



that the design team at SCC was small and this would take a few months. As regards the Jewsons land, the preferred option would be for the land to be dedicated as a highway but for Jewsons to retain ownership. It was important to keep Jewsons updated as plans developed and to let them know that SCC were working up detailed plans.

**Action: Alan Fordham to write to Jewsons and attach SCC Committee Report.**

### **3. Hindhead**

The Tunnel is due to open by the end of July but the alternative cycle route (via BOAT 500) can only be completed after the old A3 is closed so there will be a diversion for a while. Concern was expressed about the lengthy diversion for non-tunnel traffic as it was understood that this involved going via Beacon Hill from Thursley to Hindhead. Further details would be sought.

**Action: David Moxon to contact Paul Arnold (Highways Agency).**

DM had met the National Trust to discuss possible improvements to connecting routes between settlements using permissive bridleways as well as ROW alongside development of circular recreational routes. There was also a need to ensure that permissive routes were clearly identified on maps (as their status is rarely shown on OS maps), obstacles removed (i.e. kissing gates) and good directional signage. PM had undertaken some initial work on possible routes from Hindhead to Haslemere via Farnham Lane, and across Witley Common to link Witley and Milford with Hindhead and Thursley.

**David Moxon to have further discussions with National Trust**

### **4. Farnham Greenways**

TL recapped how the Greenways route had come into existence comprising of

1. Scholars Greenway connecting up the UCA and other Farnham schools
2. Weyside Greenway / NCN 22 final route along the river

TL reported that the Scholars Greenway was close to completion with:

- waymark roundels having been ordered by Transition Town Farnham
- widening and regrading of the Bear Lane entrance to Farnham Park by Waverley Borough
- developer-led progress on a toucan crossing of the A325 dual-carriageway

A formal opening would probably take place next spring

There is still a critical bottleneck in relation to the Weyside Greenway. This involves the need to remove some Leylandii on Guildford Road Trading Estate to widen the path. This would need to be addressed by satisfying the occupants that alternative screening would meet their concerns. Both Greenway schemes had depended on the support of councilors, SCC officers and developers. It had been important to start with a clear strategy, and

developing the detail later. The Forum agreed that the success of the Greenway schemes had wider lessons for schemes elsewhere in the Borough, such as Godalming key Site, and the Cycle Plan should take these lessons on board in setting out its priorities.

## **5. Any other business**

### **a) Surrey Sustainable Transport Fund**

DJ expressed surprise that no cycle schemes in Waverley were included for the above funding, particularly as schemes in both Woking and Guildford were. JH said that the timescale for bidding was very short and there was a need to spend the money quickly. However there was a second tranche of funding and there would be a need to get involved. The Forum agreed that much of the success of Woking and Guildford was down to the strategic consideration of their cycle routes. CM suggested that perhaps Waverley would be successful in getting funding if it linked into one of Guildford's routes. Cllr DM also said it was surprising that Farnham wasn't included in Phase 2 of funding when other towns such as Epsom and Egham were.

### **b) Swallow Tiles**

RH wanted reassurance that s106 money from the planning application would be used for creating a cycle path from Swallow Tiles to Barhatch. JH advised that the scheme was likely to be a s278 agreement rather than s106 (i.e. developers would undertake the infrastructure development themselves). DJ said that Councillors were advised not to support the application because the applicants had not put forward any legal agreement to secure costs towards infrastructure. DJ considered that a new application for housing will be submitted. However if the Council are to approve it, one of the issues will be that infrastructure schemes are agreed.

### **c) Cranleigh to Ewhurst Cycle Path**

This had not moved on. JH said it was considered that the expense of the scheme was too great in present circumstances and that, because of competition for limited funding and the cost of undertaking feasibility studies, it was better to go for smaller schemes for the time being. DJ said she would be happy to map out the proposed Ewhurst/Cranleigh route to provide a clear idea of the scale of the work involved and the obstacles to be overcome in taking it forward when resources allowed.

## **6. Revision of Cycle Plan**

DM said that the Local Transport Plan was pro-cycling and although the Cycling Strategy paper which will form part of the LTP had yet to be finalised, the approach is clear. It was accordingly agreed that there was no need to delay revising the Waverley Cycle Plan. It was important that the Forum prioritises a small number of schemes and updates this list annually. A fuller list of schemes would be included, but as a basis for future work once the current priority schemes had been implemented or when opportunities arose to press ahead with them (e.g. because resources became available or they could be fitted in with other work). DJ stated that the Forum should remain proactive rather than reactive and should publicise its successes. The need to be strategic as evidenced by the Farnham Greenways and deal with detail

when appropriate was important. The Forum was keen to work with SCC when schemes were being drawn up and CP suggested that involvement took place both before schemes are finalised and during the implementation process. It was agreed that CTC should be added to the distribution list for relevant planning applications. Cllr DM stated that SCC could not be proactive so it was down to grassroots involvement.

**Action: David Moxon to produce revised draft cycling plan for next meeting.**

#### **7. Further matters arising from minutes of 14/04/11**

MNS said that Witley PC was putting pressure on SCC to resolve concerns about BW 142 where the owner is trying to discourage access and two people have been bitten by a dog.

#### **8. Any Other Business**

- a) DK informed the Forum that the path from Meadow to Bunkers Hill Farm that is legally a cycle route under the Cycle Tracks Act is still signed as pedestrians only. It is also not identified on SCC Cycle Maps or the interactive maps

**Action: DK to contact James Taylor at SCC (and copy Cllr DM in)**

- b) RH asked the Forum to write to Alec McCalden to thank him for all his work for as the Cycling Coordinator, Godalming Cycle Campaign and the Forum

**Action: DM to write to Alec**

- c) DJ said that there had been a proliferation of racing cycling teams riding through Ewhurst and other villages, and such events were expected to increase in the run-up to the Olympics. There was also a rise in charity bike rides. It was considered that these events should be monitored as they had impact on traffic and litter. While there was no wish to discourage such events it was important for organisers to take responsibility for managing events to minimise risks to riders and other road users and to deal with litter. There was no requirement for licenses except for races (which were rare) and although some event organisers took responsibility for clearing up after the event, others did not. CP said CTC were aware of the issue and were considering drafting a code of practice for these events.

#### **9. Suggestions for future speakers and dates of Future Meetings**

It was agreed that it would be good if we could get someone from Sustrans to attend a future meeting.

**Action: Tom Lankester to approach Nick Farthing of Sustrans**

#### **10. Date of Next Meetings**

- 13<sup>th</sup> October 2011
- 12<sup>th</sup> January 2012
- 12<sup>th</sup> April 2012