



**MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

**24<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2006**

**Five Member questions have been received**

**Cllr M Buttery, Member for Tadworth and Walton ward, asks the following question:**

**1 Pfizer Travel Plan**

“Pfizer is in the process of reviewing the Company’s commitments in its Travel Plan for Walton Oaks, with the County Council. Please will you provide a summary of when these discussions started, the various stages that have taken place already or need to take place and when they are likely to be concluded?”

**The East Team Manager, Transportation Development Control, responds:**

**1 Pfizer Travel Plan**

“This issue has and is being dealt with by Surrey County Council’s Transportation Development Control Officers and their response is as follows:

Discussions have been taking place between Surrey County Council Transportation Development Control Officers and Pfizer since January 2004 in order to progress the Pfizer Company Travel Plan. Pfizer submitted a Draft Company Travel Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (CTP2) in April 2005, with a further version in August 2005, neither of which were acceptable to the County Council. A meeting in September 2005 between

Surrey County Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Pfizer resulted in stalemate.

In December 2005 it was agreed by all parties (Surrey County Council, Pfizer and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council) that an independent consultant should be appointed to undertake a peer review of the Company Transport Plan and the Draft Company Travel Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition in order to break the deadlock. The brief for the Independent Expert was agreed in February 2006 and Lynda Addison of Addison and Associates was appointed in April 2006.

There was a preliminary meeting between all parties on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2006, the first draft of the Report was circulated on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2006 and a further meeting to discuss the issues arising from the Report was held on 7<sup>th</sup> July. All parties have submitted comments and the final version of the Report is due by the end of July. This Report is to remain confidential unless all parties agree to release it."

**Cllr R M Bennett, Member for Tadworth and Walton ward, asks the following questions:**

**1 Tadworth – various actions**

"At the last meeting I asked several questions. In their answers, Officers indicated that various actions would be carried out. To date absolutely nothing has happened. When might I and the residents of Tadworth see some of the promised action?"

**The Local Transport Manager responds:**

**1 Tadworth – various actions**

"A summary of the points raised by Councillor Bennett at the Local Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006 are listed below with an update on progress:

*(i) Parking issues at the end of Lywood Close*

At the Local Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006 officers reported that as part of the Decriminalised Parking Enforcement review approved by the Local Committee at its meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> December 2005, the Northern Villages, which includes Tadworth, is to be reviewed in the current financial year.

This review work has been completed and the most appropriate solution is considered to be placing 'at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) across the junction/access to Lywood Close. This proposal is contained in Annex 12 of the Proposed Waiting Restrictions report that has been submitted to today's Local Committee meeting for approval. Should these proposals be approved the subsequent legal process (including advertising the restrictions) would be undertaken in the current financial year.

(ii) *Issues related to parkers blocking the emergency access to Tadworth cricket Club*

At the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006 the Local Committee agreed to implement an H-bar marking at this location. Officers have subsequently placed an order with Carillion for this work with to be undertaken and are currently awaiting confirmation of when this will be implemented. In order that financial resources may be optimised, the work will be carried out as part of a programme of access markings.”

(iii) *Drainage issues at the entrance to Tadworth Cricket Club*

As outlined at the Local Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006 officers were to investigate this issue and determine whether surface water from the highway was finding its way into the club's cesspit. Officers subsequently discussed the issues with the Secretary of the Cricket Club and the follow conclusions were reached.

- A reduction in the volume of surface water collecting in the vicinity of the access track may be achieved by cutting slots in the existing kerbs either side of club entrance. These will serve to intercept water flowing along the channel and allow it to soak away into adjoining soft ground before reaching the track leading to the clubhouse.
- It is recommended that the work identified above be complemented by surfacing works to the entrance track, domed to shed water from the area over which cars and pedestrians pass. This element would have to be funded by the Cricket Club.
- An existing bund on the east side of the club entrance already prevents water collecting on the track from reaching the cesspit.
- The cover to the cesspit is set at a higher level than an adjoining hollow. This ensures that water leaving the highway from east of the entrance is not channelled into the pit.
- At times of protracted heavy rain it is perfectly conceivable that the local water table will rise thus affecting the performance of the cesspit.
- The kerb slots will be cut by the Community Gang during a scheduled visit to the Tadworth area. Their next visit is programmed to commence 4th September 2006.

(iv) *Issues relating to the drain on the bridge in Tadworth*

Following the officers response at the Local Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006 it was confirmed that the question related to a different gully to that referred to in the answer and the Local Transportation Service were to arrange a site meeting to investigate further. This has yet to be arranged and officers would welcome further discussions with Councillor Bennett to finalise arrangements and work together to resolve the issue.

(v) *Commissioning of Vehicle Activated Sign units at Dorking Road*

This work is being undertaken by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership who are waiting for the electricity company (EDF) to complete the connections to the vehicle Activated Sign (VAS) units. EDF have visited site and are programming the connections along with other VAS signs in the borough. Surrey County Council officers are actively chasing progress on this issue.

## **2 A217 - Safety Cameras**

“Two Gatso cameras have been reinstalled along the A217 north of Reigate Hill. Both are surrounded by large and very unsightly crash barriers. May I be told what the cost of this work was and who authorised it? Was it known that the area close by is Metropolitan Green Belt and is such a structure considered appropriate in such a sensitive location?

Finally, the camera close to Shelveys Way lasted less than two weeks before it was vandalised. Bearing in mind how many times cameras have been vandalised in the locality, why were not the taller cameras used (as in Croydon) so that vandals cannot reach the camera?”

### **The Safety Camera Partnership Team Manager responds:**

## **2 A217 - Safety Cameras**

The implementation of safety camera's in Reigate and Banstead (and across the County) are provided and managed by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership. Officers from the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership have provided the following response:

Safety fencing has been provided by Surrey County Council on behalf of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership at a number of safety camera sites across the county. Surrey County Council is the lead partner of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership and has responsibility for the installation and maintenance of safety camera sites. Upon the creation of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership in April 2005, all sites were reviewed by Police and County Council colleagues to see what improvements may be necessary to ensure that enforcement could be undertaken safely at each of the sites. At a number of sites on the A217 risk assessments showed that it was dangerous for technicians to attend to the cameras, as they would be required to stand unprotected in central reservations very close to high-speed traffic.

It is also increasingly good practice to protect roadside objects from traffic to protect the occupants of vehicles should their vehicle leave the road and strike the roadside object. Therefore for enforcement to be undertaken safely at these sites, resulting in fewer collisions, safety fencing was deemed to be required. There has also been instances of vehicles colliding with speed cameras we believe as an act of vandalism (e.g. Dorking Road).

The potential "unsightliness" of the safety fencing was not a consideration when determining their provision. Surrey County Council have a duty to ensure the safety of highway users and those working and travelling on the highway and allow safe provision of the safety camera sites and the enforcement that they provide.

It should also be noted that safety barriers have been provided at other locations along the A217 and as such is not an unusual occurrence on this road.

The Local Committee may also like to note that reports regarding the location and deployment of safety cameras in the borough were presented to the Local Committee at the meetings held on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2005 and 21<sup>st</sup> June 2004.

The cost of the safety fencing work was estimated to be:

Location	Design	Traffic Management	Construction
L6 - Brighton Road Kingswood	£2,375	£9,000	£8,690.86
L7 - Brighton Road, Copleigh Drive	£2,375	£9,000	£8,795.90
L18 - Burgh Wood	£2,375	£9,000	£11,015.82

However the final costs will only be known following submission of invoices from the contractor Carillion.

It is important to remember that all the costs of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership are reclaimed from central government, and are ultimately met from the fines that the cameras generate. Therefore the cost of the provision of these works was at no cost to the taxpayer, and has no bearing on the budget for other highway works in the County Council (the fines from the cameras can only be used to reclaim the costs of camera related activity and not to raise revenue for other purposes. These costs are subject to external audit to ensure that this is the case).

The taller cameras used in the London area are operated by the London Safety Camera Partnership. These cameras are digital, and cost in the region of £50,000 each. A standard Gatso camera installation would cost in the region of £10,000. There are also implications to back office processes, software and training with a set of new equipment. There are approximately 400+ speed cameras in the London area, and 18 in the whole of Surrey. Consequently the London Safety Camera Partnership has much greater resources to be able to invest in these new safety cameras. Surrey County Council monitor all new equipment that is type approved by the Home Office and will look to invest in new technology when appropriate.

**Cllr S Kulka, Member for Meadvale and St Johns ward, asks the following questions:**

**1 St Johns Park, Redhill – speed limits**

“I have been asked to investigate whether it is possible to reduce the speed limit around the St. Johns Park development in Redhill. Even though there are no speed limit signs, drivers using the perimeter road seem to think that the speed limit is 30mph.

The residents would prefer a limit of 15mph. Could I please have some guidance on how the limit is set and how to arrange for it to be changed?”

**The Local Transport Manager responds:**

**1 St Johns Park, Redhill – speed limits**

“The St John's Park Development in Redhill is a private development and as such is not under the control of Surrey County Council. It is up to any Management Company acting for the development to set a speed limit if they wish to do so.

One approach that Members may like to consider is to write to the developers bringing this issue to their attention. Officers understand the main Developer of the Estate was Barratts Southern Counties whose address is as follows:

Barratts Southern Counties,  
Walnut Tree Close,  
Guildford,  
Surrey  
GU1 4SW

However, it should be noted that the chosen speed limit would not be enforceable by the police as this is not public highway.”

## **2 Hooley Lane development, Redhill – kerb stones**

“The new development in Hooley Lane, Redhill has involved some highway modifications. The contractors have recently carried out a completely unannounced removal of the Victorian granite kerb stones and replaced them with contemporary concrete ones.

The new concrete section lies between sections of the existing granite. Local residents are quite concerned. Could I have an explanation of why they were replaced with concrete and what will happen to the granite kerbs?”

### **The Local Transport Manager responds:**

## **2 Hooley Lane development, Redhill – kerb stones**

“This is a new development that has yet to be adopted by Surrey County Council as Transport Authority. Officers have, however, raised this issue with colleagues in Surrey County Council’s Transportation Development Control to address this matter.”