



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

**RESPONSE TO THE PETITION
SPEEDING PROBLEMS COBHAM ROAD**

4 MARCH 2009

KEY ISSUE

To consider the petition submitted by the residents of Cobham Road, Fetcham to resolve the current speeding problems.

SUMMARY

A petition was presented to this Committee on 3rd December 2008 that requested that certain measures be installed in order to help address the perceived current speeding problems on the D2508 Cobham Road, Fetcham.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree that:

- (i) the petition is noted
- (ii) the suggested way forward is approved.

• INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 A petition, signed by 88 signatories was submitted to the Local Committee on 3 December 2008. It requests that measures are installed to address the perceived speeding problems on Cobham Road, Fetcham.
- 1.2 The measures requested were:
- The installation of signs to indicate the speed limit and the fact that the road is a residential area.
 - The installation of speed cameras
 - The installation of a puffin crossing on Cobham Road near to Cannons Grove and School Lane.
- 1.3 The following information responds to each of the suggestions made by the petitioners.

2 ANALYSIS

2.1 Installing 30mph signs and signs that indicate Cobham Road is a residential area

As Highway Authority, Surrey County Council has to adhere to the DfT's Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002. This is a statutory instrument that sets out what signs can be placed on the Highway. Additionally, the Traffic Regulation Act 1984, specifies that when a road has a system of street lighting in place, the road will always be a 30pmh speed limit unless an Order has been made. The presence of carriageway lighting effectively replaces the need for repeater signs and as such, 30mph repeater signs cannot be installed along the Cobham Road. Various inforamatory signs are allowed on the public highway, however 'residential area' or similar is not an allowable sign. The signing suggestions are therefore not possible.

2.2 Installing Speed Cameras

An important principle of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is that the core enforcement provided is reserved for the very worst collision hotspots where excessive speed or red light violations have been confirmed as a problem. Safety cameras are only introduced as a last resort after sites have been assessed and approved by both the Police and County Council road safety professionals. As well as ensuring the most effective use of resources, and the most effective casualty reduction results, this approach also helps to maintain public support for safety cameras. The detailed criteria used for considering new sites is described within the guidance issued by the Department for Transport which will be available at this meeting. In Cobham Road, between Shamrock Close and Raymead Way there have been 4 personal injury accidents since January 2005 and up to October 2008 (the latest data available). This site would not therefore be considered appropriate for Safety Camera installation.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

2.3 Installing a Puffin Crossing

In order to ascertain the feasibility of this suggestion, a feasibility study would need to be undertaken and thus funding assigned to it. It would be necessary to assign funding from a future years LTP allocation and it is therefore deemed appropriate to place this suggestion on the 'wish list' for consideration in the future.

3 **OPTIONS**

3.1 The options available, following the suggestions made are limited and the only viable scheme that has a possibility of reaching fruition is the suggested puffin crossing, subject to funding being made available.

3.2 In addition to the core enforcement provided by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership there are also Police Casualty Reduction Officers operating in each of the Districts or Boroughs who may be able to provide exceptional mobile enforcement from time to time at locations where there are public concerns over speeds, but where the level of collisions is not serious enough to warrant designation as a core enforcement site. This could be an option for this site.

4 **CONSULTATIONS**

4.1 No consultation in respect of the suggestions made has been undertaken at this time although if a scheme were to be approved in the future, consultation would form part of the process.

5 **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND VALUE FOR MONEY**

5.1 There are no specific implications arising from the petition although if a Puffin crossing were to be pursued then typically a construction budget of around £100,000 would be needed.

6 **EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no specific implications arising from the petition.

7 **CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no specific implications arising from the petition.

8 **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 Local public feeling as that measures are required in Cobham Road, however out of the suggestions made the only scheme that may prove to be a possibility in the future is the Puffin Crossing. It is therefore suggested that this scheme is added to the 'wish list' for possible future progression, subject to the necessary funding being put in place.

8.2 Another way forward that could be possible is the enforcement as mentioned in paragraph 3.2. It is suggested that this is pursued.

9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 Out of the three suggestion made by the petitioners only one is deemed to be a possibility and the only other option that may be available in the short term is that of mobile enforcement.

10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

10.1 The allocation of funding will be considered at a future meeting of this Committee.

10.2 Discussions regarding mobile enforcement will be held with the Police.

LEAD OFFICER: Gerrie Van Saasen, Local Highway Manager (Mole Valley)

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 08456 009 009

E-MAIL: east Surrey highways@surreycc.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Gerrie Van Saasen, Local Highway Manager (Mole Valley)

TELEPHONE NUMBER: 08456 009 009

E-MAIL: east Surrey highways@surreycc.gov.uk