



## **OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (WOKING)**

### **ROAD LAYOUT AMENDMENTS AT LOCKFIELD DRIVE / WELL LANE JUNCTION**

**22 October 2009**

#### **KEY ISSUE**

To consider the inclusion of amendments to the road layout at the traffic signal junction of Lockfield Drive and Well Lane, which could be incorporated into planned resurfacing works in the 2009/10 financial year.

#### **SUMMARY**

This report sets out a proposal to use road markings to reduce the west-bound carriageway of Lockfield Drive to a single lane through the junction with Well Lane. Such a proposal was discussed when the Local Committee considered a petition in October 2007 and forthcoming resurfacing works will offer an opportunity to undertake this modification at minimal cost.

#### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Local Committee is asked to agree that:

- (i) on the basis that the work can be undertaken without any additional cost to the planned resurfacing work, the west bound carriageway of Lockfield Drive should be reduced to a single lane using white road markings and the traffic signal detector loops amended accordingly.
- (ii) if the proposal is likely to significantly increase the cost of the planned maintenance and cannot be funded from the central budget then the decision of whether to fund the changes from the local allocation budget is delegated to the Local Highway Manager following consultation with the Local Committee Chairman and relevant Divisional Members.

## **1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 This report seeks the authorisation of the Local Committee to implement changes to the road layout at the junction of Lockfield Drive with Well Lane as part of forthcoming resurfacing works on Lockfield Drive.
- 1.2 At its meeting on 30 October 2007, the Local Committee considered a petition that had been submitted and which asked for certain changes to be made to the pedestrian crossing over Lockfield Drive, just to the south-west of its junction with Well Lane.
- 1.3 The petition called for changes to the signal timings, for additional flashing signs to be erected and for a red light violation camera to be installed. The petition and the Officers' response are shown at Annex A.
- 1.4 During her presentation, the petitioner also asked for the two west-bound lanes to be reduced to a single lane. This is reflected in the minutes of the Local Committee meeting, which are shown at Annex B.
- 1.5 The agreed changes to the signal timings were undertaken during 2008 and appear to have resolved many of the problems. However, the opportunity has not yet arisen to change the road markings and layout, although a forthcoming resurfacing scheme may provide a chance to carry out these changes at no additional, or minimal cost.

## **2 ANALYSIS**

- 2.1 There are currently signal detector loops in each of the two west-bound approach lanes of this junction. It is intended that the single lane that replaces them should run centrally through the junction in order that there is insufficient room to encourage either over- or under-taking and to maximise the distance between vehicles and waiting pedestrians. This would render the current layout of detector loops useless and will require it to be altered and the loops replaced accordingly.
- 2.2 When road surfaces are planed off for the road to be re-surfaced, any signal loops in the relevant area are destroyed and have to be re-newed. However, the design and overall extent of the resurfacing scheme has yet to be finalised and it is not clear if all of the loops will be affected or whether all of the existing road markings will be planed off. This will ultimately determine whether it is financially viable to put in the single lane as part of this re-surfacing work and whether a further discussion between the Chairman of the Local Committee, the Divisional Members and the Local Highways Manager will need to take place.
- 2.3 Although a number of personal injury collisions have taken place at this junction during the last 3 years, none have involved waiting pedestrians being struck by passing vehicles in the scenario described by the petitioner. An injury to a pedestrian did occur but this appears to have been due to the inappropriate use of the crossing.

### **3 CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 No consultation has taken place with Divisional and Ward Members, other than the discussion at the Local Committee on 30 October 2007. The County Council's Traffic Systems Team, who are in charge of traffic signals, did not express any concerns about the revised layout when it was discussed with them in 2007/8. Surrey Police have not yet been consulted.

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

4.1 The planned resurfacing will require the replacement of the road markings and signal detector loops anyway. However, at the moment, it is not clear if this resurfacing work will extend over the entire length of Lockfield Drive that would need to be treated to allow the proposal to be implemented. As a consequence, it is not known if any additional costs might be incurred and if they are, whether they would still represent value for money.

### **5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The Highway Service is mindful of its responsibilities within this area and attempts to treat all users of the public highway with equality and understanding. The proposal should go some way to making pedestrians feel safer at this crossing, particularly with a sight, or mobility impairment.

### **6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 Anecdotally, there have been some instances of road rage caused by drivers speeding past other motorists through the signals and cutting-in in front of them. The proposed layout should remove the possibility for overtaking and, therefore, for cutting-in. Otherwise, there are no crime and disorder implications.

### **7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 The resurfacing scheme is planned to go ahead with or without the incorporation of this revised layout. It is likely that this resurfacing will provide the ideal opportunity to make these changes at no or minimal additional cost. Although it has not appeared on our programme as an individual scheme, had it done so, it would have scored highly in terms of being able to be included within a planned maintenance scheme.

## 8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 If the proposal does not significantly increase the cost of the planned maintenance scheme the revised layout should be introduced during the resurfacing scheme and allow the County Council to action an improvement that was discussed when the Local Committee considered a petition presented to it on 30 October 2007.

## 9 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

9.1 The extent of the resurfacing scheme is still to be determined and the proposal assessed to see if the cost could be borne entirely from the maintenance scheme budget. If there is no additional cost, the change can go ahead. If not, the Local Highway Manager will consult with the Chairman of the Local Committee and the Divisional Members and agree whether to fund the works from the local allocation budget.

**LEAD OFFICER:** Ian Haller Local Highway Manager  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 0300 200 1003  
**E-MAIL:** [wah@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surreycc.gov.uk)  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** Kevin Patching Engineer  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 0300 200 1003  
**E-MAIL:** [wah@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:wah@surreycc.gov.uk)  
**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** None

Version No. 1      Date: 08/10/09      Time: 17.35      Initials: ILH      No of annexes: 2