

This document was scanned and an optical character recognition performed. Some of the page breaks are slightly different and there may be other format changes. The paragraph numbering is the same as the original document.

REPORT of PUBLIC INQUIRY

**ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 & LOCAL AUTHORITIES'
TRAFFIC ORDER (PROCEDURE)(ENGLAND & WALES)
REGULATIONS 1996.**

**ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ACT 1984 SECTIONS 1(1) AND 2(1)
TO 3 AND 4**

**THE SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL GREAT GEORGE STREET HIGH
STREET MOSS LANE AND POUND LANE GODALMING
(PROHIBITION OF TRAFFIC) ORDER 200-**

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	2
The Case in Support of the Order	4
Objections to the Order	8
Conclusions	12
Recommendation	15

Annexes to the report:

- A. List of Appearances.
- B. List of Documents submitted at the Inquiry.

Inspector: A.K.POTTER BA CEng FIMarE.

File References: Surrey County Council LPE/PAG/25602
LCP/TRO151 GDMG

TO: The County Solicitor
Surrey County Council
County Hall
KINGSTON upon THAMES
Surrey
KT1 2DN

1 February 2001

Sir,

1.1 On 16-18 January 2001, at your invitation I conducted a Local Public Inquiry at the Waverley Borough Council offices in Godalming into the proposed Traffic Regulation Order extending the pedestrian priority policy for Godalming Town Centre. The purpose of the Inquiry was to hear representations and objections relating to your proposal, under Sections 1(1) and 2(1) to (3) and 4 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and of all other enabling powers, in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the above Act, to amend the regulations governing movement of vehicles in the town centre on Saturdays between 10am and 4pm.

1.2 The intention of this Order was to complete the package of traffic management measures designed to develop a more attractive and environmentally friendly town centre with greater pedestrian domination on Saturdays.

1.3 A copy of the original draft Order, detailing your proposals is attached at Annex B2. A copy of the modified Order as submitted to the inquiry is at Annex B3.

1.4 At the inquiry your County Council presented the case in support of the Order, in conjunction with Waverley Borough Council. Five local residents spoke in support of the Order, including representatives of the Godalming Initiative, the Godalming Trust and "Go Godalming". There were numerous objections to the Order as originally drafted, many directed at the declared intention to charge for residents parking permits. When this provision was withdrawn, a key objection was overcome. The remaining objections were generally not directed at the principle of pedestrian priority for Godalming Town Centre per se, but at the detailed implications of the Order for cyclists, for the disabled and for small traders. At the inquiry nine people detailed their

specific objections under one or more of these headings, seeking amendments to the Order to accommodate their concerns.

1.5 On completion of the Inquiry I carried out an accompanied site inspection, visiting those streets and certain properties in the town centre potentially affected by the Order.

1.6 This report contains a brief outline of the context in which this traffic regulation measure has been proposed, and the gist of the case in support of the Order as presented to me during the inquiry. There follows an outline of the objections raised against it, my analysis of the evidence, my conclusions and recommendations. A list of documents submitted during the Inquiry is given at Annex B.

BACKGROUND

2.1 The layout of Godalming Town Centre (Annex B4) is well known to all parties concerned with this Order, and I shall not therefore describe it in detail, other than to highlight certain features which appear directly to affect the suitability of Godalming for pedestrian priority schemes in general, and the subject Order in particular.

2.2 Godalming High Street lies within the Godalming Conservation Area. It possesses numerous listed buildings and an interesting mixture of architectural styles illustrating four centuries of evolution by successive generations of local residents. In recent years sustained efforts have been made to retain the character of the town, chiefly through traffic management measures but also by sympathetic street enhancements and by conservation of interesting historical details.

2.3 Chief among the former is the existence of a by-pass around the High Street. Flambard Way was opened in 1989. It has provided a direct arterial route around the town and thus has effectively removed through-traffic from the town centre.

2.4 In the High Street itself, making it one-way and pinching the carriageway at intervals with sturdy bollards, providing loading and unloading bays (and daytime parking for disabled only) and installing pedestrian priority paving in various patterns has apparently greatly reduced conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, not only by reducing traffic flows but also by inhibiting the speeds of those vehicles which still find their way into the town.

2.5 During my tours of the town centre I noted that the overall effects of these measures were diminished by a general disregard for the regulations. Casual, obstructive or illegal parking appeared commonplace in, and adjacent to, the High Street. Nobody seemed to expect the rules to be enforced.

2.6 There are five public pay-and-display car parks within one minute's (level) walk of the High Street, and a further three nearby. At the times of my visits there was spare capacity at all these locations. (Annex B4)

THE CASES OF THE PARTIES.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER - the material points were -

3.1 Your County Council noted that in recent years there has been intense public interest in local transport and traffic issues, reflecting the major impact these have on all our lives. This interest was reflected in the first Transport Plan for Surrey, published in May 1991. Recent traffic management measures in Godalming have in turn reflected the objectives of this Plan, particularly in the context of safety, the adverse effects of motorised transport and improvements to accessibility.

3.2 The opening of Flambard Way facilitated the implementation of the Godalming Town Centre environmental enhancement scheme. This was completed in 1993. Since then the removal of non-essential motor traffic from the High Street, consistent with county policy, has remained part of the Waverley Borough Local Plan. The Go Godalming Association was formed in 1994 to bring together official and elected representatives and representatives of the voluntary sector, the Police, the Churches and the Chamber of Commerce with the common aim of revitalising the town centre.

3.3 In 1996, following representations from local traders seeking better communication between the business community and local councils, the Godalming Initiatives Forum was set up. Membership included representatives of the Go Godalming Association and The Godalming Trust. The Forum's working party on pedestrianisation of the town centre reported the following year and recommended that public consultation should take place prior to an experimental 3-month trial of a suitable pedestrian priority scheme.

3.4 A survey of local businesses, residents and visitors revealed that the majority of respondents in all of these classifications supported this proposal.

3.5 As a result a trial was carried out in May-August 1998 under the auspices of the Waverley Partnership Area Transportation Sub-Committee (WPATSC) whereby traffic was excluded from the High Street between 10am and 4pm on Saturdays. Exceptions were made for emergency vehicles, buses, (for part of the trial only) access for those with off-street parking spaces in the designated area and cyclists (one-way only)

3.6 A further public survey was then conducted to assess reaction to the experimental closure, and to canvass public opinion as to the optimum range and scale of a permanent arrangement.

3.7 This confirmed the high level of support among the general public for the Saturday only scheme (80+%) Local business opinion was less clear cut and appeared evenly divided over the question of Saturday closure over the trial area, but substantially against enlargement of the closure area or extension to other days of the week.

3.8 In the light of all the survey results and further representations from interested parties it was resolved by the Godalming Initiative to recommend to the County Council, as highway authority, that a pedestrian priority scheme for Saturdays, but retaining access for buses as well as for emergency vehicles, be made permanent through an appropriate Order.

3.9 The Order was published in February 2000 and attracted a total of 23 written objections.

3.10 These fell into two broad categories:

- Objection to the closure itself, because it inhibited access, threatened trade etc,

and/or

- Objection to the declared intention to make a charge for permits (to be issued to holders of off-street parking spaces [122 in number] in the designated pedestrian-priority area)

3.11 Objectors in the former category fell in turn into three special-interest groups, viz

- Objectors to the existing one-way prohibition for cyclists in the High Street (which would remain unchanged by the Order).
- Objectors to the exclusion of disabled badge holders vehicles from the designated area on Saturdays between 10am and 4pm. (Such

vehicles in place before 10am would be permitted to remain there for up to three hours.)

- Local traders concerned about the potential loss of trade resulting from the closure. They had also expressed misgivings about access for loading and unloading, both for deliveries to their premises and for customer collections.

3.12 The Council had considered very carefully all these issues, and had conducted extensive consultations with interested parties in each case.

3.13 **Two-way cycling**. Cyclists representatives, while supporting the scheme in principle, had argued for two-way access in the pedestrian priority zone. The Council, although in turn in support of cycling as an alternative means of transport in accordance with county, and national policy, in this case judged that the introduction of two-way cycling (on Saturdays only) to be potentially hazardous. People, accustomed to one-way flow on weekdays would be confused and vulnerable if this were to be introduced on one day of the week only. The perception of greater risk among pedestrians would tend to have a discouraging effect on those who might otherwise come into the town to shop. (Annex B9) Survey results suggested that the majority of people were opposed to any cycling in the zone.

3.14 The High Street pinch points (2.75 metres between bell bollards) had proved highly effective in bringing down vehicle speeds to an average of some 13mph. At the same time they left insufficient room for a cyclist to pass other vehicles, particularly buses, going through them. This would force cyclists off the carriageway at these points. There was insufficient room in the High Street to provide a contraflow lane to overcome this difficulty.(Annex B10)

3.15 Flambard Way was a convenient alternative to the High Street for eastbound cycle traffic. Although the Godalming Initiatives Forum Working Party had acknowledged that this was inherently less safe for cyclists, the evidence available (Annex B11) did not suggest that it presented any undue risk. For these reasons it was decided that the Order should not be modified to permit two-way cycling.

3.16 **Access for the Disabled**. By excluding disabled badge holders from the pedestrianised area the Order did not contravene the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. The Act did not require that exemption be made for disabled vehicles in these circumstances. Disabled people benefited from environmental improvements resulting from reduction of traffic in pedestrian-priority schemes

as much as anyone else. Witness evidence bore this out, disabled people during the trial in the High Street having commented that the scheme made them feel safer and happier. The local representative of Disabled Citizens Advice & Support Service – (DisCASS) said at the Inquiry that the confidence and safety of frail, elderly people was paramount.

3.17 In this case special consideration had been given to the needs of the Disabled. DisCASS had been a member of all relevant committees throughout and thus had been fully consulted at every stage. It had been agreed that the most economical and effective traffic management system for the pedestrian priority area was by installing physical controls (rising bollards) (Annex B12) Such systems presented administrative difficulties if disabled drivers were to be overriding powers, and were unsuitable for disabled drivers use anyway. The 27 designated parking spaces that had been provided in close proximity to the High Street (Annex B13) not only complied with the legal requirement in the Act to provide alternative parking for the disabled, but would be just as convenient for nearly all disabled drivers.

3.18 A Shop-Mobility scheme had also been suggested but had recently been rejected by DisCASS. The opportunity to introduce one remained however, and funding was available from Go Godalming. Access to the High Street on weekdays would be unaffected by the Order, and would remain available until 10am on Saturdays.

3.19 **Local Trade**.The concerns of local traders and the significance of the scheme for trading levels in the High Street were fully appreciated. Formation of the Godalming Initiative had enabled the former to be fully engaged both in the trial and in the development of the present Traffic Order. According to the most recent survey (January 2001, Annex B14) opinion among local traders as to the desirability of pedestrianisation of the High Street remained divided, with a small majority remaining opposed to it, mainly on trading grounds, rather than because of loading/unloading difficulties. There remained however a vigorous and clear majority in the Initiative, as well as in Go Godalming (Annex B15) and the Godalming Trust (Annex B16) supporting a permanent scheme.

3.20 National research suggested that well designed pedestrianisation schemes, although unlikely to cause an immediate increase in levels of trade, and sometimes even to be associated with a small temporary drop, in the medium to longer term attracted more shoppers and thereby proved to be beneficial to traders and to property owners.

3.21 Although it was not possible to guarantee this effect specifically for Godalming, every case being unique, local opinion clearly anticipated that this would be the case. From the outset, the pressure for pedestrian priority in Godalming had come from residents, businesses and local organisations, all of whom had been involved in the very high degree of consultation leading to the present position.

3.22 The evidence submitted to the Inquiry by the Federation of Small Businesses on the other hand appeared to contain no specific information on the relationship between trading levels and pedestrian priority schemes anywhere. None of the evidence appeared to be directly related to Godalming, nor was it clear how many, if any, Godalming traders were being represented by the Federation. No attempt appeared to have been made to interpret the Federation's data for the Godalming situation. The data itself in any case seemed to add little to the general debate and nothing to the current issue.

3.23 The second main written objection to the Order, that charges should be levied for parking permits had been accepted. The Order had therefore been modified to remove this requirement.

3.24 Its Statutory obligations having been met the County Council recommended that, subject to the modification proposed, the Order be made forthwith.

4. **OBJECTIONS TO THE ORDER** - the material points were,

4.1 **Two-Way Cycling** Miss Hall and Mr McCalden, representing Godalming Cycle Campaign and the CTC said that they supported the Order in principle, but objected to the fact that in prohibiting two-way flow of cycles the Order was missing a key opportunity to promote cycling in the town.

4.2 Miss Hall pointed out that Department of Transport guidelines suggested that there was no justification for excluding cyclists from pedestrian priority areas, nor for creating inconvenient conditions for cyclists which would force them to use busy distributor roads. Promoting cycle access to town centres was a specific objective in the County Council's Transport Plan. No case had been put forward to justify Godalming being made an exception to this policy.

4.3 What was sought, and what had been agreed in committee prior to the original pedestrianisation experiment, was that cyclists would be given freedom to ride in both directions in the High Street, if only for a limited period, so that

the practicability of this could be established. Without proper consultation and for no good reason this part of the trial had been dropped.

4.4 There was no question of providing a dedicated strip along the High Street for cyclists. It was accepted by all sides that this would exacerbate rather than reduce the potential pedestrian/cyclist conflict in that environment.

4.5 It was accepted that the choke points in the High Street prevented a cycle and a bus, say, from passing one another between the bollards. This would be the case for buses and cycles travelling in opposite directions, but also held true when the two were travelling in the same direction. In these circumstances also a cyclist would be obliged to pause until the way was clear. So the Order as drafted accepted this situation anyway. There was therefore no case for prohibiting two-way cycling on this account.

4.6 The alleged strength of the public opposition to cyclists, derived from the survey results obtained by the Godalming Initiative, was misleading. Negative response had been invited by the way the questions had been framed. (Annex B19) The results were therefore prejudiced.

4.7 To suggest that cyclists were safer using Flambard Way than the High Street defied common sense. The suggestion that cyclists might find one-way use of the High Street on weekdays and two-way use on Saturdays confusing was probably more valid. Signage would need to be a good deal better than at present.

4.8 The best way to remove confusion would be to allow two-way cycling every day of the week.

4.9 Mr McCalden, representing Godalming Cycle Campaign supported these points and pointed out that contraflow cycling in Godalming High Street would be entirely consistent with national guidelines as set out in numerous Traffic Advisory leaflets and National Cycling strategy documentation from the DETR backed by robust research data from the Transport Research Laboratory at Crowthorne. (Annex B21) The Council had given no good reason for ignoring this advice.

4.10 The risks attending pedestrian/cycle interaction in pedestrian priority areas had been overstated by the Council. Empirical observations during the Summer of 1998 showed that cyclists had mixed freely with pedestrians in the High Street, modifying their behaviour appropriately in crowded conditions. The survey also showed that cyclists travelled the High Street in both directions, thus

establishing the requirement for two-way flow, and reinforcing the view that this would be entirely appropriate in the prevailing conditions in Godalming.

4.11 On behalf of the many local cyclists represented at the Inquiry (Annexes B19-23) The Godalming Cycling Campaign asked that the Order be modified to allow two-way cycling on the High Street.

4.12 **Access for the Disabled**. Mr Heather on behalf of DisCASS said that he was not opposed to pedestrian priority schemes where adequate alternatives were in place.(Annex B24) Nor was he against Shopmobility schemes for those who could use them. He was objecting because the Order contravened the Disability Discrimination Act in that people with disabilities were being prevented from vehicular access to the High Street on Saturdays. They were therefore being deprived of the opportunity to shop in a quieter, cleaner more pleasant environment and hence were being discriminated against.

4.13 The Order as prepared gave access to drivers with permits, and to cyclists, and to buses and emergency vehicles, why not disabled drivers as well? This question had been asked many times, not only by representatives of disabled people but by members of the general public. It was not sufficient to say that disabled vehicles detracted from the overall effectiveness of the scheme. No satisfactory answer had been given.

4.14 It was unrealistic to argue that disabled people would be able to circumvent the Order by getting to the High Street earlier on Saturdays. For many disabled an early start was impossible to organise and the 10am deadline would be impracticable.

4.15 A Shopmobility Scheme was of limited use. Not all disabled drivers were able to take advantage of it. Shopmobility to be successful needed wide-open pavements and low sills at all shop doorways. Godalming High Street did not have an abundance of these and a therefore a Shopmobility Scheme was not supported in this case.

4.16 In Mr Heather' view, anyone with an ounce of compassion and moral duty would consider it totally unacceptable that disabled people's rights should be effectively tossed aside and their rights to social inclusion should be rejected.

4.17 The Order should be made having been modified to allow disabled access to the High Street throughout the closure period. The rising bollard system should be scrapped in favour of a manned barrier at these times.

4.18 **Local Trade**. Mr Thorogood, on behalf of The Federation of Small Businesses said that the importance of small businesses to the national economy was underestimated and the needs of small traders were often overlooked. (Annex B27) The compromises made by local authorities in attempts to reconcile the various national policy guidelines, eg PPG 6 (Town Centres) and PPG 13 (Transport) often worked against the interests of small traders and instead tended to favour larger companies.

4.19 There was little in the way of research into the impact on small businesses of pedestrianisation, parking restrictions and other traffic management schemes. He referred however to two FSB reports relevant to this Inquiry. “Barriers to the Growth & Survival in Small UK Firms” and the “South-East Policy Unit Urban Survey” (Annex B28)

4.20 The former established that the majority of the 4,000 small business respondents were dissatisfied with public transport and with the road networks in the south east. The latter showed that of the businesses in the five selected areas responding to a recent telephone survey, over 70% reported new or changing traffic management schemes in their area, and over 80% new or modified parking restrictions. They also reported that their turnover had fallen between 5 and 50%

4.21 The clear message coming out of the responses from members was that local authorities were determined to rid their town centres of the car and that they were not listening to the concerns of the small businesses which were their lifeblood. He considered that traffic management measures damaged small businesses in the long run, and that short term downturns in trading levels, which were known to occur, could be terminal for some of the smaller businesses. Making a town centre more attractive, but less accessible, did not necessarily make small businesses more profitable. He said that the Order should not be made on the grounds that was not in the long-term interests of the small business community of Godalming.

4.22 Mr Toovey said that during the experimental closure of the High Street his two family businesses had lost 13-15% turnover, mainly due to the fact that customers were prevented from collecting their fresh bakery products direct from the shops. A secondary factor was being prevented from delivering fresh bread on Saturday mornings as had been done for 30 years.

4.23 Other objectors referred to the collection and delivery problems inherent

in the pedestrianisation scheme. It was pointed out that the Order inhibited access to the shops inside the affected area, not only for servicing purposes but also for shoppers. Collections and deliveries would be made more difficult and this was bound to be a disincentive to trade. The comment was also made that the Order was unnecessary because most traffic had been removed from the High Street anyway.

4.23 Two residents within the area affected by the Order said that the closure was inconvenient to them. Visitor access would be denied them on Saturday mornings. It was unfair to expect their families and friends to use the nearest pay-and-display car park.

5. CONCLUSIONS.

5.1 On the evidence submitted to me at the inquiry I am satisfied that all aspects of a pedestrian priority scheme for Godalming High Street have been fully explored by your Council prior to the publication of this Order.

5.2 Public consultation appears to have been comprehensive at every stage, and throughout at community, Borough and County levels. The views of all interested parties appear to have been taken into account both collectively and individually. (Paras 3.1-3.7)

5.3 It emerged at the inquiry that the principles of pedestrianisation generally and a pedestrian priority scheme in particular were supported by virtually everybody, certainly everybody with a clear understanding of Godalming's case. Substantive objections referred more to the detail rather than the overall objectives of the Order. I consider therefore that in principle the case for Saturday closure of the High Street has been adequately made. Thus the Order, as currently modified, appears to me to be a reasonable reflection of the wishes of the overwhelming majority of those who will be affected by it. (Para 3.8)

5.4 There remained however some significant minority views. Three in particular were argued in depth at the inquiry and call for more detailed analysis. In the sequence they were discussed, these were as follows:

a. **Two-way Cycling in the High Street.** This proposal I thought was particularly well argued (paras 3.13-3.15 & 4.1-4.11) Although there appeared to be some discrepancies in the various views expressed as to how the current situation had been arrived at, I am satisfied that on this issue also full consultations have taken place. Once again there seemed little argument over the principles at stake. I did not hear your Council challenge or dispute the

substantial body of national and county leaflets, letters &c issued in support of the bicycle as an alternative means of transport and brought forward by the objectors.

5.5 It is because the majority of non-cycling people generally resist cyclists on principle that such proselytising is necessary. To this extent I reject your Council's argument that cyclist's freedom of movement in Godalming High Street was not supported by the majority and therefore should be prevented. Public apprehensions unsupported by facts do not appear to me to be a very good basis for a negative policy towards cyclists.

5.6 Nor, for the reasons given by objectors do I consider that two-way cycling should be prohibited because vehicles cannot pass one another at choke points in the High Street. One might as well argue that there should be no cycling at all.

5.7 Far more persuasive was the suggestion that one-way cycling on weekdays and two-way on Saturdays would be confusing and thus put people, cyclists as well as pedestrians, more at risk. I accept this view, I find that it would be an illogical and probably impracticable arrangement anyway and for these reasons I do not recommend modification of the Order to allow two-way cycling.

5.8 Significantly, these difficulties were also acknowledged by the objectors. Their response was to suggest that the High Street be made two-way for cyclists at all times. Although strictly speaking outside the scope of the inquiry I feel bound to point out that this in principle would appear to be entirely consistent with County and national policy. I venture to recommend therefore that an extended trial be run in order to evaluate it. Such a trial appears overdue anyway.

5.9 **Access for the Disabled.** On this topic also I am satisfied that adequate consultation has taken place with representatives of the disabled. (3.16-3.18) I was nevertheless troubled by the fact that no disabled individuals themselves felt it necessary to give evidence to the inquiry. For example, while accepting that some disabled motorists would find the opportunity to override the pedestrian priority system convenient, I noted that it was implied, but not confirmed first hand, that others might prefer that vehicular traffic be kept to a minimum in the pedestrianised area. In driving all-out for unlimited access I gained the impression that DisCASS was giving the disabled community a somewhat one-sided representation of their many-sided needs. (Paras 4.12-4.14)

5.10 The further argument by DisCASS that not only should the Order be

modified to let disabled badge holders in, but also that the rising bollard system should be scrapped in favour of a manned barrier, seemed to me to weaken rather than strengthen DisCASS's case.(Para 4.15) The argument for a rising bollard system was well-made by your Council, rising bollards work efficiently elsewhere and there appears to be no reason why they should not do so at Godalming. I do not consider on the evidence presented to me that this provision, or indeed any others in the Order contravene the Disability Discrimination Act

5.11 I found the apparent stand-off in regard to a Shop-mobility trial equally unsatisfactory. Whatever the reasons for not giving shop-mobility a go, they certainly did not emerge clearly at the inquiry. The most likely argument appeared to me that disabled people would generally be able to order their lives quite well to avoid Godalming High Street on Saturdays if they so chose, and therefore a Shop-mobility provision would be redundant. I noted however that the opportunity to conduct a trial on this remained open.

5.12 I accept the point made by several witnesses that a pedestrian priority scheme is necessarily a compromise and that a balance has to be struck between conflicting interests. From the point of view of the disabled, and on the evidence submitted to me, I consider that overall, the amenity of a pedestrian priority zone for Saturday shopping should more than outweigh the slight access advantage to be gained by admitting disabled drivers that day as well as on weekdays.

5.13 For these reasons I would not recommend modifications of the Order to overcome DisCASS's objections.

5.14 **Local Trade**. Consultation with local traders and consideration of the commercial implications of pedestrianisation in Godalming seemed to me to have been particularly well covered in the last four or five years. (Paras 3.19-3.22) About half of those responding to local surveys appeared to favour or were neutral to the scheme. Of the remainder, lack of access for shoppers leading to loss of trade appeared to be more generally feared than specific problems of delivery and collection. In no case did I form the view that the inconvenience to traders outweighed the convenience to shoppers resulting from the pedestrianisation scheme.

5.15 The possibility that convenience to shoppers might well influence trading levels appeared to have been overlooked altogether by the Federation of Small Businesses in the evidence submitted to me.(Paras 4.16-4.19)

5.16 Not only had the survey data put forward not been related in any way to the prevailing conditions in Godalming, the data assembled and its interpretation I found only tenuously connected. The linkage claimed between downturn of trade and any local road schemes in the areas surveyed, regardless of their purpose, made little sense to me, particularly if the intention was to discourage roads authorities from doing anything to improve the network. I am inclined to discount the Federations evidence anyway, lacking as it did direct relevance to, or confirmation from, any Godalming traders.

5.17 The evidence of Godalming traders themselves merited more serious consideration. I acknowledge that the smaller trader is the hardest hit when business is bad, and that elsewhere certain pedestrianisation schemes have, in the short term, contributed to a downturn. In this case, however, for the reasons described, I do not consider that such an eventuality is very likely, and even if it were to occur, that its effects would offset the great environmental improvements this Order should bring.

5.18 I have taken into account all other points raised both in written submissions and at the inquiry, but they do not affect my recommendation.

6. RECOMMENDATION.

6.1 I recommend that the Order, amended as proposed by Surrey County Council (copy at Annex B3) be made forthwith.

I remain, Sir
Your obedient servant,

A.K.POTTER.
BA. CEng. FIMarE

1 February 2001

ANNEX A**LIST OF APPEARANCES.**FOR SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

Mr RICHARD HARWOOD Counsel

He called:

Mr Graham HODGSON District Engineer, Waverley
I.Eng FIHIE, MIHT Surrey County Council

Mr I.C.S.LYNCH Corporate Services Manager, Waverley
Borough Council

Ms G.A.MOLONY Planning Officer, Waverley Borough
BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI FRGS IHBC Council

Cllr C.C.SLYFIELD FCA Borough Councillor, Waverley Borough
Council
Godalming Town Councillor

IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER

Mr A.BROWN Chairman, The Godalming Trust

Mr J.SANDY Go Godalming Association

Mrs C.ALLAN 80 George Road, Farncombe

Mr MEEKS Transport Coord, Friends of the Earth
Godalming & Guildford

Miss J.SHEPHERD

OBJECTORS TO THE ORDER.

Miss S.HALL	Godalming Cycle Campaign Group, Cyclists Touring Club
Mr P.HEATHER	DisCASS, Wilfred Noyce Centre Crown Court, Godalming
Mr A.McCALDEN	Godalming Cycle Campaign
Mr D.THOROGOOD	Federation of Small Businesses 3,High Street, Polegate, Sussex
Mr T.BRIGGS	Record Corner, Pound Lane, Godalming
Mr P.TOOVEY	Hillyers Waverley Ltd and obo Mrs G.TOOVEY, 66 High St Godalming
Mr D.DENNINGBERG	145 Ockford Ridge, Godalming
Mrs A.GOWLLAND	4,Cherry Court, Moss Lane, Godalming
Mrs A.WELCH	17, George St. Godalming

ANNEX B**LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND PLANS**

Index No.	Document Description
B1	Attendance Lists for the Inquiry
B2	Copy of draft Order : Surrey County Council Great George Street High Street Moss Lane and Pound Lane Godalming (Prohibition of Traffic) Order 2000
B3	Modified copy of the Order indicating in red proposed deletions or amendments principally in relation to removal of provisions providing for a charge to be made in respect of permits
B4	Plan of Town Centre showing area covered by proposed traffic order and also pedestrian routes to and from car parks
B5	Proof of Evidence of Graham Hodgson with annexes
B6	Proof of Evidence of Iain Lynch
B7	Proof of Evidence of Geraldine Molony
B8	Proof of Evidence of Christopher Slyfield
B9	Copy of Godalming Initiatives Forum Working Party report
B10	Note on High Street widths
B11	Personal Injury Accident figures for Flambard Way
B12	Surrey Police note on enforcement of Traffic regulations
B13	Hodgson/Molony - Data on car park capacity/distribution of car parking perm)
B14	Godalming & District Chamber of Commerce Survey results – Mr D Alexander
B15	Submission from the Go Godalming association
B16	The Godalming Trust – Mr A Brown

B17	Folio of recent letters in support of the Order
B18	Notes of closing submission obo Surrey CC
B19	Proof of Evidence of Miss Sue Hall together with supporting documents re 2-way cycling
B20	Note from Mr R.Seber supporting 2-way cycling
B21	Proof of Evidence by Mr A.McCalden and supporting documents re 2-way cycling
B22	Submission by Friends of the Earth with associated documents
B23	Letters from Mr J Mortimer and Sinead Flavin (10 Jan 2001) & Mrs C.Allan (16 Jan) re 2-way cycling
B24	Summary of Evidence from DisCASS – Mr P.Heather
B25	Letter from Mrs L.Gowlland dated 9 Jan 2001
B26	Folio of recent letters of objection to the Order
B27	FSB Proof of Evidence of Mr D.Thorogood & supporting documentation.
B28	Federation of Small Businesses – extracts from Surveys of March & November 2000
B29	Proof of Evidence of Mr P.Toovey