

**MEMBER QUESTIONS****SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)****20<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2006**

**Eight Member Questions have been received**

- 1 Cllr Steve Kulka, Member for Meadvale and St Johns, asks the following three questions:**

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

“The St. Johns Park Speed Limit question I submitted for the July meeting was answered incorrectly. Reference was made to Royal Earlswood Park rather than St. Johns Park. The error was minuted and it was to be reinvestigated. Four months on and I have still have no answer.

Could I have a formal answer at the meeting”

*Original question from 24<sup>th</sup> July 2006 committee meeting: “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:**

“The St Johns Park development is not signed as such, which led to some confusion as to which development was being referred to. This development consists of residential roads on the site of a former hospital on the east side of Pendleton Road and forms a series of culs-de-sac with a central loop road. The roads are currently subject to a 30mph speed limit, which is conferred by the presence of street lighting. There are no road markings on the estate roads, which is usual in small developments where traffic flows are often low. Although no enquiries have previously been raised to the Local Transportation Service regarding this area, it is understood that there is a request to reduce the speed limit in this area.



To reduce the speed limit to, for example 20mph, it is necessary to ensure that the actual measured speeds reduce sufficiently to 20mph, as the Police are unlikely to enforce a speed limit below that which might be considered reasonable by a responsible driver. This often requires physical traffic calming measures. A 15mph limit is rarely set but would require additional measures over and above that of a 20mph limit. The Police have been contacted and are not aware of any speed related issues in this area.

A reduced speed limit and associated traffic calming would require funding either through the Local Transport Plan (LTP) or Local Allocation and would have to 'compete' with other schemes in Reigate and Banstead against the LTP2 objectives of: Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Maintenance. In addition any traffic calming would require consultation with and support by local residents.

Considering the objectives of the LTP, the primary purpose of such a scheme would appear to be safety. In the last five years, however, there has only been one recorded accident (a slight accident in 2004 where a driver accidentally used the accelerator rather than the brake)

A speed survey could be undertaken, as this is a small development and the straight links of the perimeter road short in length, however, it may not be possible to obtain representative speeds. The tight radii and presence of junctions in Abinger Drive and lack of road markings also assist in reducing speeds in accordance with the principles of the Surrey Design Guide which is used for the design of new housing developments.

In conclusion, a traffic calming scheme could be put to the Member Transport Task Group for addition onto the scheme list but it is unlikely that it would 'score' sufficiently highly to enable it to take priority over other road safety schemes and known accident sites and hence it is anticipated may not be delivered in the short term."

**Safe crossing on Pendleton Road, Redhill**

“Is there any chance of a safe crossing point being constructed on Pendleton Road, between St. Johns Primary School and Abinger Drive?

The school has the use of a Lollipop man at the very dangerous crossing point on the safe routes to school route. However, this is only available at the beginning and end of school day and doesn't serve the school and community for the rest of the day.”

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

“Surrey County Council has plans to develop and provide a traffic signal controlled school crossing on Pendleton Road. This is one of a series of schemes identified for Pendleton Road, identified in a report to the Local Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2001.

Surrey County Council officers also met with representatives (including the Head Teacher) of St Johns school on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2006 and discussed their concerns and priorities; with their top priority being a controlled crossing across Pendleton Road.

The Local Committee (on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2006) approved £5,000 towards the feasibility and design development of a scheme adjacent to St Johns School. The scope of the scheme is to provide a safe access route from Church Road, along Fountain Road and across Pendleton Road to St Johns school. It is planned that funding for the detailed design and construction will be sought in the future financial year. Progress to date has involved the production of an outline design, which is currently being developed. This has identified the need for a small topographical survey to be undertaken which has been commissioned.”

**Streetlighting on Whitepost Hill, Redhill**

“Could I have a reason as to why the street Lamps on the eastern side of Whitepost Hill in Redhill do not turn on until an hour or more after the others in the local area.

This stretch of road is on a hill, on a bend and is mainly covered by trees as it cuts through Redhill Common, which makes it darker than the surrounding roads.

Requests from local residents and myself going back nearly 18 months have effectively gone unheeded. During all that time we have been told that the timers are out of adjustment and yet as the evenings have got progressively earlier, the lights do come on earlier. Just an hour or so after all the others.

I first reported these lamps to Peter Withers by telephone in June 2005 without progress. I sent the first email on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2005 and several others since.

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

“There is a historical issue in Reigate and Banstead that a large number of street lighting columns operate on a clock system rather than a photoelectric cell. If there is a power cut/power surge and in the event of British Summer time these have to be reset. In this instance it is understood that the clocks on Whitepost Hill have not been reset, an order has therefore been issued to EDF to undertake the required works.

It is not a large cost to reset the clocks, compared to replacing the street lighting columns, but may explain why lighting columns appear to be repaired and then subsequently appear to fail again. It is currently understood that these columns could be replaced in time under the County Council's planned Street Lighting PFI contract."

**2 Cllr R C Newstead, Member for Reigate Hill, asks the following question:**

**A217, Reigate Hill – Central Refuge**

"Bearing in mind the safety of school children, pedestrians generally, and horse riders, what progress has been made in the provision of a refuge in the centre of the A217 to the north of the Yew Tree public house, and the movement of the 30mph speed limit further up the hill?"

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

"This scheme was originally identified following a petition from 76 residents of Reigate Hill requesting a pedestrian refuge in the vicinity of the Yew Tree Public House/Esso Petrol Station at the Local Committee meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2004. Following the petition pedestrian counts were undertaken and an outline scheme produced.

The subsequent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit report identified concerns related to the existing traffic speed at this location and the required sightlines needed to provide such a crossing. The Police also expressed concern related to traffic speed at this location. As a result it was identified that extending the 30mph limit northwards along Reigate Hill could assist in reducing the speeds and hence allow the required sightlines to be provided. Speed surveys would then be required upon extending this speed limit to confirm that speeds had reduced sufficiently to allow the pedestrian island to be installed.

The Local Committee at its meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004 agreed to amend the traffic order with the funding provided in the 2005/06 financial year. The traffic order was subsequently made in October 2005, along with other amendments to traffic orders in the Reigate Hill area.

A new 30mph solar powered lit speed limit sign was subsequently erected on the northbound carriageway. There have been problems, however, with the relocation of the southbound 30mph speed limit sign due to the fact that the footway is narrow at this point and the adjacent octagonal street lighting column upon which the sign is to be mounted lies behind the fence in this location. As a result of the location and shape of the column an off-set bracket is required upon which to mount the sign. This has been ordered and installation is currently awaited.

Once the speed limit signs are correctly installed further speed surveys will be undertaken to establish whether the average speed has reduced sufficiently to allow the pedestrian refuge to be installed safely. It should be noted that should the measured speeds have not reduced sufficiently then further measures may be required before the pedestrian refuge can be installed. It should also be noted that

the funding for such measures and the pedestrian island may require Local Committee approval and would have to 'compete' with other schemes for which funding is sought against the objectives of the County's Local Transport Plan."

**3 Cllr M H C Buttery, Member for Tadworth and Walton, asks the following question:**

**Maintenance of Highway Verges and Shrubs – Mini-Agency**

"The Borough Council has a mini-agency with the County Council for the maintenance of highway verges and shrubs. This came into effect in financial year 2004/05 and the fee paid for that year reflected the cost of all the work involved and was based on standards agreed under a previous agency.

I understand that the County Council is unwilling to pay the Borough Council in full an agency fee for the financial year 2005/06 which reflects all the work involved.

Can I be told:

- a) Is this is correct?
- b) If it is correct, why has this change taken place?
- c) Will the County Council pay the full cost incurred by the Borough Council in 2005/06 which reflect previously agreed levels of service and which were paid for in 2004/05?
- d) If the County Council will pay the full costs incurred by the Borough Council in 2005/06, when is this payment likely to be made?
- e) Will the County Council pay the full cost incurred by the Borough Council for 2006/07?"

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

"Firstly it is important to note that there is no agency agreement between Surrey County Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council for the maintenance of highway verges and shrubs.

Surrey County Council, however, has provided grants to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council for the cost of highway maintenance (works, services and fees) to verges and hedges (for example grass cutting, planted areas and cutting of hedges) to the County's standards contained in the Manual of Policies and Standards (MaPS) and the Surrey Highway Maintenance Manual (SHMM).

It is important for the Local Committee to note that the funding for these works is provided as part of Surrey County Council's East Area Maintenance Plan, (the 2006/07 issue being that approved by the Local Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006). This overall funding has to cover a range of activities including highway safety defects (e.g. potholes), gully cleansing, winter maintenance, sign and white lining works and the community gangs. It is therefore important that the limited funding available is prioritised accordingly with, for example, highway safety defects having highest priority.

In response to the above questions:

- a) & b) Surrey County Council paid Reigate and Banstead Borough Council a sum of £118, 675 on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2006 for the financial year 2005/06 (representing a grant of £101,000 plus VAT). The County Council is only able to fund this type of maintenance for highway purposes and cannot fund enhancement works.
- b) As outlined above the County Council is only able to fund the cost of highway maintenance to verges and hedges to the County's highway standards and cannot fund additional enhancement works.
- c) As detailed above payment for 2005/06 was made on 4<sup>th</sup> April 2006.
- d) Surrey County Council has increased the grant to £105,000 plus VAT (totalling £123,375) for the financial year 2006/07 to fund the cost of highway maintenance to verges and hedges to the County Council's highway standards and cannot fund additional enhancement works.

It important to note that with the limited funding available from all sources there is a need for the County Council to prioritise and direct funding towards the prime need taking into account highway safety.

In conclusion the County Council would like to thank Reigate and Banstead Borough Council for the high standards that they maintain which meet both their Corporate Plan objectives and make the Borough a desirable place to live, work and do business."

#### **4 Cllr F J Moore, Member for Redhill East, asks the following question:**

##### **Frenches Road Bus Gate**

"The rising bollards of Frenches Road bus gate were last repaired on Wed 4<sup>th</sup> Oct, since when they have remained satisfactorily operational.

However on the 27<sup>th</sup> April at Reigate and Banstead Town Hall, a meeting was convened specifically, to address the previous unreliability of the rising bollard component. At that meeting 4 key actions were agreed.

- a) Surrey County Council to install a BT reporting line as ordered.
- b) Surrey County Council to seek GOSE (Government Office for the South East) approval to red surface then install.
- c) Surrey County Council (CF) to liaise with BJ on specification of CCTV camera, recording equipment, etc.
- d) Surrey County Council to undertake consultation on camera siting, seek partnership funding, and procure.

At the present time, more than 6 months have elapsed since the 27<sup>th</sup> April. Therefore might the East Redhill residents and I, be given an update as to how far those actions have progressed."

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

“Following the meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2006 a number of actions were progressed as follows:

- a) Surrey County Council completed installation and testing of the British Telecom fault reporting line. This was successfully installed, tested and completed in October 2006 and is now sending status reports back to the County Council’s Network Management and Information Centre. This facility allows the County Council’s engineers to be aware when there is a fault with the bollards and hence allows improved response times to arrange any necessary repairs.
- b) A design layout has been prepared for the proposed stop line and red surfacing at the bus gate and has been sent to GOSE (Government Office for the South East) for type approval.
- c) Surrey County Council has consulted a range of groups on the suitable specification for a CCTV camera with recording facilities that could allow remote resetting of the rising bollards. These groups have included Horley Town Council, the Police, Elmbridge Borough Council (where a similar system is in use) and the Reigate and Banstead Town Centre CCTV Group. A specification and estimated costs are currently being finalised.
- d) The next stage is to discuss this with the Borough Police Inspector and to identify possible sources of funding. One approach would be to raise this issue through the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership. It is anticipated that the estimated cost of such a system would be in the region of £15,000 - £20,000. If this funding becomes available consultation would need to be undertaken on siting the camera.”

**5 Cllr Steve Kulka, Member for Meadvale and St Johns, asks the following two questions:**

**Frenches Road Bus Gate**

“There is an increasing amount of public discontent with reference to the bus barrier in Frenches Road, Redhill. I would like to know when a review of it’s effectiveness is to take place.”

**The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

“A review of the Holmethorpe Traffic Management scheme has been undertaken and reported to the Local Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006. This review concluded that following implementation of the scheme a reduction in traffic levels has been achieved on Frenches Road.

It was acknowledged in this report that there have been some reliability problems with the rising bus bollards in Frenches Road. As a result a number of measures were identified, discussed, and agreed at a joint County and Borough Officer and Member meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2006. The measures identified were as follows:

- Surrey County Council to install a BT reporting line as ordered.
- Surrey County Council to seek GOSE (Government Office for the South East) approval to red surface then install.
- Surrey County Council to liaise with the Borough Police Inspector on specification of CCTV camera, recording equipment, etc.
- Surrey County Council to undertake consultation on camera siting, seek partnership funding, and procure.

Progress on these elements is detailed in the response to Councillor Frank Moore's questions to this Local Committee meeting."

### **Station Road, Redhill – Pedestrian Crossing**

With increasing level of traffic and more housing development in the area of the Donyngs roundabout in Redhill, are there plans to provide a new pedestrian crossing on Station Road, south of the roundabout?

#### **The Local Transport Manager Responds:**

"There are no current plans identified for a new pedestrian crossing on Station Road, Redhill south of the roundabout.

The Reigate to Redhill cycle route, however, is currently being extended along Madeira Walk as part of the Borough Cycling Strategy. This includes widening of existing paths and new lighting. The extension will link Doods Way with Donyngs Leisure Centre making the route accessible to cyclists and more attractive to people who would prefer to walk. Proposed future measures include advisory cycle lanes along Linkfield Lane, between Donyngs and the A25 Roundabout where there already exists comprehensive cycle facilities.

A study could be undertaken to investigate the feasibility of a new crossing at this point and would consider, among other items, traffic speed, recorded accidents, pedestrian flows and sightlines. If a case were identified for such a crossing it would require funding either from future developments or through the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP). If the latter funding is utilised it should be noted that it would need to 'compete' with other schemes in Reigate and Banstead against the LTP2 objectives of: Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Maintenance. Should this scheme 'score' sufficiently highly it could be put to the Member Transport Task Group for addition onto the scheme list."