, shoppers or displaced non-residents of Sandrock occupying the limited space available in the evenings and over weekends nor seeking for parking spaces. The County Council has received written notification of the unanimous decision of our well-attended residents' meeting in April confirming this position and a written question on this matter was submitted to your 22 June 2012 meeting.

Annex 3 to the officers' report to the Committee shows an 83.3% questionnaire response from Sandrock to the latest 19 July survey (a response rate higher in practice given some unoccupied properties at the time of the survey). It also shows that every Sandrock respondent, without exception, disagreed with the restriction times proposed by the County Council. Instead, residents again confirmed their wish for a 24 hrs 7 days a week restriction if they are to support and pay for permit parking.

We were therefore extremely disappointed that the report makes no mention of this and only proposes to advertise the restrictions from 08.30-17.30hrs, Monday-Friday. Can we ask the Committee not only to agree with the recommendation that the proposals for restricted parking go to formal advertisement, but that the hours of restriction are changed for Sandrock to reflect our wishes of their being permanent, or 24/7 ?

Committee response

The purpose of a residents' parking scheme is to make it easier for residents to park near their homes. The proposed operational hours for Sandrock are 8.30am to 5.30pm, Monday to Friday as this is generally when shoppers and commuters park in residential roads.

A 24/7 parking restriction would mean that residents would need to provide visitor permits for their visitors in the evenings and weekends. This could be quite inconvenient. In addition, considerably less enforcement takes place outside core hours and so enforcement of residents parking restrictions over-night or on Sunday would be extremely limited. It would therefore be unrealistic to propose these operational hours and would serve to raise residents' expectations unduly high and beyond what is likely to be delivered. Furthermore the existing 'except for access' restriction will still apply at all times to deter other vehicles from trying to make use of this road. The operational hours provide consistency with the other proposed residents parking schemes in the town.

8. Ms Áine Hall (Haslemere)

In the officer report to the Local Committee (waverley), **Review Of On-Street Parking In Haslemere: Phase 1 -- Response To Petitions** it states:

3.2 Beech Road. The consultation response rate was relatively low (36%), but 75% of respondents wanted a scheme. In addition residents have previously presented a signed letter of representation requesting resident parking. The operational hours proposed for this road would prevent all-day parking but still allow parking for visitors to the Health Centre in the morning and afternoon.

3.21 In the permit schemes, it is proposed to allocate a maximum of two residents' permits to any household without any off-street parking, a maximum of one permit to any household with one-off street parking space, and any household with two or more off-street parking spaces would not be eligible for permits. The exception to this would be in Beech Road, where there would be no upper limit on permit numbers, as there is more space available on-street. The cost of permits would be £50 for the first permit issued to a household and £75 for any other permits issued.

I note that all Beech Road respondents to the questionnaire have off-street parking and yet the whole road is proposed to be residents' parking only. 83% of the respondents have two or more off-street parking spaces. Beech Road is also being considered in Phase One when there are significantly more pressing parking needs in other roads, for example, Lower Street, Shepherds Hill to name but a few. Councillor Robert Knowles who is a member of this Local Committee lives in Beech Road. Is Beech Road being given special treatment because Councillor Robert Knowles lives there ?

Committee response

No.

Supplementary question

Ms Hall understood that any displacement emerging from implementation of the Phase 1 schemes before the Committee today would be assessed in Phases 2 and 3. She believed that Beech Road residents had been advised to respond to the recent survey on the basis of possible displacement: why, then, is Beech Road to be considered as part of Phase 1 ?

9. Ms Nikki Barton (Haslemere)

In June 2012 the Local Committee (Waverley) agreed that officers would prepare proposals for (quote): "...the introduction of several urgent matters of road safety [...] and the introduction of a number of small resident-only parking schemes, for which there is very clear majority support amongst residents and where it is widely accepted that these would not result in any significant vehicular displacement." Officers also reassured the Committee that (quote) "... the Parking Team will work with all stakeholders in Haslemere".

The revised proposals that the Committee is discussing today go way beyond that scope and the County team has certainly not met with all stakeholders. The proposals are for extensive (not small) resident permit schemes in a very long list of roads.

In terms of meeting the criteria of very clear residents' support, other than for a handful of roads where there were petitions, the County Council seems to be relying heavily on just a small number of questionnaire responses. The survey and meeting were held over the school holidays when the town empties, and there was accordingly a very low overall response rate of 31.5%, in some roads considerably lower. Interpretation of the survey results has led to some extraordinary decisions. Approval rates for resident-only parking schemes of 75% for example seem convincing, until you understand that this was 75% of a mere 36% response, effectively only 27%. Yet on the strength of this 27% approval, the whole length of Beech Road has been given residents only parking, despite every resident, bar one that took part in the survey having two or more off-street parking spaces.

The report does not show whether any alternatives were considered with residents and it seems hardly credible to believe, as the report suggests, that there would not be significant displacement. The report makes no attempt to analyse this assertion. So my question is a simple one, in the light of the failure to follow its own commitment to the community of Haslemere, can this Committee please explain how it is appropriate for it to consider these parking proposals in their current form, let alone approve taking them to the next stage ?

Committee response

The response to the July/August resident parking consultation was disappointing from some roads, including Beech Road. The reasons for this are not clear. The time of year when the survey was carried out may have been a factor or possibly because residents had previously submitted a petition of 34 signatures from 31 properties in Beech Road supporting residents parking as currently proposed. (There are 32 properties in Beech Road).

The roads where resident parking is proposed in the report (Item 7) are expected to have a minimal impact on parking displacement. It is estimated by the County Council Parking Team and Haslemere Town Council that there will be approximately 35 non-resident vehicles displaced as a result of the residents' parking proposals. There is adequate space for these vehicles in nearby car parks and unrestricted roads.

Supplementary question

Ms Barton referred again to the criteria for assessment under Phase 1 agreed at the 22 June 2012 meeting of the Committee; she asked if the Committee would feel satisfied in approving recommendations based on such a low response to the recent survey and requested a more comprehensive consultation along the lines of that to which she believed the Council had committed.

10. Mr Jeremy Barton (Haslemere)

Regarding Haslemere parking, as a member of the public, one thing that I and others learnt in March this year was that Surrey County Council could not conduct a proper consultation or prepare a reliable report for the Committee within its chosen 28 day statutory consultation period (this was reinforced by the County Council's May letter giving notice that the Council in conjunction with the Chairman of the Local Committee (Waverley) had decided not to proceed with the March proposals, offering "an alternative way forward"); in this context, (a) what specific lessons did the Council, the Chairman of the Committee and the Committee themselves learn about improving consultation and due process and, (b) if the Committee decides (even after taking legal advice) to go to statutory consultation on the current, hurriedly thrown together, proposals for widespread parking controls in Haslemere (well beyond just those few roads mentioned in petitions), will the Committee give our esteemed County Council officers at least a chance to conclude their engagement and consultation properly, working with the Town Council, residents and all stakeholders, and therefore adopt an extended statutory consultation period of, say, at least ten weeks? To get it wrong twice - and the limited consultation effort so far since June clearly raises the flag - would not only be a material failure vis-à-vis Haslemere, but also deepen the crisis for the County Council and the Committee's reputation across Surrey.

Committee response

The County Council has listened to residents in Haslemere following two consultations about on-street parking in the town. After the first in January there was dissatisfaction amongst some residents with the proposals and the way the consultation was carried out. The Council subsequently decided to withdraw these and start again. In June the Committee also listened to residents who presented petitions requesting residents' parking. A further consultation has been carried out and the Committee now has more information to help it make a decision.

It is seldom possible to 'please all the people all the time' when implementing parking restrictions and the committee will need to make a decision in the best interests of the majority of residents in the roads where residents' parking is proposed based on the information available.

There is no reason to have a 10 week statutory consultation period given the amount of prior consultation that has taken place. A three week period is the minimum required by law, and observed by many local authorities, but the Council's practice is to allow an extended period of four weeks, which is an adequate time for people to register their comments.

Supplementary question

Mr Barton asked what lessons had been learned in addition to an observation that "it is seldom possible to 'please all the people all the time'".

11. Ms Maria Mateo (Haslemere)

*"As with the introduction of any new parking controls, there are **possible risks** attached to bringing in these new parking schemes. There is **likely to be some displacement** of vehicles that currently park in the roads, but will not be eligible for permits and will therefore need to **find somewhere else to park**. It is **not anticipated that this will prove too problematic**, but will need monitoring". (Report at Item 7, 3.26).*

Please explain the basis of this statement, including any analysis and reports prepared regarding the displacement of vehicles. In particular, please clarify:

1. What are risks envisaged by the County Council ?
2. What is the likely displacement anticipated by the Council ?
3. Where does the County Council propose that those displaced vehicles will park ?
4. On what basis does the Council anticipate that the displacement will not be problematic ?

For the avoidance of doubt, I understand the issue about "monitoring" which refers to the future (after the scheme is implemented). My question, however, refers to the analysis that the County Council has done to date to reach the conclusion stated in paragraph 3.26 and not its plans once the scheme is implemented.

Committee response

1. What are risks envisaged by the County Council ?
 - **Displacement causing congestion in other roads (paragraph 3.26)**
 - **Not enough space for permit holders at peak times (paragraph 3.27)**
2. What is the likely displacement anticipated by the Council ?
Approximately 35 vehicles.
3. Where does the County Council propose that those displaced vehicles will park ?
In local car parks or spread across other unrestricted roads.
4. On what basis does the Council anticipate that the displacement will not be

problematic ?

There will be enough alternative parking in the area to accommodate the displaced vehicles.

Supplementary question

With respect to the estimated level of displacement, Ms Mateo asked for details of the source of the data (i.e. 35 cars).

ANNEX 3: MEMBER'S QUESTION

From Mr David Munro

Recently there have been two serious accidents involving vehicles travelling north down the A325 Wrecclesham Hill. In each case vehicles have lost control and collided with railings separating the carriageway from the west-side footway with such force that the railings have had to be removed and temporary barriers installed.

This has of course been reported to Highways and they are taking action. However, because of the seriousness of the issue, could I have the Area Highways Manager's assurance that the barriers will be fully repaired as soon as possible so that some protection is afforded to pedestrians and residents in the vicinity, and that the underlying causes of these accidents are investigated with urgency and appropriate remedial measures undertaken quickly ?

Committee response

Replacement railings have been ordered by the Council's contractor. However, the equipment is not standard stock and requires a special order to be placed with the supplier. The estimated lead time for delivery and installation is ten weeks. In the meantime the local Community Highways Officer will monitor the site to ensure that the temporary barriers remain in place.

Surrey Police supply reported accident data to Surrey Highways and the most recent update is to the end of May 2012. If the accidents that resulted in the damage to the railings have been reported to the Police, they will be analysed when received to see whether there are common factors. Local members will recall that these railings were previously damaged during the severe winter of 2009 when the road was iced for several weeks.

Supplementary question

Mr Munro did not ask a formal supplementary question but indicated that he would pursue the matter at a senior level within the Highways service.

ANNEX 4

INFORMAL PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The meeting was preceded by an informal public question time. The matters raised are summarised below. This summary does not form part of the formal minutes of the meeting.

1. From Mr P Murphy (Elstead Parish Council)

The question raised concerns related to the revised bus services operated by Countryliner, specifically:

- Cost: fares, with a student travel card, had risen by 50%
- Reliability: the early morning service used by students was frequently late in leaving Elstead
- Timetable: the last departure from Guildford is at 5.15, as a result of which retail workers needing to catch this service are having to leave work early.

The Chairman undertook to obtain a written response from the relevant officers.

2. From Mr D Pope (on behalf of residents of Courts Hill Road (West), Haslemere)

Mr Pope welcomed the proposed parking arrangements for the road, but asked if the five spaces identified at the far western end of the road, and now being proposed for “free parking”, could be marked on the road in bays of similar dimensions to those for the other 17 spaces for “residents’ parking” elsewhere in this stretch of the road.

The Chairman replied that a response would be provided at Item 7.

3. From Mrs E Ames (Alfold Parish Council)

The Council wished to express its concern and disappointment at the recommendations of the report at Item 12 written in response to the petition presented by residents of Dunsfold Road and Compasses Park at the previous meeting. Mrs Ames asked the Committee to invite the Area Highways Manager to reconsider his recommendations, to designate Dunsfold Road from its junction with the B2133 to be part of the continuous network of unclassified roads also classified as “unsuitable for use by HGVs”.

The Chairman replied that the matter would be discussed at Item 12.

4. From Ms K Greenwood (Tilford Parish Council)

Ms Greenwood drew the Committee’s attention to the congestion in Tilford Street caused by traffic waiting to enter Waverley Abbey School and to the speed of some vehicles which overtake the waiting traffic. Parking on verges also reduces visibility for children. It is understood that proposals made to the school have not been accepted by the governors. Highways officers have

agreed to install strips in the road and the Committee was requested to accelerate this.

The Area Highways Manager responded that he had discussed with the school ways of moving traffic more quickly and the alterations put in place had not been effective. He undertook to make every effort to install the measures on Tilford Road as quickly as possible. He acknowledged the problem of speed at all times and reported that Surrey Police's Casualty Reduction Officer had carried out enforcement at this location.

As local members Mr Harmer and Mr Adams expressed their support for the Parish Council's concern and agreed that a second exit at the school would solve the problem.

5. From Mr S Fraser (Churt)

Mr Fraser asked when work would start on the remaining section of the A287 to be resurfaced in Churt.

The Area Highways Manager replied that work should start in the next few months and that authorization for the 30mph limit would be sought from the Local Committee shortly.

6. From Mr J Barton (Haslemere)

Mr Barton referred to regulations recently released by the government which encouraged openness in the proceedings of sub-committees. Referring to his question about the confidentiality of Task Groups at the 22 June 2012 meeting, Mr Barton asked whether these would now comply with the resumption of openness now being recommended. He also asked whether the Haslemere Task Group had met since the June meeting.

The Chairman confirmed that the Committee would review its processes when the outcome of the current Public Value Review had been published. The Haslemere Task Group had not met since June.

7. Ms A Hall (Haslemere)

Ms Hall referred to the consultation on which the current proposals for on-street parking in Haslemere had been based and asked how these could be justified as only a minority of those affected had been consulted: no other alternatives had been proposed and residents of adjacent roads and other users had not been included.

The Chairman replied that responses to informal questions relating to parking proposals in Haslemere would be addressed at Item 7.

8. Ms J Pohorley (Haslemere)

Ms Pohorley asked why Lower Street and Shepherds Hill had still not been included in the current proposals for on-street parking and why their residents, who had no on-street parking, had not been treated equally with other residents.

The Chairman replied that responses to informal questions relating to parking proposals in Haslemere would be addressed at Item 7.

9. Mrs V Leake (Haslemere)

Mrs Leake noted that the residents of Kings Road and Longdene had been told that they would receive residents' only parking schemes if they wished, whereas residents of some neighbouring roads had not been consulted, and asked whether this was the correct way to introduce parking schemes in Haslemere.

The Chairman replied that responses to informal questions relating to parking proposals in Haslemere would be addressed at Item 7.

This page is intentionally left blank