

Various Roads in Farnham (Prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles) Order 202- consultation (March/April 2021): collated comments and responses

Overview

All feedback sources:

- 139 responses by individuals via an online survey conducted on Surrey Says

The responses to the Order was:

- 103 supported
- 14 objected
- 22 made general comments without supporting or objecting



Contents

Various Roads in Farnham (Prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles) Order 202-consultation (March/April 2021): collated comments and responses	1
Overview	1
Objections raised to the proposed Order	3
Comment 1	3
Comment 2	4
Comment 3	5
Comment 4	6
Comment 5	7
Comment 6	8
Comment 7	9
Comment 8	10
Comment 9	11
Comment 10	12
Comment 11	13
Comment 12	14
Comment 13	15
Comment 14	16
Decision	17

Objections raised to the proposed Order

Comment 1

One respondent commented "I fully support the proposals, I live in Castle Street which is on a route frequently used by HGV's going to the landfill site on the A31. My house is a grade 2 star property built in 1775 and every day I have to suffer the noise and vibrations from countless HGV'S passing my house I hate to think of the damage that is being caused to the foundations of my property !"

Response

Incorrectly classified as objection - respondent fully supports the proposals.

Comment 2

One respondent commented: *"I have lived in Farnham for 25 years and for the last 15 have lived at my current address on West Street.*

The level of traffic and pollution has increased exponentially over the last few years, and where there was once a fairly free-running road outside my house, there is now a regularly traffic-congested road with queues of traffic stretching into the centre of town with associated very poor air quality.

Any proposals which are aimed at reducing the number of vehicles, in particular HGVs, will be warmly welcomed."

Response

Incorrectly classified as objection - respondent fully supports the proposals.

Comment 3

One respondent commented: *“Hi, so overall I think the prevention of HGV access to the A3 via Farnham town is a good idea and I’m all for supporting the prevention of HGV traffic routing on Upper Hale road and Castle Street. My objection is to the lack of inclusion of Alma Lane in this blue route proposal. All though there will be signage placed in strategic places to support the prevention of using Alma lane for HGV most modern sat navigation devises will divert you up Alma Lane after you pass Upper Hale road.*

Also I would like to raise the issue of communication to haulage companies because as we all know signs get missed or ignored,.

How do these routes get enforced apart from signs ??

If HGV traffic does turn on to Alma Lane then there is absolutely no chance of them turning around and they will continue to upper Hale road turn right and continue on up to the M3. I appreciate that delivery’s are required for building / store supplies supplies to the area but using it as a rat run for access to the M3 down a narrow road used by buses, parents walking and driving to Hale School and Tesco express increasing pollution to the area and make it an unsafe environment for residents.”

Response

In no case are HGV transits planned to be via the B3005 Alma Lane. HGVs are advised well in advance of the restrictions, and that recommended HGV routes are via the higher order road network (e.g. M3, A331 etc). HGVs cannot utilise the B3005 Alma Lane to transit unless they have a valid reason (e.g. loading/unloading) - they would need to pass through the restricted area in order to gain access to, or exit from, Alma Lane.

If a driver were heading along the A287 by the time they reach the junction with Alma Lane they will have passed through a minimum of 5 signs alerting them of the restriction. There will also be signs on the M3, and slip roads leaving the M3 to pre-warn drivers that access to the A3 is via the A331 and to continue along the M3, not exit for the A287.

The Road Haulage Association and Logistics UK (formerly the Freight Transport Association) were contacted as part of the statutory consultation, advising them of the impending weight restriction. This information available to members of the two industry bodies.

Enforcement to be via an HGV watch programme being developed jointly by SCC and Surrey Police. In due course, if/when the DfT release civil enforcement powers for moving traffic violations to councils outside of London this avenue may be explored, e.g. use of camera enforcement.

Comment 4

One respondent commented: *“If you ban HGV lorries from using Upper Hale Road, Folly Hill and Castle Street, they will only use alternative routes like Dora Green, Crondall lane. These are country lanes, with stables totally unsuitable for HGV lorries. Consequently, I do not think you should ban HGV's at the current time, unless perhaps there is another alternative route like a Western Bypass. A pedestrian was killed last year in a road traffic accident on Crondall lane. Traffic travels too fast already on this road and any increase in traffic will only make the road more dangerous”*

Response

Dora's Green Lane and Crondall Lane already have extant weight restrictions prohibiting vehicles over 7.5T.

The 'alternate' route is not an alternate - it is the existing signed route, which is to remain on the M3 until Junction 4 (junction with A331) - not exit at Junction 5 (junction with A287), and to use the M3 / A331 / A3.

Comment 5

One respondent commented: *“Whilst welcoming the concept of diverting HGVs from UHR and surrounding minor roads including Alma Lane, the proposals are fundamentally flawed from a variety of reasons and have had very little thought put into them.*

Currently any HGVs travelling south on Farnborough Road divert along Alma Lane to reach the UHR and similarly those travelling northbound travel in the opposite direction. There are actually far more HGVs using this route than travel along the congested section of UHR, which a basic traffic count would soon establish.

I've seen a very significant increase in traffic using Alma Lane within the past year.

The biggest issue is that Alma Lane has been completely forgotten in this ill-thought out proposal. Signage is intended to ban right turns onto UHR from southbound on Farnborough Road. I have never actually seen an HGV attempt this manoeuvre in 10 years. No signage, or weight limit appears to be planned for Alma Lane so all HGV's will travel westbound on Alma Lane and arrive at UHR, where the weight limit is in place between from the junction with A287 Odiham Road / Folly Hill to the junction with the A325 Farnborough Road. Presumably you will expect them to do a U-turn as they have no where to go? This is really basic traffic management and appears to be an attempt to modify the trunk road network. The current proposals need to be withdrawn or modified.”

Response

Signs will be installed on the Farnborough Road both north and south of the junction with Alma Lane, therefore advising vehicles arriving from either the north or south of the restrictions.

Regarding signage banning right turns to UHR from southbound on Farnborough Road, whilst this manoeuvre may be rare, or not occur at all, it is nevertheless legally required to advise vehicles travelling in either direction of the restrictions - therefore these signs are present in order to give drivers fair warning (in addition, they would have already passed 3 previous signs travelling southbound before reaching this junction).

In no case are HGV transits planned to be via the B3005 Alma Lane. HGVs are advised well in advance of the restrictions, and that recommended HGV routes are via the higher order road network (e.g. M3, A331 etc). HGVs cannot utilise the B3005 Alma Lane to transit unless they have a valid reason (e.g. loading/unloading) - they would need to pass through the restricted area in order to gain access to, or exit from, Alma Lane.

If a driver were heading along the A287 by the time they reach the junction with Alma Lane they will have passed through a minimum of 5 signs alerting them of the restriction. There will also be signs on the M3, and slip roads leaving the M3 to pre-warn drivers that access to the A3 is via the A331 and to continue along the M3, not exit for the A287.

Comment 6

One respondent commented: *“Whilst I appreciate the need for HGVs to access Farnham due to ongoing building works/ deliveries I am most concerned about the SPEED of these vehicles along Castle Street where I presently live. At the top of this street these heavy, usually laden, vehicles can reach speeds of 60mph going downhill (uphill they are just as fast as they are then often unladen! Of course, it is not just the wagons who exceed the speed limit, cars and motor cycles are also culprits. This said, HGVs can be dangerous vehicles and this really must be addressed. I have noticed that the property shakes when these vehicles ‘fly’past. Being old buildings and with the history of subsidence already an issue with some of the properties in the street, it really cannot continue. Also, if one of these vehicles loses control along here it does not bear thinking about the outcome. Two things need to be considered. Firstly, if at all possible, diversion of all HGVs. Secondly, or as an alternative in the short term, a 20 mph zone along the street. It must not be left until a serious incident occurs. STREET CALMING UNTIL A SOLUTION CAN BE FOUND SEEMS COMMONSENSE.”*

Response

Comment does not appear to object to the proposals, but is rather focused on general speed, and speed of HGVs specifically, on Castle Street.

The proposals are geared towards reducing the number of HGVs, which will reduce the impact of those remaining HGVs on nearby properties, irrespective of the speed these remaining HGVs are travelling.

During the most recent speed survey on Castle Street (undertaken using Automatic Traffic Counters which recorded vehicles 24 hours/day over a 10-day period), zero vehicles were recorded at, near, or over 60mph on Castle Street. The mean speed was 27.8mph in one direction and 24.6mph in the other direction.

Nevertheless, a separate study is introducing a reduced 20mph speed limit on Castle Street.

Comment 7

One respondent commented: *"The objective to remove heavy goods vehicles is to reduce pollution and remove them from the town which is seen to be unsuitable.*

This I presume 'quick fix' is just a sticking plaster.

- The alternative route is miles and miles of a detour which actually creates more pollution as a whole.

- who will police this? A sign will surely not make those that use these roads and are familiar with them think again?

- The real likely hood this is just moving the problem elsewhere , if not the town as more visible the indiscretion then doras green, crondal lane and most likely onto the waterlane / six bells and farnborough road and alma lane.

- The reason for these vehicles using the town is not being addressed?

1 reason is they are used due to the low bridge at wrecclesham pushing them into waverley lane, the ridgeway and station hill.

Signs will not sort this issue."

Response

The proposals were designed to respond to a range of resident concerns. Vehicle emissions was one element, however the primary concerns raised were: safety of pedestrians and cyclists, noise, vibration, and road width.

Enforcement to be via an HGV watch programme being developed jointly by SCC and Surrey Police. In due course, if/when the DfT release civil enforcement powers for moving traffic violations to councils outside of London this avenue may be explored, e.g. use of camera enforcement.

Dora's Green Lane and Crondall Lane already have extant weight restrictions prohibiting vehicles over 7.5T.

The 'alternate' route is not an alternate - it is the existing signed route, which is to remain on the M3 until Junction 4 (junction with A331) - not exit at Junction 5 (junction with A287), and to use the M3 / A331 / A3.

As part of the A31 Farnham Corridor business case (applying for central government funding) the issue of traffic re-routing due to the low bridge height at Wrecclesham and the weight limit on the Firgrove Hill will be considered through alterations to access to/from the A31 Farnham Corridor.

Comment 8

One respondent commented: *“Not really enough. All HGV not delivering to the town centre should use the bypass without exception. That includes a ban on their use of East and West Street as well as Castle Street.*

Very strict checks for ensuring any in town have a legitimate delivery in town needs to be done otherwise it has no teeth.”

Response

Comment supports weight limits to HGVs but requests further, additional, geographic areas be considered for restrictions.

Outside the scope of the proposals.

Comment 9

One respondent commented: *“No HGV should be allowed through Farnham. There is a bypass”*

Response

Comment supports weight limits to HGVs but requests further, additional, geographic areas be considered for restrictions.

Outside the scope of the proposals.

Comment 10

One respondent commented: *"Problem: Save our beautiful, historic town and affected villages from wrecking HGVs.*

The proposed prohibition doesn't go far enough. We need HGVs away from the town centre, Wrecclesham village (and low bridge) and the A325 towards both Petersfield and Aldershot routes

Idea: perhaps a 10-ton restriction zone to keep the artics and large trucks away and help ease traffic, road damage, vehicle movement and pollution? Better signposting to use A31 and not the short cuts. Use social media to promulgate the new restrictions and educate hauliers and business owners that things must change if we want to keep the heart of our communities."

Response

Comment supports weight limits to HGVs but requests further, additional, geographic areas be considered for restrictions.

Outside the scope of the proposals.

Additional signing is being installed on the A31 and the M3 alerting HGV drivers of the restrictions which are the subject of this TRO.

Comment 11

One respondent commented: *“leave the HGV drivers alone, their job is essential and hard enough as it is without discrimination for the purpose of pleasing fickle towns folk”*

Response

Haulage is a crucial element of the UK economy. These restrictions do not prevent HGVs delivering to Farnham.

The TRO will support routing of goods vehicles in line with existing signage on the Strategic Road Network: - currently signs on the M3 on the approach to Junction 5 advise all traffic (including goods vehicles) to use the M3 / A331 / A31 to access Farnham and Guildford. The TRO will enable local access to continue as goods vehicles will still be able to deliver or service business or residential customers in local areas. Those goods vehicles which are currently using the A287 and A3016 to reach Farnham town centre, nearby industrial / business estates, or as part of longer journeys (e.g. between Basingstoke and Guildford) will no longer be able to do so. These vehicles should already be utilising the ‘alternative route’. They should not be utilising the A287 or the A3016 unless they have a need to access a property or location only accessible from these roads.

Comment 12

One respondent commented: *"I am very concerned with the HGVS coming into town they are inches away from baby's in pushchairs and walking elderly residents it's time to look after the people and ban the heavy goods vehicles coming in to the town. Have a delivery curfew like 9pm-4pm when it's quiet"*

Response

"Ambiguous comment. Appears to support the proposed restriction.

The proposals were designed to respond to a range of resident concerns. Vehicle emissions was one element; however, the primary concerns raised were: safety of pedestrians and cyclists, noise, vibration, and road width. Through reducing vehicle volumes the impact of those walking on footways will be reduced.

Suggestion of delivery curfew is not the subject of these proposals, it could be considered as part of later work in the town centre - however, this would require significant consultation with businesses across a diverse array of industries which have differing needs regarding timing of their deliveries.

Comment 13

One respondent commented: *“The simple fact is that there are many roads in and around Farnham that are simply not suitable for HGVs. The streets are often narrow, with sharp bends and narrow pavements - and situation which is currently further exacerbated by the measures to widen the pavements to allow for social distancing, which reduces the roads in parts of the central one-way system from 2 lanes to 1. Whilst it is good that proposals are being made to restrict HGV traffic in certain places, it seems that they are very limited and will likely have very little impact, if any, to the overall levels of HGV traffic in the area. In fact, I would think it may mean HGV traffic which would no longer be allowed on Castle Street, for example, may be forced to use other, equally unsuitable roads in central Farnham, such as the central one way system. The only thing that would have a meaningful impact would surely be to prevent HGVs from entering any of the roads in the town centre.”*

Response

Comment supports HGV restrictions but requests they be extended to cover a much wider geographic area.

Restricting all HGVs from Farnham at this time is not practicable, viable or justified. Businesses require goods deliveries. Suggestion of a town-wide ban would require significant consultation with businesses across a diverse array of industries which have differing needs regarding timing of their deliveries. It may also necessitate construction of a freight consolidation centre, which would be subject to successful planning application and business case processes. Whilst a potential freight consolidation centre is referenced as a potential option within the wider OIP, it would be some years before it could be delivered if this potential option were selected.

Opposing a specific scheme which may address issues seems counter-intuitive.

Comment 14

One respondent commented: "In isolation, this HGV limit is not helpful. IF there is a proven abundance of non local HGVs passing through Upper Hale from the direction of Odiham and heading for the A31, Dora's Green Lane, Crondall Lane and Runwick Lane should also be included. Otherwise HGVs will use that route as a means of bypassing Upper Hale and the Town Centre,

None of those roads are sufficiently wide to accommodate HGVs, but these routes have been used as rat runs. This was particularly noticeable when there were traffic lights at the recent development on Folly Hill, causing huge delays.

Are we sure the HGVs that use the Upper Hale Road are not coming from the Collards waste disposal site on Beacon Hill Road? In which case, they could be regarded as using that road for access and therefore will continue to use it.

There needs to be a holistic use of HGV limits across Farnham to ensure non local HGVs use the A331 as the most appropriate route between the M3 and the A31 and not divert westwards. Otherwise, there is a risk that these isolated measures will cause a false justification for a Western Farnham Bypass."

Response

Dora's Green Lane and Crondall Lane already have extant weight restrictions prohibiting vehicles over 7.5T.

Signage is included within these proposals on the A31 and the M3 advising drivers of the restrictions and alerting them that the route for HGVs between the A31 and the M3 is the A331 corridor.

Some HGVs using the Upper Hale Road will be heading to / from the Collards waste site on Beacon Hill Road; SCC have liaised with HCC who are the highway and planning authority for the Collards site to advise them of the impending restrictions and request they liaise with Collards to ensure they are aware of the weight limit.

As HGVs are already precluded from using Dora's Green Lane and Crondall Lane it is unlikely vehicles would divert on to these roads as a result of the weight restriction proposed within this TRO. Any illegal displacement activity would have no bearing on justification for a potential Western Bypass.

Decision

Given the quantity of favourable feedback received, and the lack of substantive objections to the proposal, it has been agreed by the Executive Director for Environment, Transport and Infrastructure to go ahead and implement the new HGV weight restriction as advertised.