



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE  
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

**PETITION REPORT  
CROYDON LANE, BANSTEAD**

**8 December 2008**

**KEY ISSUE**

To consider a petition prepared by Mrs D Potts of Lipsham Close, Banstead and signed by local residents.

**SUMMARY**

A petition has been received, signed by 106 residents of Lipsham Close, Fairlawn Grove, South Drive and Croydon Lane, Banstead with a covering letter dated 27 October 2008 signed by Mrs D Potts. The petition is headed "Petition to Request a Crossing in Croydon Lane by Fairlawn Grove Bus Stop". It states "The undersigned feel it is essential to have a crossing installed in such a busy road in order to keep safe local residents, especially school children, the elderly and those with disabilities".

## OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

**The Local Committee (Reigate and Banstead) are asked to note that:**

- (i) The number 166 bus serving Croydon Lane is on a route managed by Transport for London (TfL).
- (ii) An element of the route; between Banstead and Epsom Hospital, is funded by Surrey County Council.
- (iii) A feasibility study of an improved crossing facility at this location could be included in the County's Local Transport Plan forward programme. Given the demands on the Council's budget for highway improvements, it is unlikely that funding would be available to investigate or implement a scheme within the next two years.
- (iv) TfL have expressed their intention to fund accessibility improvements to stops along route 166 during the financial year 2010/11 in co-ordination with Surrey Highways and Surrey's Passenger Transport Group.
- (iii) Following Mrs Potts's previous representations to Surrey Highways, it has been requested of TfL they include a crossing facility at the stop in question and that they award priority for this facility over other measures planned for the route.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The bus serving Croydon Lane is number 166. This service originally followed a route from Chipstead Way, along Woodmansterne Street and Woodmansterne Lane to join Banstead Village. The route was changed to travel along Carshalton Lane and Croydon Lane in August 2003 due to the narrowness of Woodmansterne Lane.
- 1.2 The westbound stop in Croydon Lane had existed prior to the re-routing of the 166 and had served a weekly service to nearby shopping facilities. Shortly after the service was re-routed, an eastbound stop was introduced in the vicinity following requests from local residents keen to make use of the bus service that had become more convenient.
- 1.3 Buses travel along the 166 route every twenty minutes. Starting from Croydon in the east the bus visits Purley, Coulsdon, and Banstead. Every third Bus (one per hour) continues on to Epsom Downs and terminates at Epsom Hospital. The buses return to Croydon via the same route.
- 1.4 Croydon Lane is designated A2022 and subject to a 40 mph speed limit. No recent speed data is available.
- 1.5 Since the beginning of 2004 there have been 7 collisions resulting in personal injury along Croydon Lane within 1 kilometre of Lipsham Close.
  - 3 were shunts into the back of a stationary queue of traffic
  - 1 followed a turning movement into a side road
  - 1 was the result of a driver becoming fatigued
  - 1 due to loss of control at speed and
  - 1 involved a pedestrian.

All injuries were slight except the incident where speed was a factor.

- 1.6 Mrs Potts has been in correspondence with Surrey Highways prior to the petition and has been advised that the County are working with TfL who plan a programme of work to improve accessibility at stops along the 166 route. TfL budgets are not guaranteed but, at this time, it is thought possible that funding may be available to provide a pedestrian crossing during the financial year 2010/11.

## 2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 The Council's strategic transport policy includes improvements in accessibility and sustainability.
- 2.2 The request made by the petitioners to provide a crossing in the vicinity of the bus stop on the north side of Croydon Lane could improve accessibility and encourage use of a sustainable form of transport.
- 2.3 A signal crossing at this location is not thought suitable for this road due to the low level of use it would receive. DfT guidance suggests that lightly used signal crossings can become overlooked by drivers and ignored, even when displaying a red signal.

- 2.4 A zebra crossing would also be unsuitable due to the posted speed limit. Zebras are only permitted on roads where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is 35 mph or less.
- 2.5 Road widening and provision of a pedestrian island would be the most favoured option as it would serve to control speeds in the vicinity whilst offering a safe place to cross.
- 2.6 If any scheme is to be considered for implementation it would be subject to a feasibility study and Local Committee approval.
- 2.7 There are no schools in the immediate vicinity of the proposed crossing. However, testimony received from the petitioners indicates school children use the bus stop on the north side of Croydon Lane.
- 2.8 The accident history along Croydon Lane is not inordinately high given the speed and volume of traffic using it. Despite the appeal of the scheme it would receive relatively few points if scored against many of the other potential improvement schemes under review in Reigate and Banstead where higher levels of accidents have been identified.

### **3 OPTIONS**

- 3.1 Options available in response to the petition are:
  - Do nothing
  - Include a feasibility study of the issue in the LTP forward programme
  - Give an undertaking to continue to work with TfL with a view to their funding a pedestrian island as budgets permit

### **4 CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 No consultations have been undertaken at this time.
- 4.2 Any potential scheme would be subject to consultation with Surrey Police, TfL and local residents.

### **5 VALUE FOR MONEY AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The full cost of providing a pedestrian island has not been calculated.
- 5.2 Road widening, associated with an island, may involve diversion of buried utility apparatus beneath the verge. Any works planned would be designed to avoid the need for utility diversions where possible but scheme costs could be as high as £100,000.

### **6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 If a pedestrian crossing is to be provided, the design would incorporate facilities for the blind and disabled. At the moment they may be considered to be disadvantaged.
- 6.2 There are no other perceived equality or diversity implications.

## **7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 None identified at this time.

## **8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 Given the demands on the Council's budget for highway improvements, it is unlikely Surrey could provide funding to investigate or implement a scheme to provide a crossing within the next two years.

8.3 Based on the information made available by TfL, it may be possible for them to fund a crossing during the year 2010/11.

8.4 It is recommended Surrey Highways continue to work with TfL and encourage them to award priority to a crossing at this location against other accessibility improvements they have planned for the route.

## **9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

9.1 The recommendation is considered to offer the best compromise available between providing the facility requested and achieving value for money.

**LEAD OFFICER:** David Stempfer, Local Highway Manager  
(Reigate and Banstead)

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 08456 009 009

**E-MAIL:** eastsurreyhighways@surreycc.gov.uk

**CONTACT OFFICER:** David Stempfer

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 08456 009 009

**E-MAIL:** eastsurreyhighways@surreycc.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND** Petition dated 27 October 2008

**PAPERS:**

ANNEX 1 – LOCATION PLAN

