

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Waverley LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
 held at 10.00 am on 9 December 2016  
 at Godalming Baptist Church, Queen Street, Godalming GU7 1BA.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

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

**Borough / District Members:**

- \* Cllr Jerry Hyman
- \* Cllr Carole Cockburn
- Cllr Brian Adams
- \* Cllr Denis Leigh
- \* Cllr Julia Potts
- Cllr David Round
- \* Cllr Richard Seaborne
- \* Cllr Val Henry
- \* Cllr Jeannette Stennett

\* In attendance

---

**41/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from the following members:

Ms Denise Le Gal

Cllr Brian Adams  
 Cllr David Round

**42/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed by the Local Committee.

**43/16 DECISION TRACKER [Item 3]**

The decision tracker was reviewed by the committee and the Area Highways Officer updated those actions attributed to Highways.

## ITEM 2

### **44/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]**

Cllr Julia Potts has a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 as a resident of the area in question.

Cllr Richard Seaborne has a non-pecuniary interest in Item 12 as a resident of Bramley.

### **45/16 PETITION [Item 5]**

No new petitions had been received for this meeting

### **46/16 RESPONSE TO PETITION: REINSTATEMENT OF BUS SERVICES 4 & 5 [Item 6]**

The results of the divisional member's survey were shared with the committee. As a result it was agreed that the chairman and the divisional member would instigate a meeting with the bus company to see if they would be prepared to reinstate the service. It was noted that the final decision as to whether or not to do so would be with the bus company.

### **47/16 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 7]**

**Question 1** had been received from Mr Martyn Sandford who had asked which officers were responsible for cycling within the borough.

Having received and acknowledged the Cycling Strategy Officer's response, Mr Sandford's follow up question concerned how did the team ensure that any funding would be invested in an appropriate way. The Cycling Officer stated that there are a set of standards that they work to which sets out both the minimum requirements as well as the ideal levels that they would want to aspire to.

The chairman also related that a cycling officer had been invited to the area task groups to advise on cycling improvements as a local level.

**Question 2** had been received by Mr David Howell. This related to parking arrangements in and around College Gardens in Farnham

The Local Committee acknowledge Mr Howell's question and the officer response.

### **48/16 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 8]**

Cllr Jerry Hyman submitted a question concerning proposed traffic management measures at the 'Royal Deer' junction. A full response will be sent to the councillor directly.

The chair assured Cllr Hyman that the situation will be looked at as a matter of urgency.

**49/16 REVIEW OF PROGRESS: WAVERLEY LOCAL PLAN (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 9]**

In the absence of Cllr Brian Adams who was convalescing from surgery at the time of the committee. A written update was submitted by a Waverley Borough Council planning officer.

In addition, Cllr Potts reported that she had attended a meeting concerning this the previous day and all work was on track.

**The Local Committee resolved to:**

Note the written update that was presented.

**Reason:**

The outcome of the Local Plan will impact infrastructure (including highways).

**50/16 REVIEW OF WAVERLEY CYCLING STRATEGY (EXECUTIVE DECISION) [Item 10]**

The Cycling Officer presented her report. This report suggested the next steps for the Waverley Cycling Plan and set out a role for the local committee to oversee its development. This included a Cycling Plan website which it was proposed would serve a 'one-stop shop' for residents for all cycling matters and provide a link into other transport initiatives such as "Drive SMART"

The committee recognised the work of the cycling team and that the plan had good local support. It was also recognised that cycling groups (such as the one represented by Mr Sandford who had submitted a question on this earlier) could play a role in determining what was needed and should be invited to submit their views where possible.

The committee also acknowledged that it was important that key routes were joined up across the borough and across the borough and county boundaries where appropriate. The Cycling Officer related that the maps on the proposed webpage would highlight this and that the cycling team were made aware of any proposed developments in the borough so that links could be assessed between town centres, stations, bridleways and existing cycle paths.

As part of the report, the Cycling Officer had included some low-cost schemes. It was noted that these were items that were relatively simple to implement and would demonstrate the committee's commitment to the cycle strategy although schemes of any size would still be considered on merit.

The safety of cyclists was raised as a concern, especially for families who wanted to encourage their children to cycle. The Cycling Officer told the committee that this data was available on the webpage. Accident blackspots are indicated along with the nature of the accidents so that trends can be monitored and safety measures improved.

(Mr Alan Young left the meeting at 11.03)

It is suggested that the £10,000 of budget that was proposed as part of the recommendations could be used to make improvements to signage. This

## ITEM 2

which would enhance the infrastructure by promoting routes but also improve safety. However divisional members, task groups can influence this and nominate the improvements they would like to see.

### **The Local Committee resolved to:**

- (i) Approve the publication of the Cycling Plan as a webpage with map of existing and suggested infrastructure, and to receive ongoing comments and suggestions via the webpage.
- (ii) Agree that the Cycling Plan be used as a basis for officers to liaise with borough officers to update the Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document.
- (iii) Agree in principle the list of suggested lower cost schemes.
- (iv) Make an allocation of £10,000 from the committee's highways budget for cycling schemes that can then be considered by the **appropriate** Task Group.

### **Reasons:**

- (i) The Waverley Local Cycling Plan is being updated in line with the Surrey Cycling Strategy. By publishing the cycling plan as a webpage it maximises those viewing it and enables it to be easily updated to keep it relevant.
- (ii) As new policy documents are being written or updated for Waverley, the Cycling Plan can inform these plans.
- (iii) By creating a prioritised list of cycle infrastructure and identifying lower-cost improvements it will enable more targeted cycle development and encourage cycling in the borough.

## **51/16 HGVS IN RURAL AREAS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 11]**

The Transport Planning Engineer presented his report which was an update on progress on the combined rural Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) review and de-cluttering project being carried out in the central part of the Surrey Hills area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB) currently focussed mainly within the Parishes of Shere, Ewhurst and Albury. This area is illustrated by the map contained in annex 2 of the report.

The review seeks to reduce HGV traffic from this rural area by redirecting the vehicles to the larger A' roads around the periphery. Local parish councils have been consulted so that a consensus can be reached about the approach and this consultation is still underway. The Transport Planning Engineer also hopes to win the support of the police for this proposal. This area is being piloted with the intention that the transport

team can learn what approach is most effective in alleviating HGV traffic and thus roll out this scheme to other areas in Surrey.

In parallel to this work, the transport team, in collaboration with the parish councils, are identifying superfluous road signage and street clutter in order to improve the look of the street scene in the area and reduce driver distractions

The committee asked how the redirection of the vehicles would work and what impact on there might be on local businesses that relied upon the vehicles for deliveries. The Transport Planning Engineer advised that the signage that would be used would be the mandatory signage prescribed by the Department for Transport which would require a traffic order. The redirection could not be formally enforced but is intended to encourage HGV drivers to use more appropriate routes and avoid using rural lanes as a short cut. It would not hamper vehicles making deliveries as part of their rightful business. The Ordinance Survey have recently conducted an assessment to determine more appropriate routes for HGVs and there is a specific satellite navigation system for large vehicles that can filter out roads where there are restrictions.

Support was voiced for the de-cluttering scheme with members seeing the value of this process. The Transport Planning Engineer advised that the risk assessment would shortly be commencing in other areas and that a copy of the form that collects the assessment data had been included as annex 1 of the report for the members' information

#### **The Local Committee resolved to:**

- (i) Support the continuation of road signing decluttering programme.
- (ii) Support the continuation of a collaborative approach supporting parish councils to identify rural HGV and traffic issues and note that a report will be brought back to this committee for decision.

#### **Reasons**

- (i) The project crosses parish and local committee boundaries so it is prudent to reach a consensus with the parish councils before seeking a decision from the relevant local committees.
- (ii) Parish councils, with their in depth knowledge of their locality, are ideally placed to play a central role in identifying superfluous signing and street furniture and a number have already been trialling the using the Norfolk risk assessment process.
- (iii) Much work on decluttering audits by parish councils has now taken place and so it would be timely to advise the committee of progress or the trial process before rolling out the initiative to other areas.

**52/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 12]**

The Area Highways Manager presented an update on current Highways work across the borough and the list of schemes recommended by the Local Transport task group following input from the four area groups.

The Area Highways Manager reported that the committee budget for 2016/17 has now all been spent and that priority was given to spending funding that has come from developer schemes (such as Planning Infrastructure Contribution 'PIC', Section 106 'S106' and Community Infrastructure Levy 'CIL')

The Lengthmen's scheme and maintenance works had all run well this year.

With reference to recommendation (ii) on page 45 of the committee papers, it was noted that both the Highways officers and the police approved this measure and the divisional member had personally witnessed speeding in this area at a time when there were pedestrians present.

It was further noted that this would be funded by PIC money which should be spent in the division in which it was generated and for measures which benefit the community. It was therefore agreed that this measure would be appropriate and would encourage traffic to slow down ahead of the double bend.

With reference to recommendation (iii), the scheme in question has already been agreed previously. What was being requested here was the authority to seek the appropriate traffic order which will publicise the council's intention to install the bus cage and gather the public's responses accordingly which will be taken into account by the Area Highways Manager.

It was noted that the task groups sometimes include schemes that do not get implemented due to budget restrictions which then may get carried over to the following year. This did not however, guarantee that they were implemented as they still competed with any other schemes and were prioritised according to their relative merit. It was suggested that schemes that are not implemented are recorded so that members can get more transparency of the task group's decision making process.

The committee asserted the importance of local knowledge when smaller transport measures (such as the provision and location of bus stops) are decided upon as local Members were best placed to gauge the impact of decisions on residents. It was therefore decided that the chairman would write to the appropriate cabinet member to ensure that these decisions were referred to the committee.

The Area Highways Manager was asked whether measures were monitored for effectiveness after implementation. He reported that schemes were often revisited up to one year after they were first installed.

The committee moved on to discuss the recommendation schemes to be installed in the next financial year. The available budget will not be known until the end of the financial year in March, however the task group has devised a schedule of schemes making an assumption that the budget will be

in the region of £500,000. As the assumed budget was £750,000 last year, this figure acknowledges the likelihood that there will be a significant reduction in funding this year.

The Area Highways Manager will inform each divisional member of available Section 106 and PIC funding in their respective divisions.

At the time the report was written, the £10,000 allocation to the improvement of cycling infrastructure, which was earlier agreed as part of item 10 of this committee, had not been proposed. This will be incorporated into future financial calculations.

It was recognised that the lists of recommendations presented by the area task groups were driven by each area's priorities and it was understood that the budget to implement all of them (especially the larger schemes) was unlikely to be available. It was however agreed that the allocation of funding was a necessary step to take at that time in order to allow scheme designs to be drawn up straightway which would assist in their timely delivery in the following year. It was further agreed that the assumed budget of £530,000 budget was realistic given the present financial uncertainty. The task groups would be convened as appropriate to progress decisions once the budget has been set.

The committee went on to discuss the recommendation for the Horizon 2 programme which is a scheme to undertake major maintenance works across the borough. As 80% of the programme has been determined, the committee was asked for its feedback on determining the remaining 20%.

As this would equate to approximately 250 metres per division, it was agreed that each county Member would nominate one road in their respective wards.

The committee noted that it would be helpful if information pertaining to this project could be presented by division in order to assist Members in locating their roads more easily.

**The Local Committee resolved to:**

- (i) Note progress of the 2016/17 programme of highway works funded by this committee and by developer contributions described at Annex 1.
- (ii) Agree to promote a traffic regulation order extend the 30mph speed limit on the B3001 Milford Road by approximately 200m to the east (towards the A3).
- (iii) Agree to promote a traffic regulation order to install a bus cage on the north side of Alma Lane and extend the existing double yellow lines opposite the junction with Heath Lane by approximately 4m to meet the new bus cage.
- (iv) Agree to promote a traffic regulation order to extend the double yellow lines on the south side of Alma Lane by approximately 15m from the junction with Heath Lane.

## ITEM 2

- (v) Agree the allocations recommended by the LTP Task Group and described in this report to a total value of £530,000.
- (vi) Note that the LTP task group will convene if necessary once the Local Committee budget is known in the spring of 2016.
- (vii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager (AHM) to progress the schemes prioritised by the four area task groups and listed at Annex A in consultation with local elected members and associated task groups, subject to available funding from developer contributions.
- (viii) Authorise the AHM to consider and determine any objections submitted following the statutory advertisement of the traffic orders and notices associated with the programme of schemes, in consultation with the Chairman and/or Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee and relevant local councillors.
- (ix) Delegate authority to the AHM in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and locally affected members to amend budgets throughout the year if required.
- (x) Agree that the Community Engagement Fund is devolved to each county councillor based on an equal allocation of £5,000 per division.
- (xi) Consider the selection of schemes under the influence of local committee for inclusion in Horizon 2 (2017-2021) Roads Major Assistance Programme.
- (xii) To delegate the final decision on selection to the AHM in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman to be submitted to Asset Planning by 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017.

### Reasons

- (i) The traffic orders are required in order to progress ITS schemes in the 2016/17 programme.
- (ii) The committee agreed the 2017/18 allocations in order that the scheme design can start at the earliest opportunity and increase confidence in their prompt delivery.
- (iii) The selection of schemes under the Horizon 2 programme will enable the finalisation of the major maintenance schemes.

(Mr Martin left the meeting following these decisions)

### **53/16 PROGRESS IN PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 13]**

The Community Partnerships and Committee Officer presented the report. This was an update on the work that had been carried out in the priority neighbourhoods since the Index of Multiple Deprivation data had been released last year.

The committee acknowledged the value of the work that had been undertaken and thanked the officer for her efforts. The officer re-iterated that she would be happy to work with members on any other initiatives in the areas in question.

**The Local Committee resolved to:**

- (i) Maintain its support for multi-agency activity in its identified priority neighbourhoods.
- (ii) Note the continuing activity in the priority neighbourhoods previously identified by the committee.

**Reason:**

- (i) The report provides a summary of continuing activity in the priority neighbourhoods previously identified by the committee

**54/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME 2016-17 (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 14]**

The forward plan was presented to the committee and they were invited to forward any requests for items for future agendas to be sent to the Committee Officer.

Meeting ended at: 13:16

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank