

MINUTES: of the meeting of Surrey County Council's Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) held at 14:00 on Monday 24 September 2007 at Reigate Town Hall.

Members Present – Surrey County Council

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Mrs Angela Fraser DL# | Mr Nick Harrison |
| Mr Michael Gosling | Mr Daniel Kee |
| Dr Lynne Hack | Mrs Frances King |
| Mrs Kay Hammond | |

Members Present – Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Cllr M A Brunt | Cllr R C Newstead |
| Cllr M H C Buttery | Cllr B A Stead |
| Cllr B C Cowle | Cllr R F C Wagner |

for part of meeting

PART ONE - IN PUBLIC

[All references to items refer to the agenda for the meeting]

Public Open Session

Before the formal Committee session began, the Chairman invited questions relating to items on the agenda from members of the public attending the meeting. There were no questions asked.

- 54/07 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**
Apologies were received from Mr Simon Harding, Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin and Cllr R M Bennett. Apologies for lateness were received from Mrs Angela Fraser DL.
- 55/07 **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING – 4 JUNE 2007 [Item 2]**
The minutes were agreed as accurate.
- 56/07 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**
There were no declarations of interest. A declaration was made later in the meeting, during item 13.

57/07 **PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Three petitions were received.

a) Great Tattenhams, Tattenham Corner – Road Safety

Mr Jason Glynne, of Great Tattenhams, Tattenham Corner, presented a petition containing 681 signatures, on behalf of local residents requesting that the County Council introduce road safety improvements in the Great Tattenhams area. Mr Glynne informed the Committee that the petitioners welcomed the proposed scheme, but that it could go further to reduce speeding or improve pedestrian access. He suggested improvements such as vehicle activated signs, speed cameras, speed bumps, or better signage.

The Chairman and Local Highways Manager thanked Mr Glynne for presenting the petition, and confirmed that the Local Committee had agreed a scheme for the area within the resources available.

The Local Highways Manager informed the committee that the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership was considering a speed camera in the area. Improved signage will be considered in the design of the scheme. The Local Highways Service will monitor the effects of the scheme on speeding.

The Local County Councillor thanked the petitioners and the Local Highways Manager. He asked that the time of the speed surveys be confirmed as he considered the figures to be surprising.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee note that:

- (i) A traffic management scheme for Great Tattenhams is currently being designed and is programmed for construction during the current financial year. This scheme was the subject of a report put to the Local Committee on 5th March 2007.

b) Garland Road, Redhill - Parking

The Committee noted a petition from residents in Garlands Road, Redhill, containing 106 signatures. A spokesperson for the petitioners was unable to attend the meeting. The petition requests residents only parking along the road.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee note that:

- (i) Garlands Road will be included in the review of Redhill Waiting Restrictions due to be carried out late 2007/08 or early 2008/09. Once this review commences it is recommended that a consultation letter regarding curfew parking be sent to all residents of Garlands Road.
- (ii) Garlands Road is already on the database of roads in Redhill requesting a residents parking zone (RPZ). A residents parking zone has to be implemented on an area basis to address the possibility of displaced parking and to provide economies of scale for Reigate and Banstead Borough Council who administer the permits and undertake enforcement. As such there is only Local Committee approval to implement RPZ's in two pilot areas (Horley and North West Reigate).
- (iii) A parking study for Redhill is currently being undertaken by consultants on behalf of Surrey County Council/Reigate and Banstead Borough Council considering the impact on parking as a result of potential new development.
- (iv) As a result of (ii) and (iii) above, it is recommended that any decision on introducing further RPZ's be deferred until findings from these two schemes are available.

c) Gatton Park Road, Reigate – Safe Crossing

Mrs Jill O'Reilly of Broadhurst Gardens, Reigate presented a petition containing 477 signatures, on behalf of local residents, requesting that the County Council provide a safe crossing on Gatton Park Road between Carlton Road and Wray Lane junction.

Mrs O'Reilly informed the Committee that the petitioners stopped collecting signatures when they were informed that a scheme was being progressed. The residents are pleased with the plans, but will continue to be concerned for the safety of pedestrians, particularly school children, until the crossing is installed. Mrs O'Reilly urged that the crossing be installed as soon as possible.

The Chairman and Local Highways Manager thanked Mrs O'Reilly for presenting the petition, and confirmed that the points raised and the photos presented would be passed to the scheme design team to consider. The Local Highways Manager stated that the scheme was the highest priority for this financial year.

The Chairman also asked that the community gangs be used to tackle the issue of overhanging foliage.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee note that:

- (i) A scheme is planned for implementation this financial year to:
 - Construct a mini-roundabout at the Gatton Park Road / Wray Lane junction,
 - Provide a signal controlled crossing over Gatton Park Road west of Carlton Road, and
 - Introduce a series of traffic islands along Gatton Park Road between Wray Lane and a point east of Carlton Road.
- (ii) The proposed scheme seeks to address the concerns of the petitioners and will serve to reduce average vehicle speeds to seek compliance with the recently introduced 30mph limit.

58/07 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

No public questions were received.

59/07 MEMBERS' QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

Seven member questions were received. Responses were tabled at the meeting and are attached as Annex A. There was a misprint in question seven, where the heading was incorrect.

In a supplementary question regarding Woodhatch Road, Cllr R C Newstead raised concern that vehicle actuated signs have not had an effect on speeding, as they are regularly triggered, and also raised concern regarding loose chippings on the recently laid surface dressing. The Local Highways Manager will liaise with the Police regarding the trigger speeds of the vehicle actuated signs on speeding and request that the loose chippings are swept.

60/07 LIBRARY STAFFING REVIEW – PROPOSALS TO INCREASE LIBRARY OPENING HOURS [Item 7]

The Area Libraries Manager, introduced the report that follows a fundamental staffing and structural review within the service. The result is to provide longer, standardised opening hours across the service. The review recommendations are largely based on feedback from users and lapsed users.

The Area Libraries Manager agreed to confirm which libraries were in the sample of 15 quoted in the report. The Local Committee requested that a report be presented back, in twelve months, regarding the effect of the changes on footfall and loans.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agree that:

- (i) It supports the approach of seeking improvements to opening hours and services through efficiency gains from self-service new technology,
- (ii) It supports the proposed new Group structure – three Groups of libraries, A ('Town' centre), B ('District' Centre) and C ('Local' Centre), with a geographic / strategic approach,
- (iii) It supports the resulting improvements in opening hours in Libraries in Reigate and Banstead, by 10 hours 30 minutes per week, as detailed in Annex E of the report.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

The Review has demonstrated that genuine efficiency gains result from enhanced automation and the introduction of self-service technology for library users. The benefit is a measurable improvement in hours of access in Surrey County Council libraries that meet the preference of current and potential users and encourage more people to visit a library

Mrs Angela Fraser DL joined the meeting during Item 7 [14:45]

61/07 **REIGATE AND BANSTEAD 2020 – A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY FOR REIGATE AND BANSTEAD [Item 8]**

The Area Director introduced the report, which introduced the draft community strategy, and sought Local Committee feedback as part of the consultation.

The draft strategy sets out four broad themes that will set the Local Strategic Partnership priorities. The draft strategy follows extensive consultation with organisations and residents.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Considered the draft Community Strategy and Members will provide feedback by 12th October 2007.

REASON FOR DECISION

The Local Committee has an executive function to contribute to the borough based community strategies such as *Reigate and Banstead 2020*.

62/07 **PROPOSED 50 MPH SPEED LIMIT BACK LANE, TOWER LANE AND GATTON BOTTOM, REIGATE [Item 9]**

The Local Highways Engineer introduced the report which sought to reduce the speed limit along a section of Back Lane, Tower Lane and Gatton Bottom from national speed limit (60 mph) to 50 mph. There was a misprint in the key issue section of the report, with the correct measurements in the recommendation.

The Committee raised some concern about having various speed limits along the road.

Mrs Kay Hammond proposed that a 50 mph speed limit be introduced along Gatton Bottom, from the junction with A217 to the start of the 30 mph speed limit, which should be extended westward, starting before the motorway bridge. This proposal was seconded by Cllr M H C Buttery.

The Local Highways Manager raised concerns about agreeing speed limits that did not meet the County Council's speed policy, that the police had not been consulted on and for which no supporting speed surveys had been undertaken.

Therefore, the Local Committee agreed to defer a decision on this item to the following meeting, to allow the Local Highways Service to investigate further and consult with the police on the issues raised.

63/07 **EXTENSION OF 30 MPH SPEED LIMIT LOWER PARK ROAD, CHIPSTED [Item 10]**

The Local Highways Engineer introduced the report which considered implementing an extension to the existing 30 mph speed limit from Outwood Lane to a point approximately 40 metres west of the junction with Park Road.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agree that:

- (i) Subject to the statutory procedures the 30mph speed limit is extended into Lower Park Road from Outwood Lane to a point being the western boundary of the Banstead Woods Car Park.
- (ii) Consideration and resolution of any objections received are delegated to the East Area Highways Group Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Local Committee and Local Members.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

There are three houses on the north side of Lower Park Road, which abut the highway with no footway. Residents wishing to walk to the shops or station have no protection from passing vehicles. It is therefore considered to be safer if the speed of traffic is reduced in this location.

The Committee adjourned at 15:33 for a refreshment break, and reconvened at 15:44.

64/07 CAPITAL AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS PROGRESS REPORT [Item 15]

The item was brought forward by the Chairman.

The Local Highways Manager will circulate a list of footway schemes when they are finalised.

Following the resolution at the Local Committee on 4th June 2007, the Chairman confirmed that she had written to the portfolio holder for Transportation regarding funding and community gangs. The response, from the Head of Surrey Highways, confirmed that the 2006/07 overspend in Reigate and Banstead had not affected the 2007/08 budget. The cost for emergency works will, in future, be sought from more appropriate budgets. Surrey Highways will be implementing a more equitable division of the community gangs from 2008/09.

Cllr M Brunt raised concerns that not all Borough Councillors were consulted by their County Councillors regarding the maintenance schemes funded through £100,000 local allocation and £100,000 revenue maintenance allocation.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the report for information.

65/07 **PROPOSED DIVERSION AND EXTINGUISHMENT – PUBLIC FOOTPATHS NUMBERS 362B AND 387, HORLEY [Item 11]**

The Countryside Legal Officer introduced the report, which sought a decision regarding the diversion of public footpath number 387 and the extinguishments of part of public footpath number 362B in Horley. The local County Councillor stated that no residents had contacted her regarding the proposals.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agree that

- (i) Orders are made to divert Public Footpath Number 387, Horley from points A – B – G – C to D – F – C and extinguish part of Public Footpath Number 362B, Horley between points B – E, under sections 119 and 118 of the Highways Act 1980 respectively, as shown on Drawing Number 3/1/45/H18; (Annex A),
- (ii) If no objections are received and sustained to the above Orders that they be confirmed, if objections are received and maintained that the Orders be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for determination.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

The application seeks to move the legal routes of the footpaths onto the routes used on the ground. Orders can be made where the County Council considers it is expedient to do so.

66/07 **ALLEGED PUBLIC BYWAY OPEN TO ALL TRAFFIC BETWEEN 42 AND 75 UPLAND WAY AND ALLEGED PUBLIC FOOTPATH BETWEEN SHAWLEY WAY AND UPLAND WAY, BANSTEAD [Item 12]**

The Countryside Legal Officer introduced the report, which sought a decision regarding an application to add a Byway Open to All Traffic between 42 and 75 Upland Way, and a public footpath between Shawley Way and Upland Way to the Surrey County Council Definitive Map and Statement.

The committee was informed that, although there are exceptions to the extinguishment of vehicular rights in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, which could be provided in more detail, the Rights of Way team did not believe that these applied in this case.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agree:

- (i) Public restricted byway rights are recognised over the route A-B-C-D on drawing 3/1/36/H24 (Annex C) and that the application for a Map Modification Order under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a BOAT is not approved. The route will be known as Public Restricted Byway number 637 (Banstead).
- (ii) Public footpath rights are recognised over route E-F-G on drawing 3/1/36/H24 (Annex C) and that this application for a Map Modification Order under sections 53 and 57 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to modify the Definitive Map and Statement by the addition of a footpath is approved. The route will be known as Public Footpath number 638 (Banstead).
- (iii) A legal order should be made and advertised to implement these changes. If objections are maintained to such an order, it will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs for confirmation.

REASON FOR DECISIONS

The public had acquired vehicular rights over route A-B-C-D on plan 3/1/36/H34, but that these were extinguished by NERC on 2nd May 2006, so the appropriate status is that of restricted byway. This will give the public a right over the route on foot, horseback, bicycle and in non-mechanically propelled vehicles. Any private vehicular rights, which currently exist or are permitted by the landowners, will remain unaffected. The public has acquired footpath rights over route E-F-G on plan 3/1/36/H34.

67/07 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING - PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE [Item 13]

The Local Committee and Partnership Officer gave a presentation providing feedback from local groups on how the Local Committee funding from 2006/07 has benefited them.

Due to the need for an urgent decision, a supplementary paper was tabled containing 2 additional proposals.

Mrs Angela Fraser DL declared an interest as Chairman of Age Concern.

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee agrees that the:

- (i) Following proposals be approved from Local Committee revenue funding:
- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Volunteer Training Course – Brigitte Trust | £2,020 |
| 2. Literate Learners – Volunteer Reading Help | £1,990 |
| 3. Play Area Improvements – Holmesdale Community Infant School | £8,000 |
| 4. Reigate and Redhill Live At Home Scheme | £1,500 |
| 5. Helping Hands Scheme – Prospect Housing | £3,000 |
| 6. Kitchen Improvements – Abbeyfield Reigate Society | £1,500 |
| 7. Message in a Bottle Publicity – Age Concern | £1,000 |
| 8. Mobility Buggy Scheme – Age Concern | £1,400 |
| 9. Landscaping and Refurbishing Play Area – Sovereign Youth Centre | £2,000 |
| 10. Football Park Fencing – Cromwell Road, Redhill | £2,500 |
- (ii) Following proposals be approved from Local Committee capital funding:
- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Multi-Sensory Facilities – Brooklands School | £13,000 |
|---|---------|

REASON FOR DECISIONS

The spending proposals put forward have been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money.

68/07 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN [Item 14]

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the forward plan of the County Council's Executive Committee.

69/07 FORWARD PLAN [Item 16]

RESOLVED

That the Local Committee:

- (i) Notes the forward plan.

[Meeting Ended: 16:29]

Chairman

MEMBER QUESTIONS

Seven Member Questions were received

- 1 Cllr R M Bennett, Member for Tadworth and Walton, asked the following questions:

Road Markings – Tadworth Roundabout

“The road markings on the Tadworth roundabout have never been very good and are now very hard to see. Motorists travelling south regularly turn right from the left hand lane (to go down the Dorking Road) and others turn left from the right hand lane (to turn into Tadworth Street). Can the existing markings be made much clearer and can there be additional markings to indicate to those drivers who carry out these dangerous manoeuvres, the error of their ways.”

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“The white lining around the Tadworth Road roundabout has been added to the priority list of sites for remarking. It is anticipated that these works should be completed in the forthcoming months.

County Council officers have met with Surrey Police to discuss and view the layout of the road markings and the operation of the roundabout. The result of this meeting was that the road signs and lane markings were considered to be sufficient for the current physical layout of the roundabout and that the behaviour of some drivers may be the issue. There are straight ahead arrows on the centre lane and straight ahead and right on the right hand lane. In peak times both lanes are required for the A217 traffic so it would not be possible to dedicate one lane for right turning only.

Consideration, however, is to be given to adding a plate stating ‘Dorking’ to the local advance direction sign which currently only states Headley to the right whereas the road markings state Headley and Dorking.

In addition discussions have been held with the County Council’s traffic signal engineers regarding the signal operation of this junction. Currently this junction operates on a fixed time basis and there are aspirations to modify the signals to be more responsive, address driver behaviour and queuing at this junction and have the ability to respond to incidents on the M25. This will require funding to undertake the traffic counts, traffic modelling and feasibility work in addition to the costs of installing additional equipment on site. Officers are currently in discussion regarding possible sources of funding in 2007/08 or whether funding needs to be sought from 2008/09 budgets.”

Signage Posts – A217

“The A217 from the Burgh Heath traffic lights to the Tadworth Roundabout has nearly 100 metal post carrying signs, lights etc and some doing nothing. Can the area be cleared up please?”

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“All signs and street lighting on the A217 should be in place for a specific reason, if specific locations and details can be given where it is believed that a sign or street lighting column is not required an assessment can then be undertaken and a reason given as to why this element of street furniture is required.

It is accepted that in some instances it may be possible to combine some of the signs or install signs onto street lighting columns. This would involve costs for the relocation of signs, removal of redundant posts and the associated traffic management costs. As the current signs are functional and this is an issue of aesthetics it has a lower priority than other safety issues along the A217 due to the level of available funding.

It is also understood that there may be instances of redundant street lighting units within the central reserve. Where this has occurred these have been made safe and their removal is again an issue of priority against the available funding for such works.”

Red Light Violation Camera – Burgh Heath Traffic Lights

“The red light camera on the Reigate Road arm of the Burgh Heath traffic lights has not been in place for some months. It does not appear to be very successful in stopping drivers driving through the red light. Is it operational yet and, if so, how many fixed penalty tickets have been issued for this camera?”

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“Advice on this issue has been sought from the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership (SSCP). The SSCP have confirmed that although the housing for the red light violation camera was in place several months ago, actual enforcement only began more recently in July. The reason for this is that the traffic signal head opposite the camera had to be relocated to be within the frame of the pictures taken by the camera, and an issue with the power supply to be rectified.

From the beginning of July this camera has been active in issuing penalties for a number of red light violation offences. The County, however, do not

release detailed information related to the levels of enforcement provided at safety camera sites such as the number of tickets issued. This is because the County have 4 red light violation cameras that are deployed within 14 red light violation camera housings throughout Surrey (not all housings are "live" at any one time and a "dummy" flash is provided at sites while they do not have a "live" camera).

All sites receive "live" camera enforcement, but some sites receive more than others depending upon the extent of the road safety problem at each site. If information on the level of use of individual sites is released, this could diminish the effect on road safety, as drivers may be tempted to ignore red traffic signals at sites they perceive to have little chance of being issued with a penalty. The County Council would seek to exempt this information if asked under the Freedom of Information Act, and exemptions to the provision of this type of information have been upheld by the Information Commissioner previously."

Central Reservation Barriers – A217

"The speed camera on the central reservation of the A217 between Tadworth and Burgh Heath has large lengths of unsightly crash barrier around it. Why? Pedestrians have to walk within a metre of fast moving traffic with no protection. Is this right?"

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

"A similar question was raised at the Local Committee meeting on 24th July 2006 and officers from the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership (SSCP) provided a response to this issue. An edited version of this response is reproduced along with additional comments from the East Surrey Highway Service.

Safety fencing has been provided by Surrey County Council on behalf of the SSCP at a number of safety camera sites across the county. Surrey County Council are the lead partner of the SSCP and have responsibility for the installation and maintenance of safety camera sites. Upon the creation of the SSCP 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 road side objects from traffic and 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 would be required.

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 on the highway and the safe provision of the safety camera sites and the enforcement that they provide. There have also been instances of vehicles colliding with speed cameras believed to be as an act of vandalism.

It is important to note that prior to April 2007 all the costs of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership were reclaimed from central government, and were ultimately met from the fines that the cameras generated. Therefore the cost of the provision of the safety fencing was at no direct cost to the taxpayer, and had no bearing on the budget for other highway works in the County Council (the fines from the cameras could only be used to reclaim the costs of camera related activity and not to raise revenue for other purposes. These costs were subject to external financial audit to ensure that this was the case).

The East Surrey Highway Service (ESH) would also comment on the footways adjacent to the A217. In many cases there is insufficient space to provide a barrier along the footways adjacent to the A217 without reducing the footway width below a usable width or that would require landtake from private properties, which can be a lengthy and costly process and may not result in the land being acquired. ESH is, however, seeking to improve the footways along the A217 within available funding. In 2006/07 the footway adjacent to the A217 southbound from Chipstead Lane to Green Lane was resurfaced and overgrown verges cut back. Similar treatment is planned in 2007/08 for the footway adjacent to the A217 northbound from Holly Lodge to Chipstead Lane roundabout.

In addition ESH have investigated the accident history along the A217 in the last 3 years and there have not been any personal injury accidents involving pedestrians in the areas highlighted in this question. ESH officers would, however, welcome a meeting with the Divisional County Councillor and Borough Ward Councillors to discuss any specific areas where pedestrians feel vulnerable and where additional measures may be able to be provided."

Signage – Tadworth Roundabout

"The new post carrying the waiting restriction signs in Tadworth are all tall. I notice that in other areas e.g. Banstead, much shorter posts are used. Presumably the short post are less expensive and they are much less intrusive in addition to being easier for a driver to see. Could we please be asked in future which would be better for our area?"

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“Shorter posts were generally used on grass verges at junctions where they were used to define a ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ restriction. As there were often between two and four signs at a single junction (depending upon the number of arms) short posts were used to provide more clarity at the junction. In addition, as these posts were located in the verges there was no requirement to provide clearance for pedestrians.

The new regulations do not require signing for a ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ restriction and these are to be gradually removed as funding allows. Other restriction signs along a length of a road have generally been mounted at 2.1 metre mounting height to provide clearance height and avoid being a hazard to passing pedestrians. As such the posts in Tadworth comply with current standards.”

2 Cllr R C Newstead, Member for Reigate Hill, asked the following questions:

Pedestrian Crossing / Refuge – A217 Reigate Hill

“What progress has been made to provide a pedestrian crossing/refuge on the A217 Reigate Hill, Reigate in the vicinity of the Yew Tree public house?”

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“As outlined in the response given at the Local Committee meeting on 20th November 2006, the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and the Police had raised concerns relating to the speed of traffic in the proposed location for the pedestrian refuge island and that the 30mph speed limit be extended northwards along Reigate Hill and following the making of the Traffic Order and installation of the 30mph road signs, that speed surveys be undertaken.

At the Local Committee meeting on 20th November it was reported that the southbound 30mph speed limit sign had yet to be installed, which in turn was delaying the speed surveys. This sign has now been installed and a speed survey was undertaken by the Police. There was, however, a fault with the speed survey equipment that resulted in corruption of the data. As such a further survey is to be undertaken by the Police during September 2007.

The Local Highway Manager would welcome a meeting with the County Divisional and Borough Ward Member to discuss the results of the speed survey and practicalities, including the available space, of the potential location for a pedestrian island on Reigate Hill.”

Traffic Calming – A2044 Woodhatch Road

“Is the Highways Authority satisfied with the effectiveness of the traffic-calming measures introduced along the A2044 Woodhatch Road between Pendleton Road and the A23 Horley Road?”

The Local Highways Manager Responded:

“Since the installation of the traffic calming measures along A2044 Woodhatch Road there have been no recorded personal injury accidents. In addition no issues have subsequently been raised by Surrey Police and the Divisional County Councillor has commented that it is perceived that speeds have reduced in this area. Further ongoing monitoring of this scheme can be undertaken and the post scheme speeds are being monitored by the Community Speedwatch that operates in this area.

The Local Highway Manager would welcome comments from the Local Committee as to any issues they may have regarding Woodhatch Road.”