

**ANNEXE 5**

**BT PAYPHONE CONSULTATION – RESPONSES FROM COUNCILLORS & TOWN AND PARISH CLERKS**

Name	Representing	Comments
Farnham Town Councillor	Farnham Town Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Lower Weybourne Lane Pco is the one on Weybourne cross roads. BT tried to remove this one several years ago. I felt then, and still do, that at this busy junction and in the immediate vicinity of 4 schools, it should remain.</li> <li>2. The Badshot Lea Road Pco is the one by the Village Green, difficult to justify why it should remain, until recently was always being vandalized.</li> </ol>
Councillor for Cranleigh East	Waverley Borough Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The rule about a phone box within 400 m of another one contains no comfort. 400m is actually quite a long way to walk [people still do!].</li> <li>2, Evidence of low usage does not mean a box is not valued by those who use it for the service it provides.</li> <li>3, If this is a cost-cutting exercise [why else?], we can ask to know right away: how much per box would it save BT [year on year]; how much would it cost them to remove a box and its cabling, AND make good the site?</li> <li>4, Across Waverley, there too many boxes to go. The public here have been given an affluent image, and doubtless many use mobiles and/or have landlines. But for anyone who is out and about who may be out of mobile range or maybe the mobile runs out of charge or card a phone box can be a lifeline.</li> <li>5, As an example, most of Hascombe is out of mobile range, and there are numerous</li> </ol>

		<p>other areas where you can't get through, sometimes depending on which provider you use.</p> <p>6, As and when people begin to realise that they really do need to reduce their mobile use - as has been advised on medical grounds in recent months in Europe and in the UK [although not much publicity has been given to it so far here] - phone boxes may become more popular. It could be short-sighted to remove them now.</p> <p>7, Might BT consider installing mobile charge points in their boxes?</p> <p>8, Boxes alongside well-used roads presumably have more usage than remoter ones. But remoter ones may be out of mobile range, and therefore very useful when needed. We should ask BT if any proper study has been made of patterns of usage.</p>
Councillor for Farnham Upper Hale	Waverley Borough Council	<p>Not everybody has a house phone, or even a mobile phone and these boxes are important for emergency situations. Naturally the frequency of use has declined and they may not be financially viable, but it is supposed to be a public service isn't it?</p> <p>Two of the payphones are in my immediate area and I should like to register an objection to their removal.</p>
Councillor for Cranleigh West	Waverley Borough Council	<p>Thank you for the notification of the consultation relating to the removal of local payphones. I recognise that these may not all be making a profit or even covering running costs but BT is not only there to make a profit for shareholders but to provide a community service as well.</p> <p>I should like to register a strong reservation regarding the proposal to remove the payphone at Alfold Road, Cranleigh. This is in an area of some need and serves a large community that is fairly remote from the Village and where there is considerable passing traffic.</p> <p>Re Smithwood Common Road. I recognise that this box is off the beaten track and some way from the road. I think that it serves about 20 properties at the most and suspect</p>

		that since the public house closed there is very little use and it will not be seen by passing traffic. However, it is remote from the Village and in times of an emergency the residents would feel very cut off from help
Councillor for Haslemere, Critchmere and Shottermill	Waverley Borough Council	<p>I and my Town and Borough colleagues in Haslemere, Critchmere and Shottermill Ward, have checked with the residents about their wishes re the phone boxes as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 01428642327 - Lion Lane - Object - residents wish to retain this box</li> </ul> <p>The residents say that they use it, especially in emergencies. Some residents do not have a mobile phone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 01428642393 - Oak Tree Lane - Agree to removal</li> <li>• 01428643371 - Hachetts Drive - Agree to removal due to vandalism - Police aware</li> <li>• 01428644552 - Shottermill Post Office - Agree to removal due to problems with youths.</li> </ul>
Councillor for Elstead and Thursley	Waverley Borough Council	<p>The principal reaction from two of the parish councils in my patch is one of concern</p> <p>In cases of emergency, the public phone can be invaluable. In my ward alone, we have suffered two major outdoor emergencies recently: the devastating fire on Thursley Common and the outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease at Elstead</p> <p>Young people, contrary to popular and prejudicial misunderstanding, do not all have mobile phones, and they can be vulnerable on dark winter evenings, even within their own community envelope. Not all adults, of a certain age, carry them either</p> <p>Those who live in, or even only visit, rural areas will know well enough how poor mobile phone coverage can be in some places. And it is from just such places that the intention appears to be to remove the phone boxes</p> <p>The cost criteria will always be a factor to weigh against the public service value. You may be reminded of the post offices review</p>

		<p>However, from a practical point of view, if there is sufficient support from public opinion and the parishes, some carefully constructed comments to the press may give BT some cause to reflect. The post office may be immune to public opinion: they still operate the Royal Mail monopoly for personal post, if not for business post, but BT are in a more highly competitive arena. Public opinion may count. It certainly helped to modify service providers' proposals when telecoms masts were an issue in some places</p> <p>Secondly, do we know anything about the cost of subsidising phone boxes in order to retain them. It may be that some parish councils will see the retention of some of these phones as an appropriate public service for subsidy in their patch, and parish precepts are not capped. You might well argue that if a particular community want the facility, then they should be prepared to contribute financially towards its cost. BT should, at the least, offer proposals for the retention of the boxes to parish councils for their consideration</p> <p>Finally, how might we quickly consider whether more of the red 'heritage' boxes might become grade 2 listed</p>
Clerk	Cranleigh Parish Council	<p>Thank you for giving Cranleigh Parish Council the opportunity to comment on the removal of the telephones on Avenue Road, Alfold Road and Smithwood Common, all of which are 'red box' type telephones.</p> <p>Whilst the Parish Council appreciates that the telephone boxes may not be paying their way, the Council are concerned that the removal of the boxes will affect those who are elderly, less well off, those who find themselves in an emergency situation or those who find themselves without a land line or mobile for a variety of reasons. It was felt that BT should be providing a service to the community and that in principle the Council were against any cut in service.</p> <p>Perhaps if the change goes ahead it could be on the condition that BT restores the red kiosks in the High Street to replace the more modern boxes. I understand this has been happening in other parts of the country and has brought back some of the old character to</p>

		communities such as Cranleigh.
Clerk	Hambledon Parish Council	<p>Hambledon Parish Council has the following comments in relation to the telephone box at Hambledon Village Shop and Post Office (note: its address in BT's list is wrong: the post code is GU8 4HF).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The telephone box at Hambledon Village Shop and Post Office is a landmark site within one of the village conservation areas and as such features in many of the photographs and pictures that are - and, hopefully, will continue to be - an integral part of Hambledon's heritage. This suggests that the box might be appropriate for listing: is this something which Waverley could pursue on our behalf?</li> <li>2. Public telephones are not obsolete: in Hambledon mobile coverage is patchy and none of the current providers covers the entire village. In an emergency, an operating telephone box can literally be a life-line and for that reason alone the Parish Council recommends that that Hambledon's one remaining box should be retained.</li> <li>3. However, for the best part of a year, the box has been out of action, despite constant requests by Hambledon Village Shop and Post Office to BT to repair the telephone. To suggest that it should be removed due to lack of use is therefore ironic: any decision based on usage should be deferred until the telephone has been returned to working order and usage monitored for at least six months. The Parish Council requests that this point be emphasised in Waverley's response to BT.</li> <li>4. On the assumption that the telephone in the box at Hambledon Village Shop and Post Office is returned to working order, the Parish Council will launch a campaign, via the Hambledon village web site, to encourage usage of the box. Whilst the Parish Council feels strongly that the box should be retained on emergency grounds, it also appreciates that BT will appreciate the income that derives from its more general use.</li> <li>5. The Parish Council has considered but rejected the option of stripping out the equipment and retaining the box as a "feature". In a village where mobile coverage is patchy, the emergency back-up facility of a telephone box is of</li> </ol>

		paramount importance.
Councillor for Witley and Hambledon	Waverley Borough Council	In principle I think the BT boxes should be retained as a public amenity for use in cases of emergence. Having said that I appreciate that economic reasons and lack of use present a formable argument for their removal in some cases. As far as the one in Hambledon is concerned I would like to whole heartily endorse all that HPC have said regarding the retention of this box. Could you please let Stewart Payne have more details about listing this box as it is intrinsically part of the village.
Clerk	Ewhurst Parish Council	<p>Ewhurst Parish Council are concerned about the proposal by BT to remove a large number of telephone boxes in our communities. <b>In the case of Ewhurst it is <u>three out of the four we have in our Parish!</u></b> This is totally unacceptable in our rural community. Mobile phone connections in our area are notoriously bad, and some systems have no coverage at all for large areas. This is in part due to distance from phone masts but more to do with the topography of the landscape here – the highest hills in Surrey are immediately north of the village and we nestle in the valley beneath. Phone boxes are an essential service, and to just have one in a radius of some 5 miles would be courting potential disaster.</p> <p>The usage of the phones might appear low, but this should be taken into consideration in relation to the number of people living in our villages. A figure of £100 per annum has been quoted to us as threshold for acceptability. Using just basic arithmetic, this could be calculated as 1000 minutes. Phone boxes are not used for endless chat, so supposing the average call takes 5 minutes, this means 200 calls per phone – which is quite a bit of ‘consumer demand’. Unfortunately everything is based on economics, but we cannot compete with the usage of boxes in locations with a high population density – it should be based on need.</p> <p>However, Waverley have no doubt received lots a opinions and views about the matter generally, so we intend to comment relating to ‘our’ phones specifically for inclusion in your response to BT :</p>

		<p><b>01403822126 – Ellens Green, Rudgwick, RH12 3AR (corner of Horsham Road and Furzen Lane)</b>  This phone needs vigorous protection. It is alongside a bus stop used by local children, in a very rural area, and on a busy road where road accidents regularly occur (2 fatalities in the last 24 months); it also serves the community as a means of reference as well as the obvious function, and is in a particularly bad area of useless mobile phone reception.</p> <p><b>01483277201 – The Village, Ewhurst, Cranleigh GU6 7PB (Bulls Head Green)</b>  This is situated in the Conseration Area in Ewhurst - a delightful village green surrounded by aged listed buildings, and as such is part of the community and very much part of the 'street scene'. It would be a crying shame to have it removed and spoil the area. On a practical note, it is also the first phone box coming from Shere to the north and Ockley to the east – some 6 miles of very narrow twisting lanes – and the mobile reception is sporadic to say the least. This box is also by a bus stop, which is an 'end of the line' stop and used by the local children for school journeys. Another box which needs vigorous protection.</p> <p><b>014833277415 The Street, Ewhurst, Cranleigh GU6 7PA (outside defunct Post Office)</b>  This card phone box is outside the old Post Office and once again in an area where mobile phone coverage is <u>very</u> bad and is next to a much used bus stop where the village children leave/arrive for school each day. It is also very much part of the street scene in our village.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of progress. Would it be worthwhile to send our views direct to BT as well? We see they provide a correspondence address in their letter.</p>
Clerk	Dunsfold Parish Council	My Council has considered your email of 22 <sup>nd</sup> April about the above consultation with an end date of 2 <sup>nd</sup> July, the related BT letter to your Chief Planning Officer dated 2 <sup>nd</sup> April, and your request for submissions to you by today's deadline. This is my Council's submission that you should respond to the Consultation by exercising your veto in favour

of retention of the following red phone box ("The Dunsfold Red Box") in the village:  
Telephone Exchange, The Common, Dunsfold GU8 4LA Telephone number -1483200240

Our observations in support of this retention are as follows:-

1. We have noted from Ofcom's Review of the Universal Service Obligation in relation to Public Call Boxes (PCB's):-
  - that "Public Call Boxes (PCBs) provide a service that is valued and needed by many people without a phone or those away from home, who cannot, for whatever reason, use their mobile. Many disadvantaged and vulnerable consumers still rely on PCBs."
  - that BT is required to ensure adequate coverage of PCBs;
  - that the last PCB cannot currently be removed from 'a site' if a local council objects – 'the local veto' but that this local veto right is now vested in your Council for this area.
2. My Council has resolved to request that you exercise this veto right in favour of retention of the Dunsfold Red Box for the following reasons:-
  - It is appropriate to regard the entirety of this village as 'the site' for the purpose of this consultation.
  - The Dunsfold Red Box is the last remaining PCB in this village.
  - There is no other PCB within miles of the Parish Boundary.
    - The Dunsfold Red Box is located in the centre of the village by the Telephone Exchange Building on the common and within the village Conservation Area and the principal village settlement. It is valued by many villagers without a phone or those away from home, who cannot use, or do not have a mobile phone. My Council fears that the Dunsfold Red Box is still relied upon in variety of circumstances by disadvantaged and vulnerable people whether from within the community or visiting it.



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Dunsfold Red Box is much appreciated in the village as was clear from the adverse reaction to its possible removal at the Annual Parish Assembly on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2008.</li> <li>• The Dunsfold Red Box is of great importance in an emergency, should one occur at the heart of the village, particularly for example one involving an accident on the fast road that goes through the village past the Dunsfold Red Box. Not all villagers, or the elderly have mobile phones, so even if there were good mobile phone reception in the centre of the village that would not be an alternative option in many cases. The fact however is that mobile phone connection is not achieved by all providers and for others is at best patchy and unreliable.</li> <li>• Removal of the Dunsfold Red Box would in the view of my Council result in a breach of BT's Universal Service Obligation, and it cannot be removed if your Council exercises its veto, which my Council asks you to do for the above reasons.</li> </ul>
Clerk	Chiddingfold Parish Council	No objection from PC to removal of payphone
Clerk	Bramley Parish Council	The view of Bramley Parish Council is that it would be detrimental to our local community if the 2 payphones within Bramley Parish were removed. Bramley still suffers from very limited mobile phone reception and the phone at Thorncombe Street is in a rural area well used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. In the event of an emergency this is the only public option available. The phone at Chestnut Way is in a part of the village where residents may still not have house phones, never mind mobile phones which would be rendered useless due to lack of reception. Bramley Parish Council would be disappointed if these phones were completely removed.

ANNEXE 5A

**BT PAYPHONE CONSULTATION – RESPONSES FROM COUNCILLORS & TOWN AND PARISH CLERKS  
- COMMENTS RECEIVED SINCE THE AGENDA WAS DESPATCHED -**

Name	Representing	Comments
Town Clerk	Godalming TC	<p>Extract from Town Council minutes:- Members noted that Waverley Borough Council had asked for the Town Council's comments on British Telecom's (BT) proposals to remove certain payphones within the Borough Council's area (e-mail from WBC and correspondence from BT attached to record minutes). BT pointed out that there was no longer a requirement for BT to consult on the removal of a public payphone that had another payphone within 400m. There were a number of these payphones within Waverley but it was unknown how many there were in Godalming. Further there were 48 public payphones little used by consumers that were proposed for removal under full consultation.</p> <p>Three of those 48 payphones were in Godalming they were at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Rear of New Block, Milford Hospital, Tuesley Lane GU7 1UF</li> <li>· Tuesley Lane GU7 1RR</li> <li>· Meadow GU7 3HJ</li> </ul> <p>Members indicated that they were not unduly concerned by BT's proposals as they related to the three payphones indicated above but the Town Clerk was asked to establish what the costs would be of retaining a "red" payphone box should the Town Council, or the community, be minded to adopt one.</p>
Parish Clerk	Frensham PC	<p>It was AGREED that there was no objection to the loss of the call-box in Sandy Lane (non-working anyway).(GU10 2ET)            Members wished to RETAIN the box on Shortfield Common for decorative purposes but did not object to losing the phone. (GU10 3BJ)            St Mary's School AGREE to remove the box on the Green (GU10 3AB)</p>
Councillor for Haslemere	Waverley BC	<p>To object to the removal of the box at Haslemere Road in Brook. The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mobile signal in the area</li> </ul>

East & Grayswood		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a busy road – A286 Milford to Bognor Regis</li> <li>• Loss of public service</li> <li>• It is the only box in the area</li> </ul>
Residents' Association	Hydestile	<p>As residents of houses in the immediate vicinity of this telephone kiosk we have taken a keen interest in its future and do not want it removed. The lack of maintenance by BT in recent times has resulted in both the telephone box not working and a broken window pane not being mended. This makes the claim that BT is not commercially viable somewhat of a self fulfilling prophesy. It is impossible to use a phone even if someone wanted to. Despite this we do however accept that the era of the public telephone kiosk as a means of communication has now past and that it is quite reasonable that BT should want rid of them. That is not to say that BT has no responsibility to contribute towards its preservation as part of the local heritage. The kiosk should be preserved for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group value with Hydestile Farmhouse, Hambledon Road. This is a Grade II listed 17<sup>th</sup> Century farmhouse with which the telephone shares the crossroads.</li> <li>• This kiosk is an important part of the landscape which is Hydestile crossroads. This consists in addition to the Grade II listed Hydestile Farm, of a group of historically significant buildings built in 1884 as the headquarters of the Chiddingfold Hunt, These were designed by Ralph Nevill FSA who had been articled to and a pupil of Sir George Gilbert Scott, the father of Giles Gilbert Scott.</li> <li>• Design Classic. The K6 kiosk is one of the iconic pieces of early 20<sup>th</sup> century design by Giles Gilbert Scott.</li> <li>• Increasing rarity. From the 70,000 K6 originally built there are now less than 14,000 and of these far fewer in rural areas.</li> </ul> <p>We agree that there is no longer any realistic need for the Hydestile Kiosk to be kept in full working order and so propose that BT disconnect it from their network and the main power supply and fit a lock to the door, The telephone kiosk should then be given by BT to the community in the form of the Parish Council and BT should continue to pay whatever insurance is needed.</p>
PC response via Cllr	Witley PC	The Parish Council feels that the Witley boxes should be retained as a public amenity in emergency situations.
Parish Clerk	Busbridge	Busbridge PC note with dismay and deep concern BT's intention to remove the telephone box

		currently situated at Hydestile crossroads. The crossroads are the scene of regular traffic accidents and those involved in the accidents use the telephone box to summon the emergency service as the area is one in which mobile telephone reception is generally poor. The removal of the box could therefore lead to the loss of life if the emergency services could not be contacted. It is also considered that the telephone box greatly enhances the 'Group Value' of Hydestile Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building and other properties in the immediate area. The telephone box, a classis K6 design, is an early 20 <sup>th</sup> century design by Giles Gilbert Scott which are becoming increasingly rare. The Parish Council trusts that Waverley Borough Council will fully support the retention of this particular telephone box.
Town Clerk	Farnham TC	Only object to removal near schools – need to retain as a community facility.
Cllr for Farnham Shortheath & Boundstone	Waverley & Surrey	I only have one box in my Shortheath and Boundstone ward - the red box at the corner of Boundstone Road with Gardener's Hill Road (erroneously identified as at the Applelands Close junction). I would object to its removal primarily on conservation grounds - we need to preserve these 'heritage' boxes. It's not strictly speaking my ward (although it is in my county division) but I'd also object for similar reasons to the removal of the red box in the centre of Rowledge village.
Cllr	Haslemere TC	BT Phone at Beacon Hill (Woodcock Green) GU26 6NL, 01428 614244 - We do not wish to lose this phone under any circumstances. (part of the street scene)
Cllr for Farnham Wrecclesham and Rowledge	Waverley BC	I'd like to record my objections to the removal of the red boxes of Applelands Close, Wrecclesham, and The Square, Rowledge. Being under the consultation, it's clear that these boxes are further than 400 m from another payphone. Whilst landlines are ubiquitous, mobile phones as at 2005/6 were owned by 79% of the population, and although this may well have climbed in the past couple of years, based on the slow down of the increase it might only now be around 81% - certainly not full coverage. (Source: Family Expenditure Survey and Expenditure and Food Survey, Office for National Statistics) Payphones provide for (a) those who have no landline, and (b) especially for those on the move who have no mobile phone. Red boxes are particularly noticeable to those driving and in need of a phone, and to have two such phones in such a small geographical area removed, would be, in my view, against BT's Universal Service Obligation. In addition, I feel we should point out that the red box at Applelands Close is in a shameful condition, both inside and out, and I believe that BT's obligations should certainly include maintaining their payphones to a standard that encourages use, rather than discourages.
Cllr for Farnham	Waverley BC	We feel that neither box in the Bourne is worth preserving (Burnt Hill Road and Old Frensham Road). Both are untidy and there are plenty of houses around, if there were an emergency.

Bourne		
Cllr for Ewhurst	Waverley BC	<p>Two of the three phone boxes located in Ewhurst are threatened. A series of points to put forward for their retention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B2127 is now a major road used by commuters to and from Gatwick to the Guildford area. Many drivers are foreign HGV's with no idea of the poor, often non-existent mobile phone coverage in the area. A back up or alternative communication option is necessary.</li> <li>• Ewhurst suffers from frequent energy blackouts - this affects landlines powered by electricity sockets coupled with the lack of mobile phone coverage - an alternative is mandatory.</li> <li>• Mobile phone coverage is very poor particularly for non Orange users, due in the main to lack of cell transmitters - in the event of an emergency the existing cells would become immediately overloaded and again a backup is necessary.</li> <li>• There is no BT phone at neighbouring Forest Green or in Shere, if the 2 of 3 phones are removed, this would leave one BT phone serving in excess of 4 000 people - inadequate in instances of an emergency.</li> <li>• One threatened phone is located in the middle of the village, an acknowledged focal point for emergency congregation etc. This should be avoided at all costs.</li> </ul> <p>BT are proposing to remove 2 phones from 3 located in Ewhurst. Being realistic Ewhurst could probably afford to lose one but not two. In essence BT should be asked to reconsider their proposals for phone removal in Ewhurst.</p>
Parish Clerk	Elstead / Thursley	<p>With reference to the possible phone box closer at Elstead the Parish Council would not like to see it removed. This is also the same response from Thursley PC.</p>
		<p>De-commissioning of telephone boxes at Shamley Green, Wonerish, Lords Hill. Cllr Harding's response to this consultation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blackheath Lane: poor reception on mobile phones</li> <li>• Lords Hill: this telephone box is listed (<i>query? – not on list</i>). Only recently been converted from coin to card, and is near to playground.</li> <li>• Shamley Green: next to shop, is used a great deal and is a good central point for contacting emergency services.</li> </ul> <p>This was agreed to be the view of all Members, the response to go to BT and WBC.</p>

