



**LOCAL COMMITTEE
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

20 SEPTEMBER 2010

Six questions have been received relating to Agenda Item 7 – High Road, Chipstead – Experimental Kerb Build-out and Priority Give Way

1. A question from Ms Julie Rogers, a resident of Chipstead:

“Can the Members confirm the area that constitutes “Chipstead Village” for traffic calming purposes as referred to in the report? This will then allow the measure of any traffic calming that has been gained by the experiment. As the best practice guide states: ‘It is important to firmly establish the precise boundary of the area under study as all addresses within the study area are directly affected. The study area should include all roads where proposals may have an effect on traffic movements and is likely to include roads where traffic calming is not proposed. In addition, some roads, typically culs de sac, may feed directly affected roads with no available alternative route and these should also be included in the study area.’ Can it be concluded from the report as presented to Members that this experimental measure will address ‘the volume of traffic using the local road network in Chipstead as link between the A23 and A217’, i.e. my interpretation of Chipstead Village? To conclude can Members confirm that measurements will be taken across the wider area of Chipstead, and any shift in rat-running traffic will result in the scheme being cancelled? ”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“In the context of the scheme for High Road, Chipstead, Chipstead Village is defined as the area bounded by and including Castle Road and Elmore Road to the south, High Road and How Lane to the east, and Outwood Lane to the west. Automatic traffic counts measuring volume and speed over a 7 day period will take place on all arms of the junction of High Road with Castle Road and Elmore Road and also on Outwood Lane in the vicinity of the Ramblers Rest public house. Manual traffic counts will be carried out at the junctions of High Road/Castle Road/Elmore Road, High Road/Hazelwood Lane and Castle Road/Outwood Lane which will supplement the automatic counts and provide information on turning movements for the peak periods.

The data collected before and after implementation of the scheme, subject to Local Committee approval being given, will enable any displacement of traffic to be identified and quantified. The results of the traffic counts will form part of the review of the scheme, which will be reported to a future meeting of the Local Committee for decision as to whether the scheme should be made permanent.”

2. A question from Mr Geoff Eales, a resident of Chipstead:

“This scheme is on the direct route of the official annual London to Brighton Bike Ride and is used by cyclists keen to follow the official route throughout the year. At para 6.1.5 of the Dept of Transport March 2007 Directive on Traffic Calming it states cyclists can feel threatened when it takes the form of a localised narrowing of the carriageway and the construction of cycle by-passes need to be considered and cycle lanes need to be no less than 1.5m wide. Further para 6.4.11 says cycling by-passes around chicanes should be strongly considered and that the views of local cycling groups should be taken into account. Has the Committee considered this Directive and the needs of cyclists and all aspects of its own Traffic Calming Best Practice Guidance concerning cyclists? If it has not, will the Committee reject this application until the proper consultation with the Council’s Cycling Officer and cycling groups has been completed and considered? If it has can I have a copy of the relevant papers?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“The measure being proposed for High Road, Chipstead, is a kerb build-out with priority afforded to one direction of traffic rather than a general road narrowing. Cyclists would either have priority over on-coming traffic or be expected to obey the traffic signs and give way, proceeding only when the road ahead is clear and it is safe to do so. Department for Transport guidance on Cycle Infrastructure Design (Local Transport Note 2/08) states that, in the absence of a cycle bypass, a minimum gap of 4 metres is recommended. The remaining road width between the proposed kerb build out and the edge of carriageway at 4 metres would not introduce a pinch point for cyclists and complies with Department of Transport guidance.

The needs of cyclists have been addressed as part of the scheme design. Consultation with the County’s Cycling Officer and cycling groups has not been carried out at this stage but would be sought if the scheme is approved and would form part of the review of the experimental scheme.

3. A question from Mr Terry Cushing, a resident of Chipstead:

“Summary of Plan – the summary states that the kerb build-out will be taken out if unforeseen safety problems arise or there are access issues for large vehicles entering or leaving the recreation ground or rugby club. Why isn’t it planned to remove the build-out if the diversion causes traffic problems elsewhere?”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“Road safety is of paramount importance and if compromised by the scheme, would require timely intervention. Similarly, access to the car park and Rugby Club for large vehicles has to be maintained and whilst the impact of the scheme has been

checked using computer software and the views of the operators of these vehicles sought, occasionally unforeseen problems arise requiring appropriate action to be taken.

Traffic surveys will be required following the implementation of the scheme, if approved by Local Committee, to quantify the extent of any displacement of traffic as a result of the kerb build-out in High Road. This survey would not be carried out immediately after construction of the scheme, as time would need to be given to enable new travel patterns to be established. A decision would then be taken at a future meeting of the Local Committee as to whether the impact of any traffic displacement outweighs the benefits of the scheme. The above does not preclude the scheme being removed if safety problems arise from any displacement of traffic."

4. A question from Mr Colin Coxall, a resident of Chipstead:

"Will Members please take note of the independently commissioned report by Crowd Dynamics Limited (attached as Annex A), a transport planning and movement consultancy experienced in the design of traffic management schemes across the UK? Will Members please take particular note of the recommendation relating to public safety to road users and follow the recommendations of the Director of Crowd Dynamics Limited that Surrey County Council undertake a safety audit on this scheme before a decision is made on its implementation?"

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

"A Stage 1 (Initial Design) Road Safety Audit was carried out by independent, experienced road safety engineers in June 2008. The audit identified a number of minor potential safety problems with the design such as overgrown vegetation, road signs and markings and the recommendations made by the auditors to address these issues have been incorporated into the design. The recommendation to provide high friction surfacing on the approaches to the proposed give way could not be justified as part of an experimental scheme but has been accepted as a measure that would be included as part of any future permanent scheme. Likewise, any potential drainage issues would be resolved in the design of any permanent scheme.

Crowd Dynamics Ltd raise particular concerns with visibility for northbound drivers and the exit from the rugby club. The safety audit also raised visibility as a problem but considered that cutting back the overhanging vegetation would enable forward visibility to be provided in accordance with current advice. Agreement has been reached with the landowner for the vegetation to be cut back to his boundary by the Council's contractor.

The safety audit did not identify an issue with vehicles turning left to leave the rugby club conflicting with northbound traffic passing the kerb build-out. The Highway Code states that a driver should look all around before emerging at a junction. Drivers turning left out of the rugby club would therefore be expected to check for traffic to their left. Drivers would also be aware of the kerb build-out as they would have seen it on entering the rugby club.

Advice was sought from the Road Safety Audit Team regarding whether a Stage 2 (Detailed Design) Road Safety would be required before implementation of an experimental scheme. The guidance given was that a Stage 2 audit should be undertaken for the design of any permanent scheme. It was agreed with the auditors that their comments be sought as part of the review of the experimental scheme."

5. A question from Mr and Mrs Chris and Sue Rapley, residents of Chipstead:

“My husband and I have lived here since July 2006 and we have not been consulted in any way about the proposed new traffic scheme that is about to be installed in the High Road, Chipstead. We have received no posters, letters or any other form of communication about the proposed scheme and only heard about the scheme a few weeks ago. We believe that this scheme is being imposed upon us without consultation and would ask the Councillors who sit on the Reigate and Banstead Local Committee to reject this scheme on the grounds that we have not been consulted and our views have not been heard.”

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

“The County’s Traffic Calming Good Practice Guidance sets out advice on consultation for permanent traffic calming schemes. The level of any consultation carried out would need to be appropriate to the scale of the scheme, based on the methodology set out in the guidance.

It is intended that the scheme in High Road, Chipstead, would be introduced on an experimental basis and so the advice regarding preliminary consultation is more appropriate to this situation. Consultation with local residents would then be carried out once the scheme is in place and the actual impact of the scheme on traffic movements is known.

The Chipstead Residents’ Association (CRA) agreed to use their links with the local community to inform residents of the proposed experimental scheme. This has been carried out in a number of ways, as set out in an article dated 15 August 2010 on the CRA’s website and summarized below.

- (i) Report of the CRA Annual Report in May 2010 of “agreement in principle with Surrey County Council for the installation of experimental traffic calming measures in the heart of Chipstead”. The Annual Report was posted to every household in Chipstead.
- (ii) Presentation of details of scheme with drawings at the CRA AGM on 8 June 2010. All Chipstead residents received a written invitation to the meeting.
- (iii) Scheme presented at the CRA stand at the Chipstead Flower Show on 17 July 2010.
- (iv) Scheme details included in the July CRA email newsletter.
- (v) Article in the August 2010 issue of the St Margaret’s Parish Magazine.

The August CRA email newsletter included in full the article posted on CRA’s website.

The CRA has no doubt that every Chipstead household has been informed of the proposals and been given ample opportunity to express their views about the scheme specifically and about Chipstead’s traffic problems more generally.

The CRA website article confirms that the CRA would be keeping residents fully informed of the progress of the experimental scheme through newsletters and their

website and would be inviting comment on the scheme from all Chipstead residents during the trial period.

Representations have been received from local residents following the publication of information about the proposals by the CRA. These views have been included in the report to Local Committee, an item on this agenda, for consideration by Members when deciding whether to approve the experimental scheme for implementation.

If Local Committee approves the experimental scheme, the County would work with the CRA to ensure comprehensive consultation is carried out with all residents and businesses within the area affected by the scheme."

6. A question from Ms Claudine Duckworth, a resident of Chipstead:

"If this scheme is approved, I and my neighbours will clearly be adversely affected by it. Obviously, the aim is to cause such a level of obstruction that traffic will take the most discernible route across the High Road into Castle Road and along Outwood Lane. Outwood Lane is narrow and winding with poor sightlines and no street lighting or pavements. Already during the rush hour I experience great difficulty crossing the road. Has any consideration been given to how much worse and unsafe the situation would be if the scheme is approved?"

The Chairman responds on behalf of the Committee:

"The main objectives of the scheme, as set out on the CRA website and included in the August CRA email newsletter, are:

- (i) to significantly reduce the volume of traffic through the village
- (ii) to encourage more traffic to avoid Chipstead and stay on the major roads which were designed for heavy traffic
- (iii) to significantly reduce the speed of traffic in the village
- (iv) to significantly reduce the personal risk to Chipstead residents

The aim is not to cause such a level of obstruction and delay in High Road that traffic is displaced to other local roads such as Castle Road and Outwood Lane. It is not possible to determine at this stage how drivers will change their routes in response to the proposed traffic calming measure in High Road. For this reason, traffic surveys will be carried out before the scheme is implemented and during the experimental period, as described in the response to Question 1 on this item, to enable any changes to be quantified."

NOTES:

- (i) Surrey County Council's constitution, (Standing Order 66) requires that public questions be sent in writing to the Local Committee and Partnership Officer at least 7 days before the meeting.
- (ii) At the discretion of the Chairman, a member of the public who has given notice of a question may ask one supplementary question relevant to the subject of the original.

The Outwood Lane Residents Association

FAO Colin Coxall & Terry Townsend



Crowd Dynamics Limited
3A Toft Road
Knutsford
Cheshire
WA16 0PE

Date: 16th September 2010

Dear Colin and Terry,

HIGH ROAD, CHIPSTEAD - Experimental Priority Give Way

On behalf of the Outwood Lane Residents Association we have been asked to comment on the proposals to install a 'Priority Give Way' scheme on High Road, close to its junction with Elmore Road.

Crowd Dynamics is a transport planning and movement consultancy experienced in the design of traffic management schemes across the UK and hence in a position to provide a technical response on the proposal.

Crowd Dynamics has concerns about the design and location of the proposed scheme, to such an extent that we consider that members should not approve its implementation until a safety audit of the scheme has been completed by Surrey County Council which responds to the concerns we raise below.

Our concerns are as follows:

- i) The location of the restriction is poor. It lies on a bend on High Road with boundary hedging limiting visibility. Our initial views are that northbound motorists, unless they pull right up to the give way line, will not have sufficient visibility around the 'buildout'. Visibility limitations appear to be such that when certain northbound motorists pull out to pass the buildout they will not be able to see an approaching southbound vehicle sufficiently far back. The southbound motorist will have to give way to this northbound motorist in advance of the buildout to enable them to pass. However they could be within the safe stopping distance of this point at the time that they first become aware of the northbound vehicle. This is a potentially serious safety issue. The attached photo highlights the limited visibility. The design seems to rely on northbound drivers pulling right up to the give way line before entering the single lane section. If they start to enter the single lane section even a limited distance in advance of the buildout their visibility of oncoming vehicles is seriously compromised. We consider it unlikely that all drivers will pull right up the buildout before passing it and this could lead to potential conflicts within the single lane section of highway.



- ii) The exit from the rugby club is in the single lane section of road. The rugby club is a well used facility with over 100 parking spaces. It is therefore not a minor residential access. Users of the club, especially non-regular users turning left upon exiting the club may only look to their right, see no traffic and enter High Road being unaware that northbound traffic will be on the wrong side of the road and immediately upon them. This is likely to create a safety problem.
- iii) The calming measure is unlikely to be sufficiently conspicuous at night time because of the lack of street lighting. It is good practice for such measures to be placed in streets with lighting. Indeed Surrey County Councils publication entitled "Traffic Calming Good Practice Guidelines" Para 2.8.3 states "*Chicanes and narrowing should be conspicuous both in day and night time conditions for drivers and there should always be adequate street lighting*".
- iv) There are no specific provisions past the buildout for cyclists. Given the poor location and lack of lighting we consider this lack of provision for cyclists could also be a safety concern

We therefore recommend that Surrey County Council undertake a detailed safety audit on this scheme before a decision is made on its implementation.

We are also surprised at the lack of information provided on the potential benefits that such a scheme is seeking to provide in the local area such that any deficiencies in the detailed design of the actual proposals can be balanced against safety, amenity or congestion benefits in the local area within the influence of the scheme. Equally information should be provided on the likely disbenefits on alternative routes. For example it is good practice to identify the accident records of the routes which could be relieved of traffic and those to receive more traffic, similarly the number of residential frontages that are likely to receive reductions in flows compared with those receiving increases in traffic volumes.



We therefore suggest that further information be provided to members to enable them to be able to make a fully informed judgement on the pros and cons of the priority scheme for High Road. Until members are provided with more information we do not consider a decision should be made by them on these proposals

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "C F Oakley". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke underneath the name.

Chris Oakley
Director
Crowd Dynamics Limited.

Tel: 01565 658440
Email: chris.oakley@crowddynamics.com