DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE held at 1.30 pm on 9 May 2014 at Godalming Baptist Church.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Pat Frost (Chairman)
- * Mr David Harmer (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Nikki Barton
- * Mr Steve Cosser
- * Ms Denise Le Gal
- * Mr Peter Martin
- Mr David Munro
 Mr Alan Young
 Mrs Victoria Young

Borough / District Members:

Cllr Brian Adams

- * Cllr Maurice Byham
- * Cllr Elizabeth Cable
- * Cllr Carole Cockburn
- * Cllr Brian Ellis
 - **Cllr Robert Knowles**
 - Cllr Bryn Morgan
 - Cllr Julia Potts
- * Cllr Simon Thornton

13/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mr B Adams, Mr R Knowles, Mr B Morgan, Ms J Potts, Mr A Young (received after the start of the meeting) and Mrs V Young.

14/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as a correct record.

15/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

Mr D Harmer declared a pecuniary interest in relation to Item 7 (Plan 24137) on the grounds that the area of Tower Road, Hindhead to be yellow-lined includes the exit from his driveway onto the road (via a lane).

Mr P Martin drew the Committee's attention to a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 7 (Plans 24075 and 24076) on the grounds that his daughter and son-in-law rent and live in a property in Latimer Road, Godalming.

^{*} In attendance

16/14 PETITIONS [Item 4]

The following online petitions attracted the requisite number of signatures to qualify for consideration by the Committee:

1. <u>Petition title</u>: Introduce a 20mph zone in Haslemere Town Centre and roads in Haslemere that want them.

Created by: Victoria Leake

<u>Details of petition</u>: In four years there have been four KSI (Killed and Seriously Injured) in a stretch of road less than a mile long. Between the hours of 0900 to 19.00 40 000 cars pass through Lower Street, Haslemere and possibly the town centre per week. Pedestrian and cyclists are not safe; the roads are narrow with little or no footpaths. We petition Surrey County Council and the police to make our roads safer by introducing a 20mph zone in Haslemere Town Centre and other residential roads in Haslemere should the residents want it.

Signatories: 187 confirmed, 25 unconfirmed

Mrs Leake was unable to present the petition in person but an additional statement was tabled at the meeting (Annex 1).

The Chairman announced that the Committee would receive a report in response at its next meeting.

2. <u>Petition title</u>: Remove George Road, Grays Road and Elizabeth Road Farncombe (24092, 24093) from the residents permit parking scheme.

Created by: Mr Patrick Haveron

<u>Details of petition</u>: The scheme will reduce the number of resident parking spaces in the affected roads, thus displacing residents and commuters into surrounding streets such as Station Road, Perrior Road and The Oval. "No parking" zones will increase traffic speeds in Elizabeth and Grays Road. Residents with off-road parking will have to pay for on-road visitors. This piecemeal approach is inappropriate and will lead to many subsequent extensions.

Signatories: 83 confirmed, 9 unconfirmed

The Chairman indicated that the contents of the petition would be considered as part of the discussion at Item 7.

17/14 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

The text of public questions and the responses provided had been tabled (Annex 2). The Chairman explained that the matters raised would be considered at the appropriate point at Item 7.

18/14 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

There were no member questions.

19/14 WAVERLEY PARKING REVIEW - RESPONSE TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT [Item 7]

The following locations were discussed (plan reference in brackets):

Waverley Eastern Villages

The Street, Wonersh (24134)

The local County Councillor, Mrs V Young, had asked the Committee to note her support for the proposed limited time waiting bays outside of the village shop as she felt that this would contribute to its viability. It was agreed to proceed with the recommended scheme.

Farnham Central

Stoke Hills, St James Avenue, St James Terrace (24015, 24128)

The Committee noted the problems presented by the layout of Stoke Hills, but, in view of the lack of support for a permit-holder scheme and the officers' view that all options had been explored, agreed with the recommendation not proceed with the advertised scheme for the estate.

Guildford Road, Farnham (24015, 24016)

It was proposed from the chair and agreed that this scheme be deferred to allow further discussion of alternative solutions. It had been noted that the advertised scheme would have impacted on adjacent minor roads. Two relevant public questions had been presented (Annex 2: 2 and 3) and the residents concerned indicated that they were content with this approach.

Hale Road, Farnham (24015)

Ms V Bolton, who had presented a public question (Annex 2: 1), was content with the recommendation not to proceed with the advertised scheme.

Station Hill, Farnham (24025)

The Committee recognised that parking can be one of several factors in generating congestion at this location, but members were concerned at the potential adverse impact of the proposed restrictions on the businesses in Station Hill. It was suggested, for example, that there is some lack of clarity in the arrangement of lanes, such that vehicles leaving the station with the intention of turning east onto the A31 often move so far across the carriageway as to restrict the passage of southbound traffic in Station Hill. It was proposed from the chair and agreed that the scheme would be deferred to allow further discussion on alternative options for changing driver behaviour to improve the flow of traffic and maintain safety.

Morley Road, Farnham (24034)

Mr D. Munro expressed his opposition to the proposed scheme as he felt that parking would be displaced further into southern Farnham. However, there was support for the scheme and, when put to the vote, it was approved;

In favour: 9 Against: 1 Abstained: 2

York Road, Farnham (24034, 24111)

Mr D. Munro reiterated his concerns about displacement. The proposed scheme was agreed on a vote as follows:

In favour: 9 Against: 1 Abstained: 2

Lancaster Avenue, Farnham (24121)

The Committee noted Mr D. Munro's continued opposition on the grounds of displacement. It was felt that the volume of commuter parking could be addressed by extending the parking facilities at Farnham Station. The proposed scheme was agreed on a vote as follows:

In favour: 10 Against: 1 Abstained: 1

Little Austins Road and Mavins Road, Farnham (24121, 24130)

Members reflected a variety of concerns: the area experiences short-term parking pressures at either end of the school day as well as all-day parking by commuters. Although most houses have off-street parking, residents are concerned about access to their properties being blocked. While recognising the support of residents for the scheme, some members felt that the number of objections, even if mostly from non-residents, should be taken into account. When put to the vote it was decided not to proceed with the scheme:

In favour: 4 Against: 6 Abstained: 2

Farnham North

<u>Upper Hale Road junction with Spring Lane, Farnham</u> (24127)

It was agreed that the extent of the restriction in front of the property known as 'Stonehaven' in Folly Lane North should be reduced and that, with this amendment, the proposed scheme should proceed.

Heath Lane, Farnham (24119)

Ms D. Le Gal asked why restrictions had not been proposed at the Alma Lane end of Heath Lane where parking opposite the junction restricted visibility at a point where a large number of schoolchildren crossed the road. Officers undertook to examine the situation as a matter of urgency.

Farnham South

Frensham Road junction with Gold Hill (Private), Farnham (24039)

Local members felt that further restrictions would have a detrimental effect on the local shops and that these would be a disproportionate response.

When put to the vote it was decided not to proceed with the scheme:

In favour: 0 Against: 5 Abstained: 7

Frensham Road junction with Stream Farm Close, Farnham (24131)

It was suggested that white-lining, although unenforceable, would be a sufficient response at this location, but that the proposed restrictions would be disproportionate.

When put to the vote it was decided not to proceed with the scheme:

In favour: 1 Against: 7 Abstained: 4

Godalming North

<u>Croft Road, South Street, Upper Queen Street, Carols Street, Town End Street, Latimer Road Permit Zone, Godalming</u> (24075, 24076)

Mr S. Cosser explained that the proposals had emerged from discussions with residents and believed that they would restore the balance of parking in Godalming and reflect the needs of residents in areas where there is little offstreet parking. He felt that there would not be a large amount of displacement. He recognised that there was a significant level of opposition from residents of Latimer and proposed that it be excluded from the scheme. Mr P. Martin, on the other hand, referred to the high level of objections and was concerned about the extent of possible displacement into roads more distant from the town centre; he felt that permit zones of this kind do not maximise the availability of on-street parking.

The proposal that the scheme proceed as amended in the recommendation and with the exclusion of Latimer Road was agreed when put to the vote:

In favour: 7 Against: 5 Abstained: 0 Mr P. Martin requested that his opposition be recorded.

Victoria Road, Godalming (24078)

Mr Patterson was invited to address the Committee and explained that the residents' preference would be for a "light-touch scheme". He felt that the road was subject to parking by town-centre workers rather than commuters and was in broad support of the proposal. Mr C Meeks, another resident, described the road as a "community street" and requested a further opportunity to explore options. Mr S. Cosser, as local County Councillor, would be prepared to discuss the operation of the scheme in practice. Mr P. Martin expressed his opposition.

When put to the vote the scheme was approved:

In favour: 7 Against: 4 Abstained: 1

George Road, Grays Road and Elizabeth Road (between Perrior and George Road) Permit Area, Farncombe (24092, 24093)

The Committee noted receipt of an online petition posted by Mr P. Haveron containing 83 signatures in opposition to the scheme and a formal public question from Mr J. Fishlock in support of a scheme in Grays Road (Annex 2: 4). Mr S. Cosser, as the local County Councillor, reminded the Committee of sustained requests from those residents living closest to the railway station for measures to address all-day parking by commuters in this area; he expressed sympathy for the position of Grays Road residents. Some members voiced their concern that consultation had taken place on the basis of the advertised combined scheme for the three roads and that implementing a scheme in only part of the area, i.e. in Grays Road, would bring risks, e.g. of displacement elsewhere. There was some support for a "light touch" scheme throughout the area. Officers indicated that a scheme in Grays Road only would be feasible, but retained some reservations about such a course of action. Mr S. Cosser proposed (seconded by Mr S. Thornton) that the scheme should not proceed, except in Grays Road where a residents' parking scheme will proceed as advertised. The Committee agreed to this proposal as follows:

In favour: 8 Against: 4 Abstained: 0

Haslemere

Courts Hill Road, Haslemere (24058, 24117)

The Committee noted public questions presented by Mr B. and Mrs R. McDevitt and Ms J. Godden and the tabled responses (Annex 2: 5 and 6). Mrs N. Barton, as the local County Councillor, supported the request of Mr and Mrs McDevitt that their house should appear on relevant maps and recognised their concern about access; she also reported that representatives of Haughton House are content with the proposed compromise. Mr D. Pope, in a supplementary statement on behalf of Ms Godden, felt that the potential impact of the proposed adjustments on the community had not been noted in

the report or addressed in the tabled response and that a serious road safety risk would remain. It was agreed to proceed with the recommended scheme.

Waverley Western Villages

Thursley Road (24142) and Milford Road junction with Upper Springfield (24142), Elstead

The Committee noted a formal public question submitted by Mrs J. Else. Mr D. Harmer as the local County Councillor reported widespread opposition to the proposals, including that of Elstead Parish Council. He asked for the schemes to be withdrawn and for discussions about alternative arrangements to take place with the Parish Council. The Committee agreed that the proposed schemes should not proceed.

Summary of adjustments agreed at the meeting to the published recommendations in Annexes A and C:

Plan	Location	Amendment
24015,	A325 Guildford Road,	Defer for consideration of
24016	Farnham	alternative solutions.
24025	Station Hill, Farnham	Defer for further consideration of options.
24121,	Little Austins Road and	Do not proceed.
24130	Mavins Road, Farnham	
24127	Upper Hale Road j/w Spring Lane, Farnham	Proceed as amended: reduce extent of restriction in front of 'Stonehaven' (Folly Lane North).
24039	Frensham Road j/w Gold Hill (Private), Farnham	Do not proceed.
24131	Frensham Road j/w Stream Farm Close, Farnham	Do not proceed.
24075,	Croft Road, South Street,	Proceed with recommended
24076	Upper Queen Street,	amendments, but with the
	Carlos Street, Town End Street, Latimer Road Permit Zone, Godalming	exclusion of Latimer Road.
24092,	George Road, Grays	Do not proceed, except in Grays
24093	Road and Elizabeth Road	Road where a residents' parking
	(between Perrior Road	scheme will proceed as advertised.
	and George Road) Permit Area, Godalming	
24142	Thursley Road, Elstead	Do not proceed.
24142	Milford Road j/w Upper Springfield, Elstead	Do not proceed.

Officers were requested to ensure that, for all agreed restrictions, adequate notification is provided locally and that "light touch" enforcement is carried out during the first four weeks on operation.

Several members expressed their concern that the approach to advertising proposed schemes sought objections only, with the consequent risk that the level of support may be underestimated in consultations.

Resolved to agree:

- (i) The proposals and recommendations in Annexes A and C, as amended following statutory consultation and further by this Committee (as set out above).
- (ii) That if necessary the Parking Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member make minor adjustments to the proposals following the meeting.
- (iii) That the County Council make an Order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and onstreet parking restrictions as shown in Annex B and as amended by Annexes A and C and by this Committee (and as subsequently modified by (ii)).
- (iv) That the Committee allocate up to £20,000 towards the cost of implementing these proposals.

Reason

Changes to the highway network, the built environment and society mean that parking behaviour changes and consequently it is necessary for a Highway Authority to carry out regular reviews of waiting and parking restrictions on the highway network.

Following consideration of the comments and objections the waiting restrictions agreed by the Committee will help to:

- Improve road safety
- · Increase access for emergency vehicles
- Improve access to shops, facilities and businesses
- Increase access for refuse vehicles and service vehicles
- Ease traffic congestion
- · Better regulate parking

Meeting ended at: 4.10 pm

Chairman