

To: All Members of the Council

When calling please ask for:

Ben Bix, Democratic Services Manager

Legal and Democratic Services

E-mail: ben.bix@waverley.gov.uk

Direct line: 01483 523354

Date: Wednesday 17 April 2024

Dear Councillors

COUNCIL AGENDA SUPPLEMENT - 23 APRIL 2024

I refer to Items 6 & 7 on the agenda for the Council meeting on Tuesday, 23 April 2024 and now enclose the questions from Members of the Public together with questions from Members of the Council which were received by 5pm on Tuesday 16 April 2024.

6 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Pages 3 - 6)

To respond to questions from members of the public, received in accordance with Procedure Rule 10.

7 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Pages 7 - 8)

To respond to any questions received from Members of the Council in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.2.

Yours sincerely

Ben Bix
Democratic Services Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

Notice of Public Questions (Procedure Rule 10) – Council 23 April 2024

1. Question from Daniel Kuszel

Could the Leader explain why the FOI Team is not responding to queries for information within the statutory 20 working day period? Is he aware that the team is still using Covid-19 as a reason for not meeting the statutory deadline? Could he explain why the completion of FOI requests continues to be affected by Covid-19 when it appears all other council services have returned to normal operation?

2. Question from Katie Hobson on behalf of CranleighHighStreet.uk team

This question is in relation to the new Cranleigh Leisure Centre and the proposal to build it in the middle of the Village Way car park.

The minutes of the Cranleigh Parish Council AGM on 9th March 2023, state that Councillor E Townsend spoke about the proposed new leisure centre, in her role as Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development at Waverley Borough Council.

- When asked ‘will there be a consultation on the location of the new leisure centre?’, Cllr Townsend answered ‘once a consultant has been formerly appointed there will be more information available and a full consultation on its final location.’
- Cllr Townsend also explained that ‘there will be disruption to parking to begin with but at the conclusion of the project there will not be any parking lost.’
- When asked about the amount of useable parking available during the construction, Cllr Townsend explained ‘that there would be disruption, but about half of the car park should still be useable.’

The latest designs show that 68 parking spaces will be lost from Village Way car park at the end of the project, (235 spaces vs 303 now), and it appears that there will be very few parking spaces available during construction itself – significantly less than ‘half’.

Please could the Council confirm:

- a) Where in Cranleigh, will the 68 new car parking spaces be located – to ensure no loss of parking?
- b) When the full consultation on the final location of the new leisure (as referred to above) will take place.

3. Question from Virginia Ray

It is proposed that the new Cranleigh Leisure Centre is to be built in the middle of Village Way car park, resulting in the likelihood of little-to-no public parking being

available during the construction period (once parking for leisure centre staff, and users of the medical centre has been allocated). The current designs show that once construction is completed, there will be just 235 parking spaces, a reduction of 22% from the 303 available now - all while the footfall for the new leisure is projected to be greater than it is now, and while new houses continue to be built in Cranleigh.

Has an impact assessment been undertaken to determine the effects on the High Street businesses, of this substantial loss of parking:

1. During the construction (which is expected to be circa two years)
2. Once the whole project has been completed?

If an impact assessment has not been carried out, what are the Council's expectations in respect of the impact on Cranleigh High Street businesses?

4 . Question from Daniel Hussein

Would the Leader please provide an update on Broadwater Park Golf Course in Godalming? In particular:

- I understand that the legal negotiations are now complete and that the old golf course land is now wholly in the hands of WBC. What have been the total costs (including all legal costs) since May 2019 and what further costs to the Council are anticipated?
- The Leader has talked of a facility at Broadwater Park to rival the Surrey University Sports Park. What are the current plans of the Administration for this area and when will there be a meaningful consultation with members of the public?
- When will the land recovery and capping commence, how long will it take and what daily lorry movements are anticipated?

5. Question from Richard Benson

The Broadwater Golf Club site

- The site area is approximately 80,000 square metres.
- Based on data from the Environment Agency the cost of capping the site will be approximately £2,400,000.
- The recommended aftercare period is at least 60 years.

Questions:

1. Does the Leader agree that the cost of capping the Broadwater Golf Club site will be at least £2,400,000 ?
2. If the Leader does not agree, what is his estimate of the cost of capping the Broadwater Golf Club site ?
3. Where will the funds come from to pay for the cost of capping ?

4. What is the Leader's estimate for the annual aftercare cost?

6. Question from Alex Page

Fairground Development Project; on 9 April, the Executive approved a budget for the procurement of services that are required for the purposes of preparation, planning, and implementation of the procurement strategy. As it seems some of the assessments have not been completed, and those that have appear to be less comprehensive than required, remembering the details of the land plan 2, and the full Council meeting means there was only a two-week gap for those assessments, let alone signing contracts for those services, so that the council can provide informed consent to this budget,

What is the rush?

Noting the difference in how this budget was presented to the council compared to the budget for the Godalming high-street budget.

7. Question from Brian Edmonds

Why has the 2023 review of the Health and Safety Policy not taken place and by what legal authority have the Chief Executive and Leader chosen to redact their signatures. There also appears to be no rational reason for redacting the name of the elected member responsible for Health and Safety matters. Of similar significance how have the significant elected members' obligations for health and safety been brought to their attention?

8. Question from Peter Goodwin

With the proposed increase in car park charges the Council seems determined to inflict the most damage on Haslemere High Street shoppers, retail businesses and restaurants. Shoppers using the High St car park were already charged more than commuters in the Weydown Rd car park for the whole charging period. Now commuters face a mere 40p increase for staying all day, with High St shoppers having to pay incremental increases every single hour.

1. The High St car park is the main car park for the High St, West St, Lower St and High Pavement - the retail and restaurant hub of Haslemere. Many have already moved to shop out of town and in Petersfield with its wider range of shops. So what is the reasoning behind this Council decision to impose the highest incremental charges on the main Haslemere East car park, used by shoppers and those visiting businesses, solicitors, the Banking Hub, estate agents, etc., as it shows a clear bias to the Haslemere West retailers i.e. Marks & Spencer and Tesco with their free parking?
2. Why have the Council imposed a very unfair £2 evening charge in the High St, which will affect all Town Hall Council and Committee meetings, and those visiting the restaurants and pubs in Haslemere East? This can only be interpreted as a wish to stifle evening business in Haslemere East, in favour of out-of-town pubs and restaurants, so why has this been levied?

3. The Fairground car park proposal will force not only commuters, but all those working in the Wey Hill shops to park on residential roads. I believe that - "*A car park capacity study found there are adequate spaces available elsewhere*", but where?? The 100 or so spaces on the Fairground site will all be needed by the houses and supermarket, so why has the Council totally ignored the fact that Wey Hill, from the railway bridge to the Tesco traffic lights is almost always a traffic roadblock, which these proposals will make far worse?
4. I also question 1. What will be the cost to the taxpayer of evening traffic wardens? 2. What additional budget has Waverley set aside to monitor Borough car parks up to 10pm?

**Notice of Member Questions (Procedure Rule 11.2) – Council 23
April 2024**

1. Councillor Hyman

It is a matter of public record that the March 2023 Revised Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) for Farnham was, as ever, merely a Plan to have a Plan at a future time, specifically stating its reliance upon the awaited details and modelling of the County Highways Authority's 'Farnham Infrastructure Programme' proposals for East Street, Castle Street, West Street and the gyratory system.

Surrey's proposals consist of a mixture of roadspace (capacity) removal and partial contraflow sections in The Borough and Downing Street, with accompanying signalisation. Their aim is to discourage car use significantly by significantly increasing congestion, even though the latter increases journey times and fuel usage, increasing air pollution.

The CHA measures are intended to shift the town centre air pollution problem to less central and more residential roads where current levels are already likely to be, or become, far above the WHO (if not EU) pollution limit levels. The March Farnham Board papers indicated that the detailed plans and Paramics traffic modelling remain to be completed, despite Surrey Highways having supposedly provided a previous (June 2023) Farnham Board meeting with selected results from that modelling. We now find that Surrey and Waverley are already relying on that dubious 'satisfactory modelling' for supposedly meeting our obligations under planning and air quality legislation.

Will Waverley now please agree to meet our obligations (under Schedule 11 Parts 6-8, Sections 83A, s85A(2) and 85B of the Environment Act 2021), and due process, by requesting and ensuring that SCC publicly demonstrate their '2019 Base' and '2025 With-FIP' Paramics models for Farnham on-screen for scrutiny, along with their assumptions and input and output data, before any related decisions are made and before works commence? And if not, why not?

This page is intentionally left blank