



**Surrey County Council
Local Committee In Epsom & Ewell
12 September 2011**

PETITION 1:

Road Safety outside Cuddington Community School

Received from Ms Sue Collis, 1 Ewell Court Avenue, 75 signatures from parents and staff.

The key concerns are:

- 1 That the traffic calming installed is not having the desired impact.
- 2 That drivers are not acting considerately when pupils attempt to cross at the raised table outside of the school.
- 3 In light of the above that the following should be considered, reduction to 20mph, improved signage, pedestrian fencing, extended zig zag markings or a pedestrian crossing / school crossing patrol.
- 4 If the above are not possible that the removal of the traffic calming feature outside the entrance should be pursued.
- 5 Subsequent to the above the request has been made that a Safety Officer/Highways Officer attend the site to review the situation.

Officer Response:

- 1 Cuddington Community Primary School is located on Salisbury Rd. There is currently a 30mph restriction in place and the road outside the school has been subject to traffic calming. The traffic calming features were not funded from Local Transport Plan allocations but rather developer contributions.

ANALYSIS

- 2 Further to the receipt of the petition Highways Officers have visited the location and can confirm that the traffic calming installed is to the suitable standard, to make the calming more 'severe' would be likely to result in increased damage to vehicles as they would be 'non-standard' features and the County Council would be at risk from insurance claims. To introduce non-standard features would also require special authorisation from Dept for Transport.
- 3 The County Council database, supplied by Surrey Police, of personal injury collisions shows that there have been no personal injury collisions in the past five years within 300m of the school entrance. The nearest personal injury collision in recent history took place in August 2007 (where a vehicle turned out of Cuddington Rd in to Salisbury Rd).
- 4 There is no vehicular flow or speed data available for this location. However, site observations indicate that average speeds are in keeping with what speeds are expected in a 30mph speed limit, indeed given the presence of traffic calming it is felt the speeds are below this.

- 5 It is recognised that the site visit did not take place during term time therefore meaning that the behaviours of both drivers and pedestrians at school times could not be reliably observed. A site meeting will therefore be coordinated between County Council Officers and the School in the new term.

OPTIONS

- 6 An initial view on the requests submitted is below, given limited budgets Officers have to work on the best available information available, particularly casualty information.
 - 7 Given the absence of any collisions at the location Officers would not recommend significant engineering action suggested for the following reasons:
 - 8 The introduction of a 20mph restriction would require appropriate signage and a supporting Traffic Regulation Order. Drivers need to understand why a 20mph restriction is in place at all times and although this may be apparent at school opening/closing time it would, in effect, serve no purpose outside of these hours, which would be likely to result in non-compliance.
 - 9 There are already a number of signs in situ and to add to this could lead drivers to be unable to absorb all the information they are being expected to take in. Consideration could be made to installing school wig wag lights on the approaches to make drivers more aware of the potential pedestrian/vehicle conflict ahead, such measures are though most appropriate where there is a high proportion of non-local traffic.
 - 10 Installing pedestrian railings to discourage crossing at the location would be likely to channel pedestrians to more inappropriate locations to cross. It is considered that such usage of this type of feature should be used sparingly where there is ongoing pedestrian/vehicle conflict consistently throughout the day.
 - 11 The cost of a signalised crossing would be high and hard to justify given the absence of collisions. A signalised crossing is likely to cost upwards of £60,000 and would account for much of the Local Committee funding allocation. A Zebra crossing would not be recommended for similar reasons to the speed limit in that in order for it to be recognised by drivers it needs regular usage.
 - 12 The removal of the crossing point should be seen as a last resort and would not be recommended given it is to the appropriate design standard.
 - 13 As discussed in 5 it is proposed that a site visit, (involving key stakeholders such as Highways, Road Safety, Police, Local Member and a representative of the School) should occur in term-time to understand driver and pedestrian behaviour better, it should though be noted that education measures may be more appropriate in this instance than physical intervention.
 - 14 The Committee is asked to note this response with any issues arising from the site visit being discussed with the Local Member in the first instance prior to being taken forward.
-

PETITION 2

Auriol Junior School – request for pedestrian crossing

Received from Miss Louise Taylor, 479 signatures from staff and parents at Auriol Junior School.

The Head at Auriol has offered to contribute to Surrey County Council towards a new lollipop person to make a safer crossing for our children.

Surrey County Council has ceased to reinstate a new lollipop person due to financial cost. Would you agree a pedestrian crossing would be safer for our children, the elderly and the disabled? Pedestrian crossing would be permanent solution for those who also attend after-school clubs, evening and weekend activities

Officer Response:

- 1 In March of this year, the Cabinet agreed that all existing school crossing patrols should continue to be funded and supported by the county council's Safer, Smarter Travel team. The Cabinet also agreed that whenever a school crossing patrol position becomes vacant at a site that has been rated as low risk, a review would be undertaken to check whether the school crossing patrol was still needed.
- 2 Other local factors in the scope of the review includes consideration of:
 - The trip hazards
 - Visibility
 - Speed of traffic
 - Volume of traffic
 - Traffic manoeuvres
 - Parking
 - Condition of highway
 - User behaviour
 - Environmental and seasonal variations
- 3 The Cabinet agreed that, as part of each review, the school and the local county councillor should be consulted to ensure that local views are taken into account in determining whether a new patrol needs to be recruited.
- 4 The entrance to the school is in Vale Road which has a 20mph speed limit and 3 road tables in place to achieve compliance with the restriction. The road width is insufficient to allow a pedestrian refuge island to be installed anywhere along its length and a traffic signal controlled crossing would be very expensive and unjustifiable given the other traffic calming measures already in place and the lack of collisions in close proximity. Highways officers have visited the location on numerous occasions and identified the main issue in the location being one of inconsiderate parking as opposed to excessive speed or dangerous driving.
- 5 In addition the County Council has now carried out a risk assessment, including a review of existing traffic calming measures. Due to the site being rated as low risk and the patrol becoming vacant, representatives of the school and the local member will be invited to a meeting on site in the new academic year to review the results of the risk assessment and discuss local concerns, before a recommended way forward is agreed.

Annexe B

- 6 Officers are also investigating whether it would be possible for the school to fund the salary of a school crossing patrol and for the county council to provide training, uniform and insurance.
- 7 The Committee is asked to note the response.