



**OFFICER RESPONSE TO PETITION
LOCAL COMMITTEE
(MOLE VALLEY)**

**LOWER ROAD, BOOKHAM
PETITION**

24 JUNE 2009

A petition of 140 signatures was received from Mr Peter Horitz on behalf of the Bookham Labour Party, as follows:

We, the undersigned, call on Surrey County Council Highways Services to bring Abinger Lane, Abinger Common into the scheduled road gritting arrangements. This road is currently not gritted and is the main access to Abinger Common First School and the village.

The Local Highways Manager responds:

Lower Road - Crossing from footpath to Middlemead Estate to Recreation Ground.

Some years ago, pedestrians had to cross Lower Road from north to south with the south side being an area that was all grass, i.e. with no area of hard standing. Under the safer routes to school programme the County Council were lucky enough to secure funding to carry out some works to make crossing of the road at that point easier. The biggest need at the time was for a section of verge to be replaced with an area of footway and this work was implemented as soon as the funds were made available. However at that time, another 2 options for measures were considered, the first being a signalised crossing and the second being a central pedestrian island that would have enabled crossing of the road in two halves.

The signalised crossing was not considered possible for a number of reasons:

Land take from the residential properties nearby would have been necessary
A minimum width footway ('reservoir' area) could not be provided within the existing constraints of the highway on the north side.

The signals (lights and poles) as well as the legal markings (zig zags) were very likely to be considered visually intrusive by local residents and one or two properties would have to have the equipment very close to their front windows.

The cost of a signalised crossing was and still is very high.

Analysis of existing sites shows that there is a high likelihood of there being on average one injury accident a year at a crossing. This means that unless there is already an injury accident problem that can be reduced, it is difficult to justify installation of this type of crossing.

The central pedestrian island was not progressed due to:

The road width would have needed to be increased on the south side. This would have involved a gradual splay of verge being taken away over a reasonably long length, which in turn would have meant a large amount of full depth carriageway construction would have been necessary.

Due to the works mentioned above, the cost of the scheme would have been substantially higher than one would have thought upon first glance.

The location of the island may have provided vehicular access problems for the residents on the north side.

Since the provision of the area of hard standing being provided, conditions on site have not changed and therefore the provision of a new facility is not likely to be any easier now than back in 2003 when the issue was last considered.

24th June 2009