



## OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

### PUBLIC WRITTEN QUESTIONS

24 JUNE 2009

The following question was submitted in accordance with Standing Order 46.

#### **Question from Mr Paul Finch**

#### **Pixham Lane Speed Restrictions**

This from the document, “**Inventory of 20mph Zones in Surrey**” updated in March 2007 by **Surrey County Council**.

*Because of the documented benefits of 20 mph zones, Surrey County Council included the following key proposal within their Local Transport Plan (LTP), covering the period April 2001 to March 2006:*

*“We will implement 20 mph zones in a systematic way as part of area wide schemes in urban areas, and the streets around schools will generally be made 20 mph zones. If there are clear reasons for a higher speed limit being retained, other lining, signing and calming measures will be employed.” (LTP section 4.9.6, page 72).*

We also refer you to the **Council to the House of Commons, Transport Committee, “Ending the Scandal of Complacency: Road Safety beyond 2010: Eleventh Report of Session 2007-08: Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence”, printed by the House of Commons 15 October 2008.**

*58. The safety benefits of lower speeds—20 mph or below in residential areas, town centres and around schools—have long been recognised by the Department for Transport. Progress has been made with tackling inappropriate speed and many areas have been traffic calmed, with 30 mph or 20 mph limits. Yet this has been a slow and expensive process and, although effective in engineering terms, they have rarely enhanced the attractiveness of our streets in the way that schemes in other countries have done.*

*60. Ways must be found to satisfy the desires of local communities for safer streets. We recommend that local authorities be given the powers and resources to introduce 20-mph limits much more widely. Flexibility is required to avoid the prohibitive costs*

*associated with some approaches. The balance of engineering measures, technology, policing and community influence should be a local matter.*

The situation in Pixham Lane, Pixham (a B road) is similar to that in Highlands Road, Leatherhead (a B road), already a 20mph area. We believe that the accident rate per year in the 3 previous years is higher in Pixham Lane than 0.66 accidents/year used in determination for the 20mph zoning in Highlands Road.

At both ends of Pixham Lane the motorist has to stop and it would take approximately 44 seconds longer to travel the distance of the Lane, unimpeded at 20mph than at the current 30mph limit. There is a primary school (on a blind bend), nursery, home for the elderly and a church opening out onto the Lane. There are a number of properties with no footpath from which residents have to walk directly into the Lane. There are, especially at weekends, a number of walkers crossing the Lane to access Box Hill. Residents are continually reporting to the Residents Association incidents where they have narrowly avoided being struck by speeding motorists. From the Denbies end it is 320m to the central bollards, 142m to the pinch point, 285m to the traffic lights and 332m to the end at Reigate Road, all arguably existing traffic calming measures.

The Residents within Pixham have requested action to reduce the speed of traffic travelling through Pixham. Given that there was a road traffic accident in Pixham Lane on the morning of 9<sup>th</sup> June where a resident narrowly avoided being fully struck by a car rolling over onto its side following a collision and two young drivers managed to get out of their vehicles without serious injury, at what point will the County Council actually implement 20mph zones which it promised to do in 2007. There is absolutely no reason to maintain a 30mph limit in Pixham Lane and the Residents Association now formally request it be lowered. Please support our request.

#### **Response from Surrey Highways**

Officer response to be provided at the Local Committee on the 24<sup>th</sup> June 2009.