Cranleigh Stakeholder meeting - Agenda

Date & Time:	**Thursday 8th August 09:30 – 11:00**
Venue:	**Cranleigh Methodist Church** : 188 High St, The Common, Cranleigh GU6 8RL
Chair:	Surrey County Council, Planning & Placemaking Director - TC
Membership:	• Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council Councillor – LT • Surrey County Council, Placemaking specialist - HC • Surrey County Council, Placemaking Officer - JB • Cranleigh Parish Council representative – CW • Cranleigh BID representative – SC • Save the Heart of Cranleigh petition representative – GL • Cranleigh Chamber of Commerce representative – RF
Apologies:	Cranleigh BID representative – TS
Guests:	
Note Taker:	JB

1) **Introductions**
Brief round of introductions. Acknowledgement that TS could not attend this meeting, SC standing in on her behalf.

2) **Why are we here? Why have you been selected, is everyone here who needs to be?**
RF – SMART Cranleigh could have been included in this new group for an accessibility point of view. However, RF agreed to represent SMART and feedback discussions.
LT – It was agreed by the Cabinet Member Cllr Matt Furniss to set up a group of 5 representatives to focus on engagement.
TC – It is worth remembering that all of us within this room and reach others and capture engagement. It is our groups responsibility to inform residents and groups within Cranleigh.
GL – The reason as to why we are here is that we think the previous process failed. We need to learn from these lessons and do it right this time.
TC – There is a process that Surrey County Council (SCC) have to go through, but we are rewinding and starting the engagement again. With your support we should get this right.

3) **Terms of Reference: What is the purpose of this group, what are its rules and responsibilities.**
GL – What is the actual purpose of this group?
TC – The purpose is for us (the group) to develop an engagement plan for Phase 2 (Cranleigh High Street). We are not a decision making body – that is up to our professional designers to do. We need to make sure that what we capture during engagement is communicated to our designers.
RF – It is good to move this forward and not look back. Focus on the future and not the past.
GL – If this is not a decision making body then we are just a talking shop.
TC – This is a group to engage with our representative groups and also the residents. We cannot be a decision making body, that is up to Cabinet and Council.
LT – This group can engage with as many people / groups as possible and engage more effectively. We can stop the misinformation being shared on social media and inform those on what we can and can't do as part of this scheme.
GL – The letter from the cabinet member that SCC sent to residents was done without informing this group first. This was an issue. The mention of speeding along the high street resulted in

many residents coming to our group stating that there is no issue. The Petition group believes that this further damaged the credibility of SCC which needs rebuilding.
RF – You may believe that there is not an issue with speeding, however as a cyclist I believe that there is an issue with speeding.

4) Scope of project: Highway boundaries, S106 & CIL funds allocated, Phase 1 – Fountain Square

RF – I am fearful that no works will be carried out, what about the funding that we have?
SC – Is there a time limit on funding?
HC – Yes, funding from S106 & CIL will expire. We are requesting a 12 month extension on the CIL funding from Waverley Borough Council (WBC). We have funding from SCC, but this is match funded, if we lose the CIL then it could affect the SCC funding.
LT – Full disclosure, I am on with WBC CIL board, however, do not vote for any matters related to Cranleigh as it is not appropriate for me to do so.
SC – Concerns that if we rush to spend the funding then we may get it wrong.
LT – There is nothing set in stone for Phase 2 High Street works. However, the CIL funding provided specifies what type of interventions the funds can be spent on and in which area of the high street. We cannot expand the scope of this project to include other areas as we do not have the funding to do so.
SC- Hopefully people will see the benefit from phase 1 (Fountain Square) and be more supportive of Phase 2.
HC - Exactly, we want to reassure residents that the works not only benefit Cranleigh, but also do not cause as much disruption to the High Street as some expect them to.
TC – Lets go through the full potential works :

- Flood alleviation methods
- Providing safe accessible access along Cranleigh High Street
- Safety improvements to Knowle Lane junction
- Improving public transport and public realm

GL – What about the boundaries, these should include the High Street from The Arts centre to the Baptist Church. When was this reduced scope communicated to residents and businesses? Most people will not understand why the worst part of the High Street for congestion has been excluded.
HC – The scope limit has not been reduced. The Placemaking limits, are from Village Way to Stocklund Square.
LT – This is outside the CIL funding boundary scope. We cannot change what was applied for.
GL – The roads are too narrow for buses, HGV's and cars to pass each other on the stretch of the High Street between the Methodist and the Baptist Church. The petition group believes the road width is below recommended guidance. We have measured it with a laser measuring devices which show 5.8m against the side of a parked van.

RF – As there is no funding for this then we cannot focus on it. We can only focus on the areas set out in the funding agreement.
TC – To recap, there is a boundary, and we need to stay within our boundaries. Moving forward we need to be clear on how to engage this better with residents. We need to communicate this clearly so that everyone is informed properly. Do we all agree?
(Nod of heads all round)
TC – Back to boundary (sheets provided), pavement directly outside of shops is in the main privately owned and SCC cannot touch this. Shops can put planters / chairs / anything they want outside on the land they own (licence permitting). Once they do the pavements suddenly become very narrow.
RF – This needs to be communicated with residents.
TC – Suggestion for WBC to look into a pavement licence design guide.
LT – There are conditions for businesses who require pavement licences, however a design guide would be good, if possible, around things like planter heights.
TC – Is there anything else in the scope needed to be discussed?
GL – Phase 1. What is happening? We need to tell people what the final designs are.
HC – These are not complete yet. We will have a formal consultation for Phase 1; however, we are not at that stage with the designs yet. Anticipate the formal consultation for Phase 1 to take place around November / December.
TC – We have a process to follow, and we cannot speed it up. We need to work through the process.
RF – As a reminder, please do not post on social media any miss information being shared. We are here to help engage, not to feed back on the designs.
TC – All agree?

All – Yes
CL – I need to report this back to the Parish Council and it will be minuted.
TC – That is fine, all of our minutes will be publicly shared online: Have Your Say Today - Cranleigh High Street - Commonplace

5) LTP4 update

HC – The LTP4 sets up plans to improve our transport networks, following a hierarchy of needs putting people first, followed by cyclists, public transport and then cars. Full details of the plan can be found online: Local Transport Plan (LTP4) - Surrey County Council (surreycc.gov.uk). The designs for Cranleigh are concept, these are not set in stone.
GL – The LTP4 is not obvious to us on what the impact is to Cranleigh. Do people really want to change from driving cars to cycling? We surveyed people parked in Stocklund square car park and 90% of users said that they could not cycle into Cranleigh as they live too far away / need a car for shopping etc.
TC – However if you asked the same question to those coming off a bus, they might say something different.
RF – We have information on those visiting Cranleigh via car. The average amount of time spent in Cranleigh is only 30 minutes.
SC – The problem with Cranleigh is that we try and attract people from all over and our roads / infrastructure is not safe for cyclists to do so. We need safer and better infrastructure in Cranleigh so that people can complete their journey via bike. We need to think about 10 – 15 years in the future and not just focus on right now. We have cycle paths / lanes on the surrounding lanes but nothing when you get into the High Street.
LT – We need to recognise that the Highstreet is much busier than what it used to be and is shared by vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.
TC – Any kind of modal shift is fantastic, even if it is only a 10% shift for now it's a great step moving in the right direction.
LT – I have read one research document that highlights those who travel into towns on foot spend something like 25% more than those in cars. – (this is something similar - Walking and cycling: the economic benefits (tfl.gov.uk))
GL – Something that will make a huge difference is to improve the old railway line for cyclists / pedestrians.
LT – Funding has been approved for this and it is in the pipeline but not part of this scheme. This is a great opportunity, but will require some additional, as of yet not secured, funds.
GL – Get Fountain square right, improve pavements (by boots) & improve the old railway and people will see the benefits. They don't understand that the railway line is a different team/budget they want and expect SCC to sort this out.
JB – Note that the area outside of Boots is privately owned land.

6) 20mph Speed survey results

HC – Some people believe that speeding is an issue, and some do not. The 85th % shows that there are some speeding issues along Cranleigh High Street.
GL – We did our own analysis from SCC data and believed that speeding was not a concern between 7am – 7pm. We believe this is confirmed by various SCC studies carried out in Oct 21 and Aug 22.
RF – However after 9am as a cyclist I can confirm that speeding is an issue. It should be noted that when the SCC surveys were carried out surrounding roads were closed due to other works. This would have put added pressure along the High Street and the speeds would have actually been slower than usual.
GL – We believe that any speed reduction interventions will cause more congestion along the High Street and encourage more road users to use side roads as rat runs.
TC – Lets think about this and come up with a design solution. We can't just focus on 7am traffic, what about the evening economy?
SC – What about emergency vehicles and raised tables?
HC – All SCC raised tables will not impact emergency vehicles. They will be able to travel over the raised tables and will not be grounded. You can travel over raised tables without the need of breaking if travelling at the legal speeds, particularly along a 20mph road.
RF – Raised tables are also psychological barriers, they change driver's behaviours and makes it safer for all.

7) Horseshoe Lane

GL – People do not understand the Horseshoe Lane approval process and why this is not part of the scheme. The 2017 planning consent was for the new Horsham Road estates and included a

demand for £250k for improvements to three junctions, we believe there is no detail on what those changes would be.
HC – Horseshoe Lane is not part of the placemaking scheme. It was negotiated by SCC as part of the residential planning application process. We are looking into way as to how to make the junction safer for all, but no detailed designs have been drafted.
LT – I do think that there should be more transparency over off site highways schemes that are attached to planning applications and have mentioned this previously.

8) **Next Steps: Identify current Highway issues along the High Street and engagement opportunities High Street (map activity):**
HC – The last round of engagement presented the changes as a whole, we found people objected to the whole scheme when in fact they may only have been opposed to certain areas (raised tables / parking / loading bay etc). We suggest that we present the new designs in themes. To allow residents to comment on certain aspects that they like / dislike. Suggested themes:

- Raised tables and crossing points.
- Knowle Lane Junction
- Post office entrance and pedestrian crossing.
- Footways and parking
- Bus shelters & sustainability / public transport

Action – JB to send the themes around to the group for comments 7 suggestions.

GL- It is absolutely critical that we enable people to provide detailed feedback on any revised ideas and that this feedback is captured in electric form and is totally transparent to everyone. We feel that this was a major shortcoming of previous consultations.

Engagement opportunities / improvements:

- CIL funding. Clearly explain what is in the CIL funding agreement, and the boundaries where we can spend the funds.
- Highway boundaries. Clearly explain what is SCC land, and what is not. Explain why we cannot touch land not belonging to SCC.
- Potential to include an information sheet to businesses highlighting their property boundary and their responsibilities (so they do not encroach onto SCC land). Encourage businesses to make improvements to their private forecourts.
- Phase 1 – Let people know what's happening, once detailed design is completed and prior to the formal consultation phase.
- Explain clearly what it is we are planning to do and why. Show the benefits / impacts of what the intervention offers.

NEXT MEETING: TBC - 1st week of October

Following the meeting :

Following feedback from the group via emails. The suggested themes that the group would like to engage on are:

- Speed reduction measures [*includes traffic flow*]
- Knowle Lane junction
- Pedestrian crossing points
- Post Office entrance
- Footpaths and on-street parking [*to include disabled parking and loading bay*]
- Public transport and active travel [*this would include pavement works*]