



**MINOR IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMME  
2008/09**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

**23<sup>rd</sup> APRIL 2008**

**KEY ISSUE**

This report recommends options for the programme of minor schemes for 2008/09.

**SUMMARY**

The report sets out the recommendations made by officers to an informal meeting of the Committee on 12 March 2008. It summarises the discussions which took place, and the revised recommendations put forward by Members.

**Report by**

**Surrey Atlas Ref.**

LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER

N/A

**GUILDFORD B.C. WARD (S)**

**COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION (S)**

ALL

ALL

## OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the officer recommendations set out in paragraph 8, as amended by the Member proposals in paragraph 15, form the basis of the minor schemes programme for 2008/09.
- (ii) that officers be authorised to proceed with any necessary actions including traffic orders, advertisements and notices of intent in order to deliver these projects as soon as 2008/09 budgets are known.

## INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

- 1 At its last formal meeting on 12 February 2008 this Committee considered (Item 11) a report on the proposed minor scheme programme for 2008/09. There were a number of competing projects and the funding available was not formally decided, and the Committee resolved to hold two additional meetings, the first informal and the second an extraordinary formal meeting, to enable these complex issues to be given proper consideration.
- 2 For brevity, wherever possible, this report does not repeat information which was in the 12 February 2008 report. Members may, however, find it useful to read the two reports in conjunction with one another.

## THE FUNDING AVAILABLE

- 3 As this report was in preparation, the exact level of funding available to each Local Committee was not formally agreed. However it is clear that the funding level will be substantially reduced from last year's figure in order to transfer funds to an expanded programme of capital highway maintenance.
- 4 This report is therefore based on the 'Option A' assumption from the 12 February 2008 report, i.e. that that the sum available will be about half of last year's figure (£380,000).

## THE INFORMAL MEETING – OFFICER PROPOSALS

- 5 The informal meeting took place on 12 March. Officers presented that meeting with a suggested strategy which was thoroughly debated. A number of Members made amendments to that. This report is essentially the recommendations of the informal meeting.
- 6 At the informal meeting, officers reminded the Committee of the process normally followed by the Transportation Task Group in sifting and prioritising the programme, including the need to have a strategy led approach, to achieve and balance of feasibility, design and construction activities in any year, and not to start on a scheme, raising expectations and incurring costs, until there is a reasonable chance of finishing it.

- 7 The Committee was provided with a list of all schemes in the programme, fully updated with the latest information on Annual Rates of Return and Benefit / Cost Ratios (the criteria against which schemes are usually judged).
- 8 In the light of this updated information, officers recommended the following programme to the informal meeting:

	<u>£000</u>
Completion of schemes commenced in 2007/08	80
York Road / London Road junction (construction)	220
Safe Routes to School schemes	20
Speed Management	30
New signs and road markings	20
Feasibility and design projects:	80
▪ 7/329 Onslow Village to Station cycle facilities	
▪ 7/339 A247 Send Barns Lane & Send Road ped. & cycle facilities	
▪ 7/348 A31 Hogs Back Puttenham interchange	
▪ 7/330 Artington to Town Centre cycle facilities	
▪ 7/352 East Horsley Village Safety Study	
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>450</u></b>

- 9 Clearly the total estimated cost of these projects (£450,000) would exceed a budget of £380,000. In practice this may not be a problem, as some projects may not survive the feasibility process, and their detailed design may not therefore be incurred. In the event that all the above projects proved feasible, the detailed design of one or more would have to be deferred to a future year.
- 10 The 12 February 2008 report recommended proceeding with three projects:
- 7/337 York Rd j/w London Rd, Guildford - carriageway widening
  - 7/359 Portsmouth Road, Guildford - Pedestrian Crossing
  - 7/345 Aldershot Road, Guildford - Pedestrian facility
- 11 Since then, feasibility reports have been completed on the Portsmouth Road and Aldershot Road schemes. The outcomes of these were discussed at the informal meeting, and are summarised in **ANNEXES A & B** of this report, respectively.
- 12 Each of these schemes presents difficulties, which are set out in the **ANNEXES**. For these reasons, officers proposed at the informal meeting that both schemes should be abandoned.

**THE INFORMAL MEETING – MEMBER PROPOSALS**

- 13 There was considerable discussion of the proposed programme of schemes, in particular the officer recommendations to abandon the Portsmouth Road and Aldershot Road schemes and the need to address problems in Stoughton. Members spoke in favour of a strategy-led approach, particularly where accident reduction was concerned. It was suggested that funding for speed management might be reduced, since the number of speed limit requests has been reducing in recent years. Those Members speaking in favour of individual projects were encouraged to consider contributing to their costs from their Member Revenue Allowances.
- 14 A number of views were expressed in connection with the Stoughton area. There was broad support for action to be taken to address traffic issues in the area, in view of the representations made to the Committee. Some concerns were expressed regarding the need for comprehensive survey of the area, particularly that these would be expensive, and would not actually deliver any immediate benefit to road safety, traffic speeds or residential amenity. There was agreement that while the ‘pan-Stoughton approach’ advocated by the residents was desirable, it was not affordable, particularly in view of the proposed budget reductions. There was agreement that the most significant problem in the area was Grange Road, and that this should be looked at as a priority.
- 15 The informal meeting made the following proposals:
- That scheme 7/330 (Artington to Town Centre cycle facilities – feasibility and design) should be deleted from the programme
  - That a new scheme for Grange Road, Stoughton – feasibility and design, be substituted.
  - That Cllr Pauline Searle will contribute £5000 from her Member Revenue Allowance in order to contribute to the funding of this.
  - That the scheme for a pedestrian crossing of the A323 Aldershot Road be retained in order that electricity supply and common land issues can be fully investigated
  - That Cllr Mike Nevins will contribute £5000 from his Member Revenue Allowance in order to contribute to the funding of this.
  - That the individual budgets for Safe Routes to Schools, speed management and new signs and road markings be combined into a single budget.

**CONSULTATIONS**

- 16 All of the projects referred to in this report will be subject to appropriate individual consultation as they progress.

**FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 17 These are all covered above. Given the uncertainties about the funding available in 2008/09, the rules regarding carrying funds over into the new year, and regarding year-end outturn costs, it may be necessary to bring a further report to the Committee to update the position in due course.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 18 Each scheme referred to in this report has site-specific environmental and economic implications which will be taken into consideration in future reports and as each scheme progresses.

**EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 19 This report has no implications for equality and diversity.

**CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 20 This report has no implications for crime and disorder.

**CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 21 These are covered in the report.

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

- 22 Assuming that the recommendations are agreed, officers will pursue the approved schemes to the extent that budgets permit once those are known.

---

<b>LEAD OFFICER</b>	DEREK LAKE, LOCAL HIGHWAYS MANAGER (GUILDFORD)
<b>TELEPHONE</b>	01483 517501
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	Minor Improvements Programme Review Report, 13 December 2007

---

**A3100 PORTSMOUTH ROAD  
PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY**

**SUMMARY**

- 1 This Annex considers the merits of a proposed pedestrian crossing facility on the A3100 Portsmouth Road, Guildford in the vicinity of St Nicolas' school., following completion of the feasibility study report.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

- 2 Portsmouth Road in the vicinity of the proposed crossing is a two-way single carriageway road with street lighting and subject to a speed limit of 30mph. The vertical alignment to the north of the existing pedestrian refuge is uphill approaching from Guildford, but levels off near the site. The road is also on a shallow left hand bend approaching from Guildford which doesn't straighten until south of Lawn Road.
- 3 Portsmouth Road varies in width from 7.2 metres at the Church to 9.5 metres at the junction of Lawn Road which has a ghosted right turn facility. A one metre wide refuge island is located north of Lawn Road in the ghosted island and provides additional assistance to pedestrians outside school crossing times and acts as a deterrent to overtaking on this stretch of Portsmouth Road.
- 4 Lawn Road lies on the inside of the bend and consequently visibility both to the right and left of Lawn Road is restricted by the road geometry and property boundaries. Currently there is no street furniture on the eastern footways to further compromise visibility for motorists turning out of Lawn Road.
- 5 A School Crossing Patrol (SCP) escorts children across Portsmouth Road between St Nicolas' Infants School and the Guildford United Reformed Church during school arrival and departure times.
- 6 Bus stops with shelters are located on opposite sides of Portsmouth Road just north of the pedestrian refuge. As well as serving local residents, these stops serve a significant business community including Guildford Borough Council Offices. Routes served include the Artington Park and Ride service. The shelter for the southbound stop is set behind the back of footway and is equipped with Surrey Suretime Real Time Passenger Information.
- 7 The northbound bus shelter to Guildford is installed on the footway but sufficient space remains for pedestrians to pass on their way to and from the school. It does however restrict visibility for pedestrians crossing from the School to the Church.

## THE PROPOSAL

- 8 A new controlled pedestrian crossing would provide a safer and convenient alternative to the SCP currently operating between St. Nicolas' Infants School and the Church Car Park, as well as serving an inclusive need including bus patrons at times when the SCP is not present.
- 9 A controlled crossing would need to cater for pedestrians of all ages. Significant numbers would need to be catered for at school times. As a result of this and vehicle approach speeds, it is recommended that the controlled pedestrian crossing should be of the Puffin type. The crossing would be fitted with the standard audible and tactile indicators to assist partially sighted and blind pedestrians.

## OPTIONS FOR LOCATION OF THE CROSSING

- 10 Two possible locations have been considered:

### **The site of the current SCP**

- 11 Locating the controlled crossing at the SCP has the singular advantage that it is well established and close to the Church Car Park. This is used as an unofficial "drop-off and collection" point for school children and is directly opposite the steps to the school and therefore on the desire line.
- 12 However even for the SCP, this location has been shown to have inherent risks. There have been instances of drivers late breaking or failing to stop when requested to do so by the SCP. A crossing sited at this location would carry similar inherent risks, some of which could be addressed by mitigating actions, but not without further local safety and environmental consequences. These risks include:
- Poor southbound forward visibility due to the vertical alignment of Portsmouth Road and supporting wall to steps to St Nicolas' School
  - Turning movements into and out of the access to the Church and private car park
  - Extremely close proximity of the bus stops on Portsmouth Road (the shelter on the west side in particular, creates a permanent obstruction to forward visibility for northbound motorists)
  - Pedestrian crossing equipment on the east side of Portsmouth Road would obstruct line of sight for motorists leaving the Church Car Park
  - Bus stops would need to be relocated outside the limits of the "controlled area" as prescribed in the Regulations and delineated by zig-zag markings. This will have implications for local residents.

### **The existing refuge-island location**

- 13 The location is approximately midway between the Church and the junction of Lawn Road. Despite some disadvantages, a crossing here would overcome many of the problems and issues associated with the SCP site. Those associated with this location are listed below, but through careful design can either be reduced or eliminated or complementary

## **ITEM 7 : ANNEXE A**

mitigating measures. Any residual risk would be minimal and need to be weighed against the advantages afforded by the crossing. Issues include:



- Buses waiting at the bus stops would temporarily obstruct visibility onto the crossing.
- The post van would need to park outside the zig-zag markings when collecting from the “hole in the wall” post-box.
- Street furniture associated with the crossing on the east side of Portsmouth Road would obstruct line of sight of motorists leaving Lawn Road.
- The existing refuge island would need to be removed.
- The visual impact of the crossing on local residences.
- Of great concern is that this location does not lie on the ‘desire line’ where most people wish to cross. It would be difficult to force people to cross at the crossing as guardrail could only be installed on one side of the road. Pedestrians crossing on the approaches to the controlled crossing may result in an increase in accidents, particularly as there are no accidents at present.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

- 14 No consultations have been carried out to date, although the proposal arose from discussions with the Head Teacher, local residents, Members and Anne Milton MP. If the proposal proceeds, appropriate consultation would be carried out.

## **FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 15 The estimated cost of the proposed crossing is £100,000. This figure includes civil engineering costs, supply and installation of traffic signal equipment, the required electrical and BT connections, and relocation of existing street furniture as required. It makes allowance for the costs of design, site supervision, safety audit and advertising. It does not allow for any extensive public consultation, nor does it include for unforeseen contingencies, or the ongoing revenue costs of maintenance.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- 16 Constructing a controlled crossing at the site of the SCP raises many issues related to safety, amenity and the local environment for which there are no easily acceptable solutions or compromises. Road geometry, locations of bus stops and vehicular access in the immediate area of the SCP would compromise the safety of a crossing at this location and require un-economic and unjustifiable mitigating actions. It is strongly recommended that a crossing should not be constructed at this location.
- 17 The site of the existing refuge island also presents a number of difficulties, to which mitigating actions and acceptable compromises are achievable. These would elevate the site to an acceptable safety standard without undue detriment to local amenity or the environment. A crossing so located would serve the combined needs of both the School and the wider community with little loss of amenity for the School. A comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of the two locations overwhelmingly favours the site of the existing refuge island. However the crossing would not be on the desire line for pedestrians, so may not be used by all those

**ITEM 7 : ANNEXE A**

who cross the road in this vicinity, and this may increase the accident rate.

**A323 ALDERSHOT ROAD  
PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY**

**SUMMARY**

- 1 This Annexe considers the merits of a proposed pedestrian crossing facility on the A323 in the vicinity of Fairlands, following completion of the feasibility study report

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

- 2 The A323 Aldershot Road is the main road linking Aldershot with Guildford town centre and the A3 trunk road. The speed limit along this section of the road is 40mph. There is no street lighting along the A323 in this vicinity.
- 3 The road runs to the east of the Fairlands housing estate, which has Worplesdon County Primary School and a Community Centre. Worplesdon County Primary school is located at the southern edge of the Fairlands estate and the community centre is positioned to the north.
- 4 There is a footway that runs along one side (the east side) of the A323 Aldershot Road.
- 5 There are two bus stops on the A323 Aldershot Road. Both stops are located by footpath 458 with the eastern bus stop the only stop in the study area with a shelter.
- 6 There are no pedestrian crossing facilities on the A323 Aldershot Road. Currently pedestrians cross the A323 Aldershot Road at the Hunt's Farm entrance and walk along the private track to footpath 449 to Worplesdon County Primary School.
- 7 Common Land surrounds both sides of the A323 Aldershot Road at the junction with Hunts Farm's access. Exchange land would have to be found to accommodate any footway construction/widening.
- 8 Site observations show the only flow of crossing pedestrians is at the junction to the track leading to Hunt's Farm. This is the favoured route by pedestrians to Worplesdon County Primary School and the Fairlands housing estate.

**SURVEYS**

- 9 12-hour weekday vehicle and pedestrian surveys together with a radar speed survey were undertaken in December 2007. The results show a limited number of pedestrian crossing movements in the area of study. The main movement of pedestrians took place in the vicinity of the Hunt's Farm track.

- 10 The pedestrian survey shows that there is a difference in number of pedestrians crossing between the AM peak and the PM peak, with higher numbers in the morning peak compared with the afternoon peak. This could be due to children being picked up after school in a car rather than walking.
- 11 The speed survey showed 85th percentile speeds of 49mph and mean speeds of 43mph.

### **ACCIDENT HISTORY**

- 12 Analysis of accident data covering the three-year period from November 2004 to November 2007 revealed 3 personal injury accidents (PIAs). None of these involved pedestrians.

### **THE PROPOSAL**

- 13 It is clear from site observations that either an uncontrolled or controlled crossing facility would have some benefit to the Worplesdon Primary School and the local community, and is technically feasible. The introduction of a crossing would not escalate difficulties for traffic at peak times, as there is a low number of pedestrians crossing during peak times. However, the small number of pedestrians suggests that the benefits of this expenditure might be lower than similar projects elsewhere,
- 14 There remain, however a number of issues which would have to be overcome before the project could proceed:
  - Highway Lighting - Local lighting would need to be considered at the crossing location and approaches, street lighting Engineers would need to be approached for advice and costings.
  - Power Supply - A power supply would be needed to run the controlled crossing and street lighting. The only supply in the immediate vicinity is a high voltage supply and a sub-station would need to be implemented to reduce this to low voltage so that the controlled crossing could operate. This would add significantly to the cost.
  - The speed survey indicates 85 percentile and mean speeds over the 40mph speed limit. The feasibility report recommends that consideration be given to speed reduction measures before installing a controlled pedestrian facility.
  - Common land surrounds both sides of the A323 Aldershot Road at the junction with Hunts Farm's access. To construct any form of crossing at this point, footways would need to be constructed and widened. Therefore to carry this scheme forward, exchange land would need to be negotiated.
  - As noted above, the Hunts Farm track used by pedestrians is private. Since the provision of a crossing may intensify its use, the agreement of the owners would need to be sought.

**FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 15 No detailed cost estimate has been carried out pending resolution of the above issues. A controlled crossing would normally cost in the region of £100,000; the cost is likely to be higher in this instance due to the Common Land and power supply issues referred to above.

**CONSULTATIONS**

- 16 No consultations have been carried out to date. There are few residents who might be adversely affected by the scheme, other than the owners of Hunts Farm as noted above. If the proposal proceeds, appropriate consultation would be carried out.

**CONCLUSIONS**

- 6.1 Provision of a pedestrian crossing would improve accessibility for pedestrians within the area of study. The Committee may wish to consider whether the cost is justified by the numbers of pedestrians involved. It is recommended that no further design work be carried out until the issues raised in paragraph 14 have been resolved.