

**MINUTES:** of the meeting of the Mole Valley Local Committee held at 14.00 on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> June 2007 in the Council Chamber, Pippbrook, Dorking

**Members Present - Surrey County Council**

Timothy Ashton, Chairman  
Tim Hall, Vice Chairman  
Helyn Clack  
Stephen Cooksey  
Hazel Watson

**Members Present - Mole Valley District Council**

Valerie Homewood  
Ann Howarth  
David Howell\*  
Chris Hunt  
Jean Pearson  
David Sharland

\* denotes substitution

[All references to Items refer to the Agenda for the meeting]

**PART ONE - IN PUBLIC**

- 21/07 **ANNOUNCEMENT OF ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN**  
[Item 1]  
The Area Director introduced Mr. Timothy Ashton who had been nominated as Chairman of the Mole Valley Local Committee for the municipal year 2007/08
- 22/07 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS** [Item 2]  
  
Apologies were received from Jim Smith.  
  
Councillor J. Northcott was present as a temporary substitute for Councillor D. Howell
- 23/07 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** [Item 3]  
Hazel Watson declared a personal interest in agenda item 11 – Local Committee Funding – Proposals for Expenditure, by virtue of being the Chairman of the youth project, Projx and on the Boxhill Steering Group.  
  
Councillor C. Hunt declared a personal interest in agenda item 14 – City of Freeman’s School, by virtue of being a governor at the school.
- 24/07 **MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING** [Item 4]  
An amended set of minutes was circulated to all Members and officers highlighted the two-typo changes.

The minutes, along with the amendments were agreed and signed as a correct record of the meeting, which took place on the 21 March 2007.

Councillor D. Sharland requested an update on Epsom Road, Leatherhead and informed the Committee that subsequent to discussions with Officers concerning the Leatherhead waiting restrictions review the Committee's previous resolve on the 21 March 2007 be amended following these discussions.

Councillor Sharland proposed that the central white lines be refreshed in their current position without the previously agreed 'slight off-set' to acknowledge the current on street parking, and that 'No waiting' cones be trailed in advance of any permanent yellow lines.

The Local Highways Manager was comfortable with the proposal put by Councillor Sharland and agreed to consider the use of 'No waiting' cones on Epsom Road.

### **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed to amend its 21<sup>st</sup> March 2007 resolution, minute 10/07 accordingly to refresh the central white lines in their current position without the 'slightly off-set'.

Councillor D. Sharland requested an update on Fortyfoot Road, Fetcham.

The Vice-Chairman informed the committee that discussions had taken place with the school and the school was preparing to hold a residents meeting in the near future.

#### **25/07 PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS [Item 5A]**

One public written questions was received. The question and answer is set out in annex A to the minutes.

#### **26/07 MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 5B]**

Twelve Member questions were received. The questions and answers are set out in annex b to the minutes.

At the Chairman's agreement Mrs. Helyn Clack submitted a late Member question;

#### **Povey Cross Road**

Residents petitioned the Local Committee in March 2006, to take action to prevent all day/night vehicle parking in Povey Cross Road, particularly that associated with off-airport parking and vehicle movements in the early hours that disturb their sleep. Whilst the Committee in March 2006 supported Trading Standards in their attempts to prevent misrepresentation of firms offering secure parking whilst using Povey Cross Road, which did result in some success, the bulk of the all day/night parking remains.

Mrs. Clack therefore, asked that Officers be tasked with developing viable waiting restrictions in Povey Cross Road to overcome the issues raised by residents; She also asked the Committee to support this exceptional and special request for a one-off waiting restriction because of the history

associated with the site.

The Local Highways Manager responded that consideration could be given to developing a viable waiting restriction on Povey Cross Road, subject to the Committee agreeing this should be pursued.

## **REVOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed to support Mrs. Clack's recommendation to task Officers in finding viable waiting restrictions in Povey Cross Road and report the results back to this Committee.

### **27/07 PUBLIC OPEN QUESTION SESSION [Item 5C]**

Two public questions were received on Pump Corner:

Nigel Wright, President of the Dorking Chamber of Commerce asked considering the adverse impact the alternations at Pump Corner, Dorking by introducing the traffic signals had had, namely resulting in significant congestion. He asked who had been consulted about the proposal before their introduction.

Sir Martin Wedgwood, president of Dorking & District Preservation Society, asked Officers to comment on the colours used for the carriageway and whether they were appropriate in the Town Centre, concluding that the Dorking Town Centre Forum also considered them unattractive.

The Highways Group Manager (East) responded to both questions explaining that the proposal formed part of a package of measures developed from a comprehensive review of Dorking Town Centre. Consultation on the final package of measures was concluded before Officers presented their final report to the Committee for its consideration at their meeting on 25 February 2005. The Highways Group Manager (East) acknowledged Mr. Wright's concerns about the impact of the scheme on the network, indicating adjustments to smooth vehicle flow, whilst maintaining pedestrians ability to cross the road, were taking place and a post installation assessment would be undertaken to evaluate actual performance against predictive. The results would be brought reported back to a future committee meeting. With respect to colour, nationally cycle facilities are now green and Surrey's high friction surfacing, at signal installations are beige.

### **28/07 PETITIONS [Item 6]**

Two petitions were received.

#### **A) Glebe Road**

Mr. Richard Jeal presented a petition regarding parking congestion in Glebe Road, Dorking. Mr. Jeal argued that vehicles frequently park on both sides of the road, severely restricting the amount of space for traffic to pass, particularly emergency response vehicles, he highlighted that as a retirement complex is situated on the road this particularly important. Mr Jeal understood that a controlled parking zone was under review in Dorking and requested that Glebe Road be included in the assessment.

The Chairman thanked the Mr. Jeal for presenting the petition and informed the petitioner that unusually the Committee was able to agree that the Local

Highways Manager include Glebe Road, Dorking in the Controlled Parking Zone Review currently underway.

**B) B2127, Forest Green**

Mrs. May presented a petition asking for speeding restrictions on B2127, which runs through Forest Green. Mrs. May informed the Committee that 75 responses from residents were in agreement that a 40mph speed restriction was needed on the road as well as signs stating this. Residents believed that this would improve safety and retain village life.

The Chairman thanked the Mrs. May for presenting the petition and informed the petitioner that a report had been prepared as agenda item 16. The Local Committee in advance of agenda item 16 noted the petition.

29/07 **RESPONSE TO PETITION – ANSELL ROAD, HART GARDENS, HEAT ROAD, JUBILEE TERRACE, ROTHES ROAD AND WATHEN ROAD, DORKING [Item 7]**

The Local Highways Manager presented a report in response to a petition received in March. He informed the Committee that the residents were concerned about non-residential on-street parking and extraneous traffic flows in the named roads for some time, which was demonstrated by the support shown locally to their consultation and to the petition.

It was confirmed that the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Dorking, which the Committee agreed to progress at its meeting on 21 March 2007, should seek to address many of the on-street parking issues within the named roads and it would probably be appropriate in conjunction with the introduction of the CPZ proposals to consider a scheme of traffic management that would influence vehicle movements in the same roads.

**RESOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed that a suitable traffic management proposal was developed in tandem with the CPZ proposals for Dorking within Ansell Road, Hart Gardens, Hart Road, Jubilee Terrace, Rothes Road and Wathen Road, Dorking.

30/07 **RESPONSE TO PETITION – KINGSCROFT ROAD [Item 8]**

The Local Highways Manager presented a report in response to a petition received in March. He informed the committee that the residents are concerned about non-residential on-street parking and extraneous traffic flows in the cul-de-sac, which they believe will increase with the development of the school site and the inclusion of a new pedestrian access into Kingscroft Road.

The Local Highways Manger updated the committee that the representations received had been passed to Surrey County Council's Planning Department where they were included in the representations brought before the Planning and Regulatory Committee. At this meeting the planning application for the Trinity School site was deferred, being referred back to the Services for Families directorate for further considerations around the issues about parking and access.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed in response to Surrey County Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee to note the report.

### **31/07 COMMUNITY PLANNING AND LSP UPDATE [Item 9]**

The Area Director for Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council's Head of Community Services presented a report on the progress of the Community Plan. The Local Committee was reminded that the Mole Valley Community Plan is a ten-year plan, delivered through an action plan, which is refreshed annually. Members were given a power point presentation around the flagship projects and the Area Director explained that each project was progressing at different rates however all projects were on course.

The Local Committee was informed that the central role and importance of the LSP had been endorsed and strengthened in The Government White Paper on Sustainable Communities 2006. In line with the white paper an annual review of the 2006/07 action plan was due to take place in July at an event facilitated by Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council.

The Local Committee was also asked to nominate a representative for the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership.

## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee resolved;

- (i) to note the report; and
- (ii) that the Local Committee Chairman represent the County Council on the Mole Valley Local Strategic Partnership.

### **32/07 COMMUNITY SAFETY IN MOLE VALLEY [Item 10]**

The Community Safety Officer for the Crime and Disorder Partnership in Mole Valley (CDRP) presented a report on the 2006/07 achievements. Partners from the CDRP were also present and updated Members on key successes and issues.

Members were reminded that the Local Committee has a role in influencing and contributing to the community safety strategy for Mole Valley and the Police and Justice Act 2006 would see the process of developing these strategies change.

The Area Director informed the Local Committee that they have devolved power for the community safety funding allocated to the crime and disorder partnership. This budget was to be spent in accordance with the community safety strategy. It was advised that day-to-day responsibility for the budget be delegated to the Area Director in line with other Local Committees.

Members congratulated the representatives present for their hard work and commitment to community safety.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Committee agreed:

- (i) to note the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership in Mole Valley; and
- (ii) to consider how the Local Committee and County Council services can support the work of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership; and
- (iii) to note the distribution of Surrey County Council community safety funding allocated to the Crime and Disorder Partnership in 2006/07; and
- (i) to agree that the Area Director, in consultation with the Local Committee Chairman, agree the allocation of Surrey County Council community safety funding allocated to the Crime and Disorder Partnership, in accordance with the community safety strategy priorities.

**33/07 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING – PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE**  
[Item 11]

Members were informed that Mrs. Hazel Watson had requested that her bid for the Vehicle Activated Sign in Abinger be removed and the committee agree to accept the bid for St Michael's Community Nursery, which was tabled on the day.

**RESOLVED**

The Local Committee resolved;

- (i) to approve the two capital proposals totalling £3,500; and
- (ii) to approve one revenue proposal totalling £2,000; and
- (iii) to note the approval of three proposals which fall below the £1,000 threshold totalling £1,783

**34/07 EAST SURREY HIGHWAYS LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2007/08**  
[Item 12]

The Committee was asked to consider its 2007/08 programme of Integrated Transport capital schemes, based on a priority scoring system that meet the objectives of Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Maintenance - **CASEM**).

The Local Highways Manager introduced the report indicating that the Committee's 2007/08 programme as detailed in Annex A to the report, had been the focus of a Member seminar in March and remained largely unchanged but with the benefit of a 6% uplift in finance. Therefore, it now included an additional proposal to be considered later on the agenda.

**RESOLVED**

That the Committee agreed:

- (i) that the programme of Local Transport Plan funded integrated

transport schemes for Mole Valley for progression in 2007/08 as set out in Annex A to the report be endorsed; and

- (ii) the application of Local Allocation for highway schemes for Mole Valley for progression in 2007/08 as set out in Annex A to the report be agreed; and
- (iii) that authority be delegated to the Highways Group Manager (East), in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and local County Member to advertise any necessary traffic regulation order(s), to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the associated order(s) to deliver the schemes in (i) and (ii) above; and
- (iv) that the Highways Group Manager (East) be authorised to determine any objections received in response to statutory notices in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local County Member; and
- (v) that authority be delegated to the Highways Group Manager (East), in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman in relation to any amendments to the 2007/08 scheme list, as a result of changes in available funding following the closing of the 2006/07 accounts.

#### 35/07 **ANNUAL MAINTENANCE EAST SURREY HIGHWAYS 2007/08**

[Item 13]

The Local Committee was provided with the 3<sup>rd</sup> version of the East Area Maintenance Delivery Plan 2007/2008.

The Highways Group Manger (East) presented the report detailing the outcome for the financial year 2006/2007 Highway Management Plan.

Members were informed that the report and tabled delivery plan also set out the new maintenance programme for the financial year 2007/08.

Members thanked Officers for their work and discussed the allocation of the £100,000 revenue. The Vice Chairman suggested that the monies be spent on removal of the signs, which were 'cluttering up' the roads and required maintenance within Leatherhead High Street. While other Committee Members supported the removal some signs Members felt other problematic areas such as drainage and potholes also need to be investigated. The Chairman asked Members, in light of the fact a decision could not be reached, to supply their list of expenditure where they would see the £100,00 spent to him and Highways Officers. It was agreed that the Committee would support the Officers recommendations.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Committee agreed:

- (i) to approve the report of the East Area Maintenance and Delivery Plan for 2007/08 of which includes Mole Valley; and
- (ii) to note the anticipated outturn figures for the East Area Maintenance and Delivery Plan for 2006/2007; and

- (iii) to delegate the authority for authorising expenditure of the £100,000 revenue monies to the Highways Group Manager (East) in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee.

**36/07 CITY OF LONDON FREEMAN'S SCHOOL [Item 14]**

The Local Highway Manager informed the Local Committee that Mole Valley District Council and the City of London Freeman's School notified the Local Highways Office of vehicle damage to the school's stone entrance piers on Rookery Hill at its junction with Farm Lane.

Members were informed that whilst considering suitable preventative measures to limit future pier damage the proposed development would also address the limited driver sight line difficulties from Rookery Hill and Pleasure Pit Road, influence vehicle speed along Farm Lane and enable the conservation gate of East Lodge to be re-hung. Therefore Members were asked to support the implementation of a mini-roundabout

**RESOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed that the proposal to provide a mini-roundabout on Farm Lane at its junction with Rookery Hill and Pleasure Pit Road, is progressed and implemented as shown on Drawing 2011/001 attached to this report.

**37/07 HIGH STREET, LEATHERHEAD [Item 15]**

The Local Highways Manager presented a report to consider the outcome of a review of the new waiting restrictions (8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday) within High Street and part of Church Street, Leatherhead, following their introduction six months ago.

Members were updated that the Local Office, in association with, Mole Valley District Council, Leatherhead and District Chamber of Commerce, and Leatherhead Tomorrow, undertook the review. Town Centre business and user groups were consulted to assess the success of the new waiting restriction introduced in September 2006 to the High Street and part of Church Street, Leatherhead.

The review demonstrated that on balance the new waiting restrictions had achieved its objectives to improve highway safety and reduce obstruction within the High Street and Church Street without alienating town centre businesses and with the support of town centre users.

The review also highlighted that consideration be given to adjust the restrictions finish time, for example, 6.00 p.m. rather than 6.30 p.m., that there is difficulty in obtaining a consensus about providing suitable spaces within High Street (when permitted) and identified issues with Framer Markets, vehicle movement and speeds near Abby corner and evening/overnight parking.

Members welcomed the restrictions however it was agreed that the 20mph speed limit should be reduced further to 10 mph to ensure pedestrian safety. Therefore it was;



## **RESOLVED**

The Local Committee agreed;

- (i) to note that the new waiting restriction introduced in High Street and Church Street, Leatherhead on 1 September 2006, is successful, it has the acceptance of High Street users, is generally supported by traders, has improved highway safety at this location by reducing obstruction and conflict and is on-balance contributing towards an improved town centre environment; and
- (ii) to note that as part of the Leatherhead waiting restriction review consideration will be given to adjust the waiting restriction finish time from 18.30 to 18.00; and
- (iii) that Officers progress a 10 mph speed limit for High Street and Church Street, Leatherhead (lengths as defined in the waiting restriction Order); and
- (iv) that authority be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order associated with the above speed limit variation.

### **38/07 SPEED LIMITS REQUESTS [Item 16]**

The Local Highways Manager informed the Local Committee that the Local Office had received a number of requests for speed limit assessments throughout the year. These are processed as resources allow and the report presented the results for various locations within the local area.

Members were reminded that speed surveys had been carried out and an assessment of each site had been made against the County Council's speed limit policy. It was recommended that the Committee agree to certain speed limits being progressed for formal statutory consultation and the funding being from the capital budgets.

In addition the Local Highways Manager asked the Committee to include consideration of speed limit adjustment on A25 east of Dorking in association with the renewal of safety crash barriers.

## **RESOLVED**

The Committee agreed;

- i. that approval be given to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order for installing a 40mph speed limit on the section of the B2127 / B2126 Ockley Road, Forest Green between a point 150 meters west of the western boundary of 'Quavers' and a point 60 meters east of the eastern boundary of 'Collins Farm'; and
- ii. that approval be given to advertise the necessary Traffic

Regulation Order for installing a 60mph speed limit on the section of the A24 London Road, Mickleham to Dorking between the existing 50mph and 40mph limits; and

- iii. that approval be given to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order for installing a 40mph speed limit on the current national speed limit section of the B2209 Old London Road, Mickleham; and
- iv. that approval be given to advertise the necessary Traffic Regulation Order for installing an extension to the existing 40mph speed limit on the section of the A25 Reigate Road, Dorking from its current terminal point East of The Watermill public house to Deepdene Bridge.
- v. that authority be delegated to the Local Highways Manager in consultation with the Chairman and local County and District Members to consider any objections received and subject to those objections make the Order(s) associated with the above speed limit variations; and

**39/07 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) [Item 17]**

The Local Highways Manger gave an oral update to the committee on the appointment of a consultant to do the work having got PRG approval.

**40/07 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN SCHEME OF PROGRESS [Item 18]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

**41/07 FORWARD PROGRAMME [Item 19]**

**RESOLVED**

That the Local Committee noted the report.

[Meeting ended: 17.15]

Chairman

## **Annex A      Public Written Questions**

The following question was submitted in accordance with Standing Order 65.

### **Question submitted by:**

**Steven Cobby, Chairman  
Dorking Business Breakfast Group**

The recent alterations to traffic lights at Pump Corner, Dorking has had a hugely detrimental effect on traffic flow to and through Dorking, with the result that the town is becoming better known for traffic congestion and a delay hotspot rather than a desirable town to shop or trade from.

Our members report delays in getting deliveries to and from their premises, and clients and suppliers reporting delays of up to 45 minutes for their journey as a result of these traffic 'improvements'.

It really seems that the whole scheme was poorly designed, implemented at huge cost to residents and local business, but has produced a detrimental result, rather similar to the Pixham Lane debacle.

We need traffic improvements that **aid** traffic flow to and through the town rather than hinder it.

Isn't it time to recognise that this scheme is yet another very costly failure and to revert to the system which was actually working pretty well? Isn't it time also to start asking why these expensive schemes around Dorking are so regularly flawed?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The pump Corner scheme progressed through normal operational channels before being presented and accepted by the Local Committee as a viable proposal that should be implemented.

Officers' are aware of the immediate impact on vehicle movements particularly along West Street. Adjustments are continuing to be made to the signal timings to achieve a balance between pedestrians and vehicle movements.

An as-built survey of journey times and delays will also be undertaken to compare the before and after situations.

## **Annex B Member Written Questions**

The following twelve questions were submitted in accordance with Standing Order 46.

### **Questions from Tim Hall, County Councillor for Leatherhead and Fetcham East**

#### **Pump Corner**

Last week a County Council Spokesman was quoted in the local media as saying "that the Pump Corner scheme was agreed in consultation with local members." Could we be told which named Local Members were consulted and when?

#### **Response from Highways Group Manager (East)**

**It might be of help to give Cllr Hall a more robust answer than just providing a list of names. The Pump Corner scheme came out of a Paramics Model produced in 2002. The extent of the model was the whole of the major town area of Dorking, it stretched from North Holmwood Roundabout in the south, Vincent Lane to the west and Denbies roundabout in the north with Pixham Lane being the eastern boundary. The rationale behind the model was to ascertain:**

1. Total traffic volumes
2. Traffic journeys which passed through the town
3. Traffic journeys finished in the town
4. Traffic journeys which started and finished in the town
5. The volume of single occupancy vehicles
6. Pressure points within the model area
7. Possible schemes to mitigate the pressure points.

The first committee paper was 26 May 2004 and a series of others followed. The Local Committee formed a steering group chaired by the then Chairmen Cllr David Gollin and consisted of a number of Dorking based members from both the County and the District Council. The membership included from the County side Cllrs Watson and Timms. From the District side it included Cllrs Mrs Cooksey, Tatham and Masters. The outcome of working group was unanimous and all of its views were adopted by this committee. During this process there was engagement with the officers of Mole Valley District Council, the local trade groups for the area.

A number of proposals were looked at with many being deleted due to any lack of realistic funding streams. The core outcomes of the work was:

1. Dene Street to be one way north bound;
2. Improved pedestrian links to the railway station via Old London Road;
3. Improved pedestrian links at A25 / Old London Road;
4. Staged improvement to Pump Corner;
5. Lastly soft measures to tackle congestion through the Dorking Decongestion Work.

With specific reference to pump Corner the following is worth noting:

1. Originally the junction was drawn to a complete stoppage every time the pelican lights came into force, in association with this was confusion over rights of way when leaving West Street and entering South St. The street clutter was also extensive due to the number of pedestrian barriers;
2. The first phase was to keep the pelican in place and operating as normal but altering the priority between West St, South St and A25. Members will recall this first phase caused some dismay with some members of the community as change always does. Once the scheme had settled down it was proven that the pre and post queuing of traffic was less, contrary to the perception of some.
3. This committee had agreed the second phase when the first phase was being introduced and should therefore not come as a surprise to members who have been on the committee for five years. The second phase gives greater opportunity for pedestrians to cross the three roads, which was an original concern and reduces road clutter with a pedestrian free centre refuge. The timing of the lights will be reviewed, as will the queue lengths once the initial furore has died down.

It is a fact that the economic prosperity of many towns is fragile due to other towns being more fashionable with parking and market choice being a factor. The notion that Dorking is going through a down turn economically due to Pump Corner is without any basis and this same argument was being made to highway officers when the changes to Vincent Lane was made which removed the roundabout and installed the existing traffic lights.

### **Questions from Hazel Watson, County Councillor for Dorking Hills**

#### **Dorking Town Centre**

When will the Dorking waiting restrictions, previously agreed by the Local Committee, be implemented?

#### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The advertisement of new waiting restrictions in Dorking last year resulted in a large number of objections. These were reviewed by local Members and changes to the proposals approved by the Local Committee; part of the proposals now include new restrictions around Rosehill.

**It is planned to advertise the new restrictions in Rosehill and at the same time make the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to implement other restrictions that form part of these proposals in August. It is then planned to implement the new restrictions during the autumn, including Rosehill if possible depending on objections received.**

**The County Council has a single traffic orders team for processing TRO's they have been particularly busy during the previous 3 months completing the implementation of DPE in Waverley and preparing numerous temporary TRO's for the summer maintenance programmes, etc.**

#### **Boxhill Road**

In view of the poor condition of Boxhill Road, when will the road be completely resurfaced?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Boxhill Road is on the rolling programme for surface dressing treatment with additional work to deal with 'shape' issues; at present the scheme is programmed for 2008. It should be noted that all schemes are reviewed annually to reassess their relative priorities within the rolling programme.

### **Questions from Stephan Cooksey, County Councillor for Dorking and the Holmwoods**

#### **Lower Punchbowl Lane**

'At the meeting on 21 March 2007 in response to question on Lower Punchbowl Lane, Dorking, the Local Transportation Manager responded as follows:

"With respect to encroachment of trees, the County Council's arboriculturist is aware of the prevailing conditions and will take action as appropriate; notwithstanding the encroachment of material over the highway its removal, at the foot of the embankment, could generate an instability of the adjoining land. Removal of this material will not be immediate and discussions with the adjoining landowner will be required to agree safe disposal and recovery of the public highway.'

Would the Local Transportation Manger please indicate what progress has been made on resolving these problems in the three months since this response was given.'

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

**Fluctuations in personnel over the intervening period between the two Local Committees, coupled with a heavy work load has delayed any progress in seeking to resolve the issues identified within Punchbowl Lane. However, this will be rectified and I will ensure Councillor Cocksey is kept informed.**

#### **Howard Road, Dorking**

I was approached yesterday by a resident in Howard Road, Dorking, which is in my Division, with an issue to be raised at the meeting on Wednesday. She wrote

'It is with concern that I am asking the Council to recognise the position of the residents of Howard Road regarding through traffic. The road appears to be a shortcut / convenient route for many types of vehicles, some going to the industrial estate in Vincent Lane. Also, twice a day, whether this is to avoid the congestion in Vincent Lane, cars can literally charge down the road. I appreciate all vehicles pay road tax and have the right to use the public highway but by doing so they do not have the right to damage other people's vehicles, which has frequently happened. The road is narrow. The residents park on the paths because if we didn't we would lose even more wing mirrors. This, of course, makes it difficult for pedestrians. I am sure this is a problem not only for Howard Road but I would be grateful if thought could be given to deny access to vans and lorries who are not delivering to the road and are only using it as a shortcut.

This is being presented on behalf of a number of residents of Howard Road and I would be grateful if the Highways Office would consider how help can be given to resolve this situation.

#### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

**Residents from Howard Road have made similar representations to the local office about through traffic using Howard Road following the completion of other works in the town centre. The development of a viable solution to limit through movements whilst retaining access and deliveries, etc. will require a feasibility study to consider the implications of such a proposal. However, further work associated with another the town centre project may ameliorate conditions in Howard Road. The request will be added to our feasibility request list.**

#### **Questions from Cllr John Northcott (sub for Cllr David Howell), District Councillor for Ashted Common**

##### **Temporary Prohibition of Traffic Order**

“A notice of the intention to grant a Temporary Prohibition of Traffic Order (TPTO) at Woodfield Lane (D2613) [Ashted level Crossing] for **18 Months** appeared in The Leatherhead Advertiser on 10th May. This was of considerable concern to 1500 of my constituents for whom the crossing is their sole vehicular access

In last week’s issue (June 14<sup>th</sup>) there were eight notices of TPTOs, of which five were for 18 months and three for three months.

As a TPTO sets aside the citizen’s basic right to travel without let or hindrance on the public highway, what is the rationale between these different lengths of orders? And if a policy decision has been taken to increase the length of time granted to longer than has been estimated for the works to be undertaken (plus a reasonable allowance for slippage), could this be urgently reconsidered?

#### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders facilitate a number of different operations on the Public Highway, be they the County Council’s own works programme, Statutory Undertakers and or other third parties. Officers’ consider the impact from such temporary closures and endeavour to advertise only what is required to facilitate the works. However, an unexpected fluctuation in work programmes often alters the anticipated start and finish dates, therefore, flexibility is required within the advertised temporary orders to cater for these alterations.

##### **Broadhurst, Culverhay and Overdale, Ashted**

“At the meeting of this Committee held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2006 it was resolved that

‘the proposed Peak Hour Waiting Restrictions in Broadhurst, Culverhay and Overdale, Ashted be installed on site as originally published and that the Order be made’

When can we expect to see this decision implemented?"

#### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

I am aware that the proposed Peak Hour Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the named roads is outstanding, The County Council has a single traffic orders team for processing Traffic Regulation Order's (TRO) they have been particularly busy during the previous 3 months completing the implementation of DPE in Waverley and preparing numerous temporary TRO's for the summer maintenance programmes, etc. The TRO will be made and implemented before October 2007.

#### **Questions from Cllr Chris Hunt, District Councillor for Ashted Village**

##### **Grass Cutting**

The recent grass cutting in Ashted (where it has occurred) has been of a very poor quality; the cut is very uneven with numerous misses and the 'finished appearance' looks a mess. Examples of this include Bramley Way and Newton Wood Road. Can the committee be advised as to whether there is a standard for the quality of a cut, who checks the quality and how the County knows whether a road has had its grass cut at all. In addition, from my experience of the service offered by another contractor - Burleys - for the parks on behalf of the District Council, could the County Council consider using a contractor of their quality in the future for its grass verges?

#### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Urban grass verges are cut for highway safety reasons and the County Council aim to keep the grass shorter than to an appropriate length. However, financial resources do drive the number of cuts. The work is carried out under the County Council's Partnership Contract with Carillion.

Under this arrangement supervision is carried out by the constructor, who is also responsible for the quality of the work within the bounds of the standards required and the number of cuts that have been allowed for within the budget.

Sample audits are undertaken (on all works) to verify that information being provided for key performance indicators is correct.

##### **Barnett Wood Lane**

What appraisals did the designer of the new speed hump in Barnett Wood Lane near Harriotts Lane undertake, given that we have been previously advised that the speed hump was built as designed, but noting that it has, thankfully, now been re-profiled? If the original design was correct, why was it necessary to rebuild it?



### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The as-built dimensional accuracy of the speed table in Barnet Wood Lane near Harriotts Lane was assessed for compliance with the design drawings by measurement of its height, width, gradients, etc.

However, further work was commissioned after a closer inspection of the vertical alignment of the existing carriageway adjacent to the speed table. The carriageway's vertical alignment was adjusted to compliment the speed table.

### **Accident Records**

What weight does the County Highways department place on a road having the worst accident record on a road mentioned in a committee report which deals with speed and accident records?

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

I believe the question is related to the evaluation and determination of speed limits, Agenda Item 16. The collision record along a stretch of road is a consideration in the evaluation process together with for example road alignment, speed of most motorists and type of road. The weight apportioned to collisions in these assessments varies dependant the urban or rural nature of the assessment.

However, guidance on the determination of speed limits only seeks to influence vehicle speed, whilst the resolution of issues associated with collisions cluster sites usually requires other more intensive engineering measures targeted at the specific issues.

### **20MPH**

Is it a legal requirement that 20mph zones can only be introduced where the speed is effectively already at that or very close to that level? Can we please be advised of examples of any other criteria has been adopted by other highway authorities who have introduced 20mph zones.

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

The Regulations make it possible for two different means of implementing 20mph speed limits: a) use of speed limits, indicated by terminal and repeater signs alone; and b) a zonal approach using terminal signs together with suitable traffic calming measures to provide a self enforcing element.

A major consideration in the assessment of a 20mph proposal is whether the chosen scheme requires unreasonable levels of enforcement by the Police; lowering a speed limit alone may not be effective at reducing actual speeds.

Hence, the guidance and advice provided by the Department of Transport (DfT) states "20mph speed limits by signs alone would be most appropriate where 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are already low and further traffic calming measures are not needed. 20mph zones should be used where excessive speeds occur, and where traffic calming measures would be needed to ensure speeds are at or below 20mph."

I believe most highways authorities approach to implementing 20mph speed limits will reflect the guidance given by the DfT.

### **Questions from Cllr Jean Pearson, District Councillor for Capel, Leigh and Newdigate**

Newdigate Parish Council is extremely concerned about the safety of bike racing in and around Newdigate.

We have been in contact with Mr Glyn Durrant, who is the South East Region Competition Administrator and have brought the issues to his attention, along with other complaints where cycle marshals have been seen stopping motor traffic at road junctions to enable race cyclists to emerge from a junction with a 'STOP' sign, without having to stop.

PC Ken Wheeler is in support of many of our complaints, and I believe that Surrey CC would agree that our rural roads have far too many potholes to allow safe cycle races.

Would your committee be prepared to support our claim that these cycle races in their current format need to be stopped. Our roads in their present condition do not lend themselves to safe cycle races.

### **Response from Local Transportation Manager**

Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention, I will contact Mr Durrant to obtain further details about these race activities.

I am aware that Surrey Police has a Road Safety & Traffic Management Officer who when asked responds to enquiries about such events. Surrey Police support the views of the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in discouraging the use of the public highway for such events. However, Surrey Police do not sanction or prohibit organised cycle rides.