



# Farnham Infrastructure Programme

Farnham Board  
22 March 2024



# Minutes

<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	22 March 2024, 10:00-11:30
<b>Venue:</b>	MS Teams
<b>Chair:</b>	Tim Oliver (TO)
<b>In attendance:</b>	Rt Hon Jeremy Hunt MP (JH) Cllr Catherine Powell (CP) Cllr Andy MacLeod (AM) Cllr David Beaman (DB) Cllr Tony Fairclough (TF) Cllr Alan Earwaker (AE) Elaine Martin (EM) – Surrey County Council Hannah Simpson (HS) – Surrey County Council Ben Funning (BF) – Surrey County Council Jenny de Q (JD) – Farnham Town Council Iain Lynch (IL) – Farnham Town Council Dawn Hudd (DH) – Waverley Borough Council David Stempfer (DS) – Surrey County Council Aurelie Pot (AP) – Surrey County Council Gemma Joyner (GJ) – Surrey County Council Rich Franklin (RF) – AtkinsRéalisis
<b>Apologies:</b>	Neil McClure Katie Stewart Cllr Paul Follows Cllr Michaela Martin

Ref	Item
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>TO outlined that FIP has been making good progress on number of areas and hope to see substantive work starting in the summer in the town centre. Thanked Members from all councils for support. TO confirmed that Natalie Bramhall has replaced Matt Furniss as Cabinet Member and Tony Fairclough has replaced Peter Clark.</p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Actions from previous meeting</b></p> <p>TO circulated letter from Farnham Society regarding Borelli's Bridge. Stated that the issue is now closed as the bridge will be 2.5m wide in line with the planning approval.</p> <p>TO asked if all agree actions are closed. All agreed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Key successes</b></p> <p>EM ran through the key project successes slide giving a brief overview on the progress made on each project under FIP to date.</p>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>20mph</b></p> <p>EM outlined that the Upper Hale Road Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) for the physical measures (tables and crossings) and the speed limit has been advertised. The TRO has been reviewed and accepted by the Surrey Member. It is now with the SCC TRO Team to make into an Order. Construction will start in July 2024.</p>

Ref	Item
	<p>CP stated that if work is starting in July, it will clash with the Sandy Hill water works. Has this interfaced been considered?</p> <p>EM stated the 20mph construction has been booked on Streetworks who manage timing of construction phases.</p>
5	<p><b>Borelli Walk</b></p> <p>EM said the preliminary design is almost complete, and we are finalising environmental mitigations and urban design including lighting. The ecological and topographical surveys are complete. We are currently planning a tree survey in April to review the existing tree stock.</p> <p>Construction provisionally scheduled from December 2024 to align with when the works will be reduced for the Christmas period in the town centre.</p>
6	<p><b>Water Lane</b></p> <p>EM advised that construction is now underway and showed the latest photographs of the site.</p>
7	<p><b>Town Centre – Introduction</b></p> <p>EM said the team have been working hard and a lot of activities have been carried out since the last Farnham Board in December:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Infrastructure Levy bid to Waverley BC for £3,253,726.</li> </ul> <p>DH confirmed that the CIL bid was successful and will be split over a 2-year payment as the project progresses.</p> <p>CP clarified that it still must go through full council before final approval. DH confirmed that this is correct. It has been approved by the Executive Committee but must go to Full Council as over £2.5 million.</p> <p>TO clarified that this is with the recommendation for approval by Full Council.</p> <p>EM continued to outline activities completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing with the detailed design.</li> <li>• Basement, pavement coring, ground penetration radar surveys and CCTV drainage surveys are complete.</li> <li>• Discussions with heritage teams and material suppliers for material palette and paving styles/suitability.</li> <li>• There is a meeting at 12pm today to review the potential paving samples.</li> <li>• Developing the phasing of the works with the contractor and our Streetworks team.</li> <li>• Engagement with Stagecoach and the Passenger Transport team to discuss mitigation to reduce the impact to bus journey times from the scheme.</li> </ul> <p><b>Town Centre – The Borough</b></p> <p>EM outlined that concern was raised by members about the proposed design of the bus stop on The Borough, with buses potentially blocking traffic. Although this was not raised as an issue by either the safety audit, internal SCC teams or the police as per usual practice, we have reviewed the design. The design would not be suitable for a bus layby at this location as inline bus stops are easier for buses to pull out from (this aligns with SCC Healthy Streets guidance) and there is limited space. The design has therefore been updated to include a widened eastbound lane where cars can pass by the bus while stopped and a single</p>



Ref	Item
	<p>westbound lane. This alteration means that the loading bays have been removed on the southern side and the pavements have not been widened to the same extent as the previous design. EM flagged that there is a risk that loading could cause congestion as the loading bays have been removed, particularly on the southern side of The Borough, which has been flagged to the local Farnham members.</p> <p>CP said the SCC Members are relieved that bus is in wider lane and noted the risk that there are lots of deliveries on the north side, so this is the area for concern. Welcomed the widening of pavements on northern side. There is some narrowing of pavements on the south side to facilitate having rain gardens and CP wishes to be part of any design discussions.</p> <p>DB asked if there would be a bus clearway.</p> <p>EM said yes there would be.</p> <p>AM asked about the possibility of loading bay in central carpark to help with loading. WBC may be happy to do this.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to investigate possibility of loading bay in Central Carpark.</b></p> <p>TO asked if there are restricted times on loading and unloading. CP confirmed it is currently 8am-6pm and raised the current lack of enforcement. TO said if it is 8am-6pm then it is a question of enforcement.</p> <p><b>Town Centre – Castle Street cycle lane</b></p> <p>CP raised the Castle Street cycle lane from Park Row to Long Garden Walk.</p> <p>EM confirmed that to keep the town centre programme moving forward, the cycle lane cannot be included at this time, but it will be considered in future via the LCWIPs. The cycle lane was considered in early phases of design. It would require removal of parking spaces on Castle Street. We already have a petition against removal of parking from Castle Street residents, comments that it is not suitable by heritage teams and that it would also cause revenue loss to the parking team. It is not considered possible at this time.</p> <p>TO confirmed that loss of parking revenue is not the deciding factor, it is residents and heritage concerns.</p> <p><i>Decision: All decided that the Castle Street cycle lane would be removed from the scheme.</i></p>
8	<p><b>Park Row</b></p> <p>EM confirmed feedback from the TRO for parking, loading and bus stops has been reviewed and the decision report drafted. The cycle lane on High Park Road and closure of Park Row was not popular in public consultation. Our recommendation is to remove this from the scheme to align with the public opinion from the consultation. Once we have monitored the real benefits and impacts of the wider scheme, it could be considered in future, potentially as part of the LCWIP.</p> <p>CP said Councillors are disappointed that this will be removed as it is seen as critical infrastructure for the town. Will prioritise as part of the LCWIP. Sad to see the TRO has not been supported.</p> <p>TO said to be clear there is public opposition, so there needs to be further engagement with residents to explain the benefits if want to obtain support to be a future scheme/LCWIP.</p>

Ref	Item
9	<p><b>Farnham Summary Programme</b></p> <p>EM outlined that at the last Farnham Board, JH and TO requested an earlier start date. We have engaged with Ringway to develop the works phasing plan. The town centre scheme is programmed to start from September 2024. Cannot start earlier due to conflicting road space with Water Lane, Upper Hale Road 20mph, East Street Brightwells Yard and water works on Sandy Hill Road. We are aware that Members want to be involved in the phasing and are committed to this. We will engage once we have feedback from Ringway and Streetworks.</p> <p>CP said there are schemes missing from list – road safety scheme on Weybourne Road (new pedestrian and cycle crossing) and Bullers Road (first school street in Surrey). Engagement with the schools and residents of Bullers Road has started, they are aware of works proposed. Consultation to take place in April. CP said this work needs to be done before town centre and asked to do the work over the summer. They have not booked road space. Want to integrate as two children hit by car earlier this year.</p> <p>TO asked if this would mean work would have to be done as part of the town centre. EM said she would check with Streetworks as not sure of the diversion routes.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to check with Streetworks about diversion routes for town centre to see if potential impact to Safety Outside Schools schemes.</b></p>
10	<p><b>LCWIP</b></p> <p>EM noted that LCWIP are now being delivered by Surrey Transport Policy Team and Neil McClure is unable to attend today so gave an update on his behalf:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now in Stage 2 feasibility design and the design proposal has been drafted to review the final priority cycle and core walking routes.</li> <li>• Report update is being prepared to capture recent stakeholder activity for consensus reached on priority routes.</li> <li>• Feasibility work is aligned to countywide LCWIP programme development and public consultation on schemes and options will form part of this stage.</li> <li>• Next stage will be to schedule a meeting with the partners for project inception and the report updated for completion and publishing.</li> </ul> <p>CP said there was a series of meetings with residents last summer that ended 17 Oct 2023 which covered other routes they want to see with the A31 projects. Minutes showed an addendum will be done to capture updates from this meeting, in the meantime a set of proposals that went to WBC that had additional changes which have not been shared with SCC officers, therefore she would like a meeting with Neil McClure to see whether these are proposals that are supported and should be included in addendum.</p> <p>DH said she was not at the meeting but is aware there was a long discussion on LCWIP and will get an update and will liaise with EM.</p> <p>CP said the top priority route was subject to planning that went to planning meeting about 10 days ago (Wednesday), was refused (Farnham Park to Hale Road) as was not included as a condition but WBC share strength of feeling to support this route.</p> <p>TO said lots of work has been done on defining routes with public meetings. Frustrating there are separate suggestions coming through.</p> <p><b>Action: NM to arrange meeting with SCC, WBC and FTC Members to get final version of LCWIP priority routes to stop doing various iterations and get one final agreed version.</b></p>

Ref	Item
11	<p><b>Farnham A31 Corridor</b></p> <p>EM outlined that the Strategic Outline Business Case for the scheme was submitted to DfT in November 2021 and recommended for approval in November 2022. As 2.5 years has passed, we are reviewing the costs, programme, and design to ensure that it is cost effective with the best benefits for Farnham. This will also identify key steps required to proceed to OBC.</p> <p>CP asked if the A31 scheme includes Station Hill up to and including the station and the LCWIP discussions over the summer. What opportunity is there to engage with Cllrs to have discussions on connecting station to the town. Desire for a walk and stride to better access the school and deal with walking routes from town to station.</p> <p>TO said the land in front of station is Network Rail so need their engagement.</p> <p>EM outlined that the rail group supported the scheme, active travel connection will be reviewed with Active Travel England.</p> <p>IL said it is good news to have Treasury approval. FTC look forward to working together and are happy to host a meeting. FTC has put in suggestions in consultation and hope to see these considered in future, consideration needs to be on the impact on the Farnham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>TO requested EM to take this away and get Network Rail in conversations.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to engage with Network Rail for A31 regarding connection from station to town centre.</b></p> <p>CP is interested in early engagement as impacted by displaced traffic. Concerns raised about lack of lines on roads on Station Hill and safety of crossings. It has been an area of concern over last few months.</p>
12	<p><b>Key Milestones and Risks</b></p> <p>EM outlined the milestones and risks from the presentation. TO noted that these risks are being managed.</p> <p>DB asked if from the air quality work, could we revoke the AQMA and are there are any other implications?</p> <p>EM said a technical note on air quality was submitted with the CIL bid. Growth, including in other counties, was included in modelling which showed the scheme improved air quality in the town centre as well as other factors like the innovation curve e.g., more electric vehicles. Air quality will be looked at throughout and after the works.</p> <p>CP said there will be lane narrowing will have less pollution in these areas but there will be displaced traffic so will be deterioration elsewhere until other schemes kick in. It is not a particulates problem in Farnham (which is not addressed by innovation curve). Keen to see final traffic modelling for displacement and the North and South Studies. Particularly concerned about pedestrians.</p> <p>EM said mitigations will be considered in detail once the scheme has been constructed and monitored meaning the real impacts are known. There are other schemes going ahead that will help address these concerns:</p>

Ref	Item
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farnham A31 Corridor (OBC will consider benefits of the scheme for the wider town)</li> <li>• Priority LCWIP proposals</li> <li>• Bus pinch points including delays for the town centre</li> <li>• 20mph schemes</li> <li>• Safety Outside Schools Scheme</li> <li>• Upgrades to traffic signals at the Upper Hale Road/Farnborough Road/Hale Road junction</li> </ul> <p>TO clarified that WBC has responsibility monitoring air quality and that it is recognised that we will move traffic but hope in medium-term behaviours will change. Difficult to accurately model exact impacts. Once in place, there will be active monitoring and mitigations that can be put in. The best scheme that can currently be designed is what we have. There was previously interest in pedestrianising the town centre, but this is currently a step too far at this stage but may appropriate down the line.</p> <p>IL said it makes sense to do additional work later. Asked for TO commitment for funding.</p> <p>TO said cannot commit at this time until the team has identified mitigation required. However, the A31 scheme will help Station Hill and we will look at what actual impact is and then mitigate to improve experience for residents and air quality.</p> <p>CP raised real time monitoring location concerns and requested a conversation to talk about additional monitoring points with SCC modelling team to see impact during and after works.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to discuss with SCC Transport Studies team about the possibility of further monitoring points.</b></p>
13	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>HGVs</b></p> <p>TO raised that he took a photo this monitoring outside Café Nero where there was a HGV parked, clearly ignoring the ban.</p> <p>EM said that Surrey now has an ANPR camera enforcement car which is receiving software updates and being configured for various types of traffic enforcement activity including HGV enforcement. This will be used to enforce Upper Hale HGV restriction, but warning signs need to be in place in Hampshire on the approaches to Farnham before this can happen. SCC have provisionally agreed locations of HGV restrictions and camera warning signs with Hampshire along the A287 from the M3 at Hook. The aim is to divert HGVs off A287 before they reach Upper Hale (preferably along the M3/A331). SCC are finalising detailed design and cost estimates for the proposals. This will need to be signed off by Hampshire.</p> <p>TO said he is happy to get involved/escalate if any issues/delays or support needed for Hampshire CC. We can look at permanent camera depending on what the camera vehicle shows. Hope to see some enforcement in the next few weeks.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to speak with SCC Parking Team to check whether additional support for Hampshire HGV ban is required.</b></p> <p>CP raised that at the M3/A287 (Hampshire) there is a planning application for a large warehouse. This would be an easy route to Guildford and close proximity to A287. We need to make it clear to Hampshire that the A287 has a HGV restriction, to avoid this warehouse being put at a location that encourages HGVs through Farnham. Diversion signs diverted</p>

Ref	Item
	<p>traffic from A287 are not on one.network. Hampshire do not seem to be aware that there is a HGV ban and asked for support on this.</p> <p>DB asked to clarify whether the fine for HGVs as a deterrent is only £75.</p> <p><b>Action: EM to discuss with SCC Parking Team the HGV fine amount.</b></p> <p><b>Ironstone</b></p> <p>DB raised the location of the existing ironstone on Castle Street.</p> <p>EM clarified it is a heritage feature that we want to retain, we have spoken with maintenance and heritage teams and proposed a layout to put ironstone in less trafficked areas. This gives the aesthetic but does not cause maintenance issues. Open to ideas that are in non-traffic areas as ironstone can be slippery and turn out with cars.</p> <p>IL said the volume of ironstone is the concern to keep the character of Castle Street.</p> <p><b>Closing remarks</b></p> <p>JH said thank you to EM. Farnham are demanding customers, but EM has helped to solve many problems. This is also thanks to the willingness of all political parties to work together and TO leadership. Come September there will be lots of disruption so it will be important to keep Farnham focused on the big prize despite short term frustration.</p> <p>TO raised that it is important that Cllrs are involved in the works phasing. Pleased we have got a plan that is supported across the town.</p> <p>CP thanked TO and JH for their commitment to the scheme. Compromise is difficult, no one is getting 100%.</p>
14	<p><b>Actions</b></p> <p>EM: Investigate possibility of loading bay in Central Carpark.</p> <p>EM: Check with Streetworks about diversion routes for town centre to see if potential impact to Safety Outside Schools schemes.</p> <p>NM: Arrange meeting with SCC, WBC, and FTC Members to get final version of LCWIP priority routes to stop doing various iterations and get one final agreed version.</p> <p>EM: Engage with Network Rail for A31 regarding connection from station to town centre.</p> <p>EM: Discuss with SCC Transport Studies team on possibility of further monitoring points.</p> <p>EM: Speak with SCC Parking Team to check whether additional support for Hampshire HGV ban is required.</p> <p>EM: Discuss with SCC Parking Team the HGV fine amount.</p>
15	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>14 June 2024 10:00 – 11:30am.</p>