

Minutes of the Meeting of the Waverley Cycle Forum 13th January 2011

Website:

<http://cycleforum.org.uk/waverley/>

Present:

David Moxon (DM)	Chair
Chris Meeks (CM)	Friends of the Earth, Waverley Group
Jenny Barnes (JBn)	Godalming Town Council
Alec McCalden (AM)	Voluntary Cycling Coordinator and Godalming Cycle Campaign
Ralph Holmes	Cranleigh Initiative
Maurice Byham (MB)	WBC Councillor
Thomas Lankester (TL)	Transition Town Farnham
Roger Newnes-Smith (RNS)	Godalming CC
Myra Newnes-Smith (MNS)	Witley Parish Council
David Munro (Cllr DM)	SCC Councillor
Andrew Stokes (AS) for item 4	SCC
Matthew Ellis (MTE)	Waverley Borough Council

1. Apologies for Absence

Alan Fordham	SCC Cycling Officer
John Hilder	SCC

2. Election of Chair

It was unanimously agreed that David Moxon continues in his role of Chair for the forthcoming year

3. Marshall Road Cycle Link

AM presented the issues that were stopping the link from Farncombe to Godalming along Marshall Road being achieved:

- 1) The widening of the footpath at the southern end in between Jewsons and the Godalming Arms
- 2) The widening of the footpath at the northern end adjacent to railway crossing

The issues include:

Legal – Jewsons have agreed for the land at 1) to be dedicated as highways, thereby enabling the path to be widened to facilitate shared use between walkers and cyclists, with the possibility of retaining part of the path as a footpath. If this proves feasible it should avoid the possible removal of the footpath from the definitive map. However, there will be a need to revoke the bylaw that prohibits cycling. 2) is far more problematic as it would require the same as 1) but may be harder as widening will involve encroaching on railway land under license and therefore cannot be dedicated as highways. It will also mean the path being close to the railway and level crossing and will require

the removal of the security fence and telegraph poles. It is unlikely that Network rail would be happy with this.

Financial - The scheme will need to attract grants or developer or voluntary contributions, as there is no funding. Jewsons have agreed to donate to the community a strip of land to allow a 3m wide route to be established between Chalk Road and Marshall Road. The route is currently 1m wide. The new route will be wide enough to allow shared pedestrian, cycle and disabled vehicle use. It is probable that there is a bylaw prohibiting cycling on the current path, and if so that bylaw would need to be revoked. The precise designation of the future status of the path will need to be examined to prevent its loss from the Surrey definitive map. The northern end of the route near the level crossing is more difficult to widen, involving the railway embankment and a potential lease of the land from Network Rail. No funds have been identified from Surrey CC; grants, developer funding and voluntary contributions will need to be explored.

There was some discussion whose responsibility it was to ensure that the Cycle Plan is implemented given it was part of the Waverley Local Plan and how feasible it would be to overcome the issues set out by James Taylor, SCC's Senior Countryside Access Officer. Cllr DM stated that there was a need to consider his comments. Cllr MB suggested that there may be scope for it being upgraded to bridleway status. (Although there is no likelihood of equestrians using the route, it can be a simpler legal mechanism for opening a route to cyclists.)

It was agreed that the Cycle Forum should concentrate efforts on 1) as

- it would be important to seize the opportunity the Jewsons offer of land had given
- the Local Plan supports the scheme
- It would still avoid cyclist having to turn right onto Meadow that is often difficult because of the very high volume of traffic and is thought to deter many from cycling between Godalming and Farncombe.
- there would be less problems than 2) and by focusing all efforts on the most important link for the time being the chances of success would be greater
- the link could still go along Lower Manor Road and St Johns' Street to/from the station which is much safer in highway terms than using Meadow.

It was also agreed that a Marshall Road Action Group be set up to progress widening the path at 1). The group should include representatives from the Cycle Forum, Godalming Town Council, Jewsons, SCC Officers, DisCASS and the Police. It would also be important to have The Ramblers Association on board. There had been complaints from walkers in the past about cyclists using this path. Given that it is much used by cyclists already, the broadening of the path so that it safely accommodates both walkers and cyclists will be of benefit to both.

It was suggested that the group could also include local train users and Broadwater School as they would use it and would help to encourage support for the scheme. However, it was important that any representation from Waverley and SCC does not result in a conflict of interest, especially in any capacity as determining authority. Cllr DM suggested that a public meeting be

held to initiate the group and it was further suggested that the Godalming Arms be the best venue for this meeting
AM agreed to put this into action.

(Action: AM)

4. Planning Gain

AS spoke about the role of the County Council in planning gain. He explained that SCC's role was to assess planning applications for transport implications. They then made recommendations to Waverley on how to deal with the issues, including promoting new ways to mitigate the transport impact including cycle schemes. There were 2 ways that these could be secured:

- Through the proposed development itself where the developer is required through s106 or s278 agreements to undertake works or
- Through Planning Infrastructure Contributions (PIC) where through s106 obligations the developer pays a tariff to County Council that along with other development tariffs contributes to the funding of highway schemes agreed by the County Council.

MTE explained Waverley's role in collecting PIC and that the Government want Councils to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy by 2014, which is run on the same basic principles as PIC. However, it was ultimately up to SCC to consider whether a scheme as a result of a particular development was needed and if so ensure that it was correctly implemented. Furthermore it was SCC who would determine what schemes should be built under PIC.

More information

- on how PIC works can be seen at http://www.waverley.gov.uk/site/scripts/documents_info.php?documentID=248&pageNumber=3
- about the role of SCC Transport Development Planning can be seen at http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/sccwebsite/sccwspages.nsf/LookupWebPagesByTITLE_RTF/Transport+Development+Planning?opendocument
- on how highway schemes are prioritised can be obtained from John Hilder at SCC.

There was much discussion about how cycle schemes, large and small, did not actually meet the requirements of cyclists. In many cases this was down to the detail of the design and the example of Monkton Lane, Farnham was given amongst others. AS said that this can happen and Safety Audits were carried out to ensure that schemes were acceptable. The Cycle Forum was very frustrated as their members have a lot of experience between them that could be used to ensure that cycle schemes were properly designed and implemented. This in time would save money for developers, as it would avoid having to rectify schemes that did not meet requirements.

It was agreed that the Forum should therefore be involved at all stages of the planning process:

- When an application is first submitted. A designated Forum member would become its planning application liaison member and check the weekly planning list for any developments that may need a comment from the Forum or contact with SCC to see what measures for cyclists would be needed **(Action MTE to establish how weekly lists can be**

emailed to the Forum and RNS who agreed to be the Forum's planning applications liaison member).

- When the plans for any works are submitted under s106/s278 agreements. SCC will email the forum giving them the opportunity to make comments **(AS to send details of how SCC will contact the Forum on any applications for undertaking the works).**
- When the schemes are being built. SCC is happy for the Forum to highlight any issues regarding its construction. However, caution needs to be exercised on schemes that are still being built as it may not always be clear that schemes are being built incorrectly

5. Review of the Cycle Forum's Terms of Reference

DM suggested that the Forum's work should be more systematically documented. It was agreed to do this by preparing a concise Annual Review of what the Forum had done and what it had achieved. This would include reporting on:

- The activities of the Forum and the individual sub groups including involvement with consultations such as the Local Transport Plan, input into schemes, co ordination of activities.
- Solid achievements such as securing implementation of cycling schemes
- A List of the key goals for the coming year.

Action. DM to initially prepare the Annual Review)

2) Raising the profile of the Forums work through the use of the local press and Council newsletters

(Action. MTE to speak to WBC Communications Team to establish what opportunities there are for publicising the Forum's work through "Making Waves")

6. Update Farnham Greenways

TL had met John Hilder and he was happy that the Scholars Greenway direction roundels could be used to sign into Farnham Park from Park Row and replace the larger blue sign on the lamp post at the Bear Lane / Park Row junction. With WBC work on the golf club car park finished, design work has started on access onto Farnham Park from Bear Lane. On January 26th TL is scheduled to have a meeting with the Farnham Park Ranger to specify what waymark roundels are needed and where. The Monkton Lane route would hopefully be completed soon and the details for the Six Bells roundabout would need to be looked at.

The Forum expressed their pleasure at the successful progression of Farnham Greenways.

(Action TL)

7. Report from the Cycling Co-ordinator

AM made a presentation from CTC on Local Transport Plans and what was needed to ensure that all cycling issues continued to be raised in them despite Cycle England being axed and that funding is becoming less available.

The Forum should support the Godalming 20 Campaign that is aiming to reduce the speed limit in the town to 20 mph. This is linked to the Quality Streets Initiative and has support from various sources including Binscombe surgery. The campaign could be linked to the Marshall Road Cycle link. The campaign was mainly about signage rather than infrastructure controlling speed.

8. Further Matters Arising

DM reported that most matters from the 30/09/10 minutes had been dealt with above except for the following:

Item 6) Liaison with National Trust - DM has contacted Caroline White at Hindhead Together Initiative but has not yet received a substantive response **(Action DM to contact Caroline White again)**

Item 8b) Two cycle signs had been obtained and would be fixed to the signposts at either end of the Community Path.

Item 8c) The A3 opening at Lea Coach Road is being closed. This creates problems for walkers, cyclists and riders as the crossing links two bridleways, BW 68 and BW 115. It has implications for mapping and signage so that those unfamiliar with the area do not find themselves at a closed crossing which requires a long diversion.

9. Any other business

a) TL, as a Sustrans Route Ranger, has been in contact with the new Area Manager for Surrey (who has safe routes to stations experience). It was agreed to invite him along to talk to the Forum. **(Action TL)**.

b) CM saw that there was some work being done in the land opposite the Bury's Godalming. He wanted to know if this would involve widening paths for cycling and if this was going to be lottery funded **(Action: MTE to speak to Jane Bowden)**

c) Members thanked DM for Chairing the Cycle Forum for the last year

10. Dates of next two meetings

18.30 hrs 14th April 2011

18.30 hrs 14th July 2011