

Supplementary Agenda

Elmbridge
Local Committee

**We welcome you to
Elmbridge Local Committee**
Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You



Venue

Location: Council Chamber,
Elmbridge Civic
Centre, High Street,
Esher, KT10 9SD

Date: Monday, 4 December
2017

Time: 4.00 pm



SURREY

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

3 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS (Pages 1 - 4)

To answer any questions or receive a statement from any member of the public who lives, works or studies in the Elmbridge Borough area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Partnership Committee Officer at least by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

The questions and officer response are attached.

6 PETITIONS (Pages 5 - 8)

Hare Lane, Claygate petition to improve road safety by reducing speed limit to 20mph

Since the publication of the agenda the petitioner has indicated that the request related to a defined area of the road and not the full length of Hare Lane. An amended response is attached.

8 A245 STOKE ROAD - SPEED LIMIT [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION] (Pages 9 - 10)

Since the publication of the agenda, a number of concerns have been brought to the attention of the Area Highways Manager, including the highlighting of an incorrect figure in the table of speed survey results. The attached briefing note responds to these concerns.

**SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 4 December 2017****AGENDA ITEM 03****WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS****Question 1: Arthur Way**

I have read the papers concerning 'A245 Stoke Road – Speed Limit' and, as a resident on the Stoke Road in Stoke d'Abernon (45 Stoke Road, KT11 3BH), would like to lend my complete support to the submission by Surrey Police that the speed limit reverts to 40 mph.

My impression is that the 30mph limit has made no difference to vehicle speeds along the road, which is borne out by SCC's survey which shows that average speeds have actually risen.

I would also like to voice my opposition to any form of traffic calming measures along Stoke Road. It is a very busy road, quite unsuitable for chicanes, speed bumps and other impediments. Quite apart from the huge cost and disruption of 'developing and implementing a scheme of engineering measures to encourage drivers to slow down', there would be implications for local pollution levels as vehicles slow down and then accelerate again. In addition, Stoke Road is used by a wide variety of emergency services – including fire, police, ambulance and paramedics – on a daily basis, and also carries a high level of large commercial vehicles (trucks, buses and coaches), even more so when there is a problem on the M25.

At a time when budgets are stretched seemingly to the limit, and in the light of Surrey Police's observations, do the councillors believe that it is a wise use of the Council's limited financial resources to allocate money on what seems to be a totally unnecessary project?

Officer Response:

The question is noted, it will be for the Committee to decide what action they think is appropriate.

Question 2: Martin Elbourne

In the Surrey Police report dated 20/11/2017 which forms part of the supporting documentation to the Highways A245 Stoke Road – Speed Limit Report, which is to be considered at the SCC Local Committee (Elmbridge) on 4 December 2017, paragraph 1.3 states that '....there appears to be no historic data for sites 4 and 5.....'.

Can Highways please explain why historic data from the speed assessments carried out along Stoke Road in 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2016 was not made available to the Police?

ITEM 3

Officer Reponse:

Sites 4 and 5 were additional sites to provide further information, as per paragraph 2.2 of the SCC report.

The historical data (prior to 2014) is not material to the decision, and therefore hasn't been included. In terms of the policy, only the very latest data from September 2017 is needed to assess whether the speed limit reduction has been successful. Regardless of any historical data, most of the mean speeds measured in September 2017 are above threshold set within the policy for the scheme to be deemed successful.

Following the reduction in speed limit there were speed surveys in March 2015. Following the change of speed limit, there was a short window before the start of extended utility works. Surveys were commissioned, but there wasn't enough time before the utility works to wait the full three months settling in time required by the policy, so in terms of the policy the 2015 surveys cannot be used for decision making.

There were also speed surveys in September 2016. These were intended to be the 'after' surveys required by the policy, following an extended period of extensive utility works. However, additional utility works then took place in the period immediately before the 2016 surveys, meaning that these speeds would then be seen as unrepresentative in line with the policy (i.e. the time needed for the scheme to settle down). Hence the additional surveys in March 2017 were commissioned, being the next opportunity for representative surveys following a settling in time. The 2015 and 2016 results were shared with Surrey Police for information, but do not form part of the assessment. The police comment "there appears to be no historic data for sites 4 and 5" is correct insofar as the data cannot be used as 'before' speeds for comparison.

All data used in the assessment has been shared with Surrey Police. Stoke Road was discussed at a recent (16th November 2017) partnership meeting of Surrey's Road Safety Team and Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. The recent speed survey results were noted for consideration in police enforcement duties.

Question 3: Mike Prentice

Regarding the Stoke Road speed restriction, I write to put forward the following questions:

1. Following the report that states that a 30mph restriction is not working and has recommended the continued use of 40mph, on what grounds would the council not follow the advice given?
2. This investigation seems to have been pursued by a narrow interest group led by individuals who are involved with Surrey Council, Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust and Stoke D' Abernon Residents Association. These individuals all live either on Stoke Road or adjacent to it, therefore potentially there can be a perception that there is a conflict of interest on this issue. Should the council decide to ignore the safety recommendations made, what safe guards would the council put in place to ensure that any further investigations of alternative methods of controlling speed would be led by parties with no potential conflict of interest?

3. Currently, local communities have little or no knowledge of the intent to change the speed limit on Stoke Road or the process that has been taking place. Should the Council decide to continue these investigations, what action will the council take to ensure that everyone who will be impacted by any change will have the opportunity to be provided with information about any proposal and be consulted?
4. It is documented that the most effective way of reducing traffic speeds is with vertical shifts in carriageway and that other measures are of limited use. Should the council decide to consider traffic calming measures, will any proposal contain within it evidence of the likely effectiveness of speed reduction and consider the unintended consequence of potential increase in traffic noise, pollution and congestion?
5. The road is frequently used by lorries eg refuse trucks going to and from the Leatherhead Refuse centre, how will the Council ensure traffic calming measures eg chicanes do not create dangerous motoring situations and congestion?
6. Stoke Road has the appearance of a semi rural road. It is mainly straight, tree lined and attractive. Will the council take into consideration any negative impact of visual amenity that would occur with additional street furniture and obstacles.

Officer response:

1. The report has recommended that Committee either reinstates the previous 40mph speed limit, or develops a scheme of engineering measures to encourage drivers to slow down. In terms of the policy either option is equally valid and it is Committee's choice one way or the other. The only option that is not available to Committee is to keep the current 30mph speed limit with no additional engineering measures.
2. Committee cannot ignore the recommendations that have been made. Any investigation of engineering measures to encourage drivers to slow down would be led by Surrey County Council's engineering teams in consultation with the Divisional Member. Before additional measures could be introduced, there would need to be a public consultation to give any interested party an opportunity to comment.
3. Surrey County Council's Highways Service has recently adopted new guidelines for consultation when promoting changes to Highway infrastructure. These guidelines stipulate that for a proposed change of speed limit, we would ensure details are published on the County Councils website. We would inform the Divisional Member, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Local Committee, the Borough Council, Surrey Police, any residents' association, frontagers, users of the highway (by means of large signs displayed on site, and bus operators (if there was a possible impact on services). For a scheme that involved traffic calming, we would also inform the fire and ambulance services, any local cycling interest group, any local chamber of commerce, residents of adjacent roads (where an impact is likely on adjacent roads), and the Road Haulage Association & Freight Transport Association if a weight / width / length restriction is proposed.
4. Officers would agree that one of the most effective ways to reduce traffic speeds is by implementation of road humps – and also that such features lead to concerns about noise, vibration and pollution. Road humps do not normally result in traffic congestion. Any proposal to introduce any kind of traffic calming would be reported to Committee to decide whether to proceed, and Committee would

ITEM 3

need to consider both the benefits and drawbacks of any proposed scheme, and also the responses to the public consultation.

5. All Highway improvement schemes are subjected to a three stage Road Safety Audit process. The first two Road Safety Audit stages are during the design phase, to ensure, so far as reasonably practicable, that a scheme would be safe for all road users if implemented. The third Road Safety Audit stage takes place after a scheme has been implemented and is in operation, to check for any safety problems that were not anticipated during the design phase. Schemes involving road humps do not normally result in congestion. Schemes involving chicanes and pinch-points can result in congestion, and this drawback would need to be considered by Committee in any decision to promote such a scheme.
6. Some traffic calming measures do tend to make a road feel more urban and cluttered. This is a drawback that Committee would need to consider in any decision to promote such a scheme.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)

DATE: 4TH DECEMBER 2017

**SUBJECT: PETITION TO IMPROVE ROAD SAFETY ON HARE LANE,
CLAYGATE**

DIVISION: OXSHOTT, HINCHLEY WOOD AND CLAYGATE



PETITION DETAILS:

A petition has been received which reads as follows:

We, the undersigned, petition that Surrey County Council (SCC) takes action to reduce the speed of traffic and improve safety for road and footpath users on Hare Lane in Claygate. We believe that SCC must take action to protect local residents, road users and the environment.

Hare Lane is the main artery through Claygate. It is used by a significant amount of local and non-local traffic. It is very narrow and struggles to cope with the large volume of traffic at peak times. Speeds are often in excess of the current 30 mph speed limit. During rare, quieter periods, cars travel at even greater speeds. Aside from the fact that a large proportion of vehicles using the road disregard the speed limit, we believe that the current limit of 30 mph is too high for this stretch of road and that it should be reduced to 20 mph.

Hare Lane is narrow and winding at its western end, with a narrow pavement (sufficient for only one pedestrian) on one side of the road. Vehicles pass very close to pedestrians who are in danger of being hit by wing mirrors – we have testimony from a number of pedestrians who have been hit by mirrors. Large vehicles struggle to pass each other and have been witnessed mounting the pavement for some distance. Cyclists are in great danger and create a hazard to themselves and vehicles trying to pass them. Vehicles frequently take the risk of passing cyclists as they approach blind corners, passing so close that they are in danger of hitting the cyclist. Residents on the opposite side have no footpath fronting their properties and face a perilous exit from their driveways and great danger crossing the road. The single footpath is used by commuters, employees of local businesses, local residents and many school children, some of whom are very young and accompanied by an adult with a pushchair which is only just accommodated by the pavement. The junction with Loseberry Road is particularly hazardous. Vehicles, horses, cyclists and pedestrians joining Hare Lane from Loseberry Road have no line of sight due to the curvature of the road.

Action is needed.

We demand that the Council:

- (i) Reduces the speed limit to 20 mph (at least between The Swan and the railway bridge)
- (ii) Introduces traffic calming measures, for example speed tables, i.e. raising the level of the road, at the entrance to Claygate and at the junction with Loseberry Road.

The petition has subsequently clarified that the section of Hare Lane that the petitioners intended to focus on was between The Swan PH and the railway bridge. The petition has been signed by 75 signatories, including representatives of 25 households in Hare Lane itself. Supporting information has been provided by the petitioners, and is included in Annexes A and B.

OFFICER COMMENT:

The C158 Hare Lane is the main road through Claygate. The section between The Swan PH and the railway bridge is approximately 500m long and connects with Milbourne Lane at its western end. To the south and east Hare Lane continues through the centre of Claygate eventually connecting with High Street. There are approximately 30 residential dwellings that front onto this section of Hare Lane. The environment from the drivers' point of view is semi-rural. There is frontage development on one side of the road, and a near continuous vegetation screen on the other. The geometry of Hare Lane is narrow and twisting in this section. The footways are narrow, sometimes on one side of the road and sometimes on both sides.

The speed limit in Hare Lane is currently 30mph. The petition alleges that drivers are exceeding the 30mph speed limit on a regular basis. The petitioners are encouraged to raise this specific concern with Surrey Police, as Surrey Police are the sole agency with powers to take enforcement action against drivers who exceed the speed limit. Surrey County Council does not have up to date traffic survey data for Hare Lane, and so officers cannot offer specific comments on traffic speeds.

There have been nine injury accidents in Hare Lane in the past three year period for which data is available, with four of these at the junction with Foley Road.

The recently published Esher Transport Study survey results suggest that a significant proportion of traffic in Claygate at peak times is through traffic avoiding the congestion in Esher Town Centre. Committee has agreed to develop a scheme to update and optimise the system that coordinates the traffic signals with the objective of reducing congestion in Esher, which it is hoped would have the result of reducing the desirability of Claygate as a through route compared to Esher. The earliest the scheme in Esher could be delivered would be 2019-20.

In deciding how to respond to the petition, Committee should consider two questions:

- 1) Is it feasible to reduce the speed limit in the subject section of Hare Lane?
- 2) Is it a high priority at the present time?

There are two ways to reduce a speed limit to 20mph: by means of a *20mph limit* or by means of a *20mph zone*.

A *20mph limit* is indicated by terminal and repeater signs, making them very economical to introduce. However a *20mph limit* may only be introduced where traffic speeds are already low enough to be commensurate with a 20mph speed limit. The anecdotal evidence provided with the petition suggests that traffic speeds in Hare Lane are too high to introduce a *20mph limit*.

A *20mph zone* is indicated by terminal signs, and includes traffic calming features at regular intervals to ensure that traffic speeds are low enough to be commensurate with a 20mph speed limit. This makes *20mph zones* very expensive. The anecdotal evidence provided with the petition suggests that a *20mph zone* would be needed to reduce the speed limit to 20mph in Hare Lane. The cost of a *20mph zone* would be in the range £125,000 to £210,000, as a road table or similar feature would be needed every 60m to 100m.

Traffic calming of this sort is not universally popular due to concerns about noise and vibration, and may only be introduced following consultation with residents. Committee will remember that following consultation with residents of Aston Road and The Avenue, traffic calming in these roads was removed when these roads were resurfaced.

In terms of priority, there are a number of factors to consider – including the casualty history of the road, the nature of the road, the use of the road by different road users, and the quality of life for the residents.

There has only been three injury accidents in the past three year period in the subsection section of Hare Lane. No assessment has been undertaken as to whether speed was a contributory factor in these incidents, or indeed whether they might have been prevented if a *20mph zone* had been in place. That said, there is a well-documented statistical relationship that suggests that even for incremental reductions in traffic speeds, the likelihood and severity of road traffic collisions may be reduced.

The nature of the road is not particularly well suited to its use by road users. Pedestrian provision is very poor in places; the narrow twisting geometry is not well suited for high volumes of traffic.

The quality of life consideration is well answered in the supplementary information provided by petitioners in Annexes A and B.

If Committee were minded to take this matter forwards, noting the likely cost of the solution suggested by the petitioners, the next step would be to commission a speed assessment. A speed assessment would include traffic surveys to understand traffic speeds in different locations, and assess the frequency of traffic calming features that would be needed to lower traffic speeds sufficiently to introduce a *20mph zone*. As part of this assessment we would also consult Surrey Police. Consideration would also need to be given to any diversionary routes through Claygate that drivers might choose in preference to a traffic calmed section of Hare Lane, for example Raleigh Drive and Loseberry Road. A speed assessment would cost in the range £3,000 to £5,000, and would need to be funded from the parking surplus.

Committee should note that Claygate Parish Council receives a proportion of CIL payments from developments within Claygate, and may have funding to contribute to a speed assessment, or indeed the implementation of a scheme should one prove feasible.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to:

- (i) Decide whether to commission a speed assessment funded from the parking surplus, bearing in mind the likely cost of the solution suggested by the petitioners.

Contact Officer: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager
www.surreycc.gov.uk/elmbridge

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)



SURREY

DATE: 4TH DECEMBER 2017

LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER (NE)

SUBJECT: A245 STOKE ROAD – SPEED LIMIT
RESPONSE TO CONCERNS WITH PUBLISHED REPORT

DIVISION: COBHAM AND STOKE D'ABERNON

ANALYSIS:

Three concerns were brought to the attention of the Area Highways Manager following publication of the A245 Stoke Road – Speed Limit report to Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Elmbridge. These three concerns are highlighted in **bold** below, together with the Area Highway Manager's responses.

In Table 1 (under paragraph 2.4) the 39.3mph figure for the eastbound mean speed at site 3 in September 2017 is incorrect.

The figure of 39.3mph is the 85th percentile speed, and has been transposed incorrectly. The mean speed is 33.6mph. The conclusion of the report relating to the 30mph section is unaffected. Speeds have increased in the 40mph section to the east of the Chelsea training ground, although not as much as the incorrect figure suggested. This error has been highlight error to Surrey Police to give them the opportunity to review their advice. Committee will be advised of this error during the meeting. The incorrect figure is highlighted and corrected in the table below.

Also in Table 1 (under paragraph 2.4) are the 2014 mean speeds the same as the speeds which were reported to Committee when the decision was made to reduce the speed limit in June 2014?

The speeds in the 2014 report were rounded to the nearest whole number (two significant figures). The speeds presented in the current report are rounded to one decimal place (three significant figures).

In 2014 information was presented to facilitate a decision on whether to go ahead with the reduction to 30mph. The rounding did not make a difference to the decision at the time.

To demonstrate the effect of the speed limit reduction it is essential to present the 2014 and 2017 results to the same level of accuracy to enable a fair comparison. If the speed measurements were to be rounded to two significant figures this time then some of the smaller differences in measured speeds between 2014 and 2017 would have been lost in the rounding, which could make a difference to the decision that Committee now has to make.

In the table below the speed survey figures are presented to both two and three significant figures.

Is there any relevant historical speed data gathered prior to 2014?

Previous speed survey data is presented in the background reports referenced at the foot of the latest report. The latest report presents the most up to date data.

The table below shows:

- The incorrect figure in **red**, now corrected.
- Mean speeds rounded to both two and three significant figures

Ref.	Location	Date	Mean speed (mph)	
			Eastbound	Westbound
1	West of Pipers Close (lighting column No. 15)	2014	32.6 (3 s.f.) 33 (2 s.f.)	33.0 33
		March 2017	34.5 35	34.5 35
		Sept 2017	33.4 33	33.7 34
2	Between Oxshott Way and Fairmile Lane (lighting column No. 27)	2014	31.6 32	31.5 32
		March 2017	31.1 31	32.1 32
		Sept 2017	30.4 30	31.9 32
3	East of Chelsea training ground; 40mph section (equestrian warning sign)	2014	29.1 29	31.1 31
		March 2017	35.0 35	34.7 35
		Sept 2017	33.6 34	33.7 34
4	Tilt Common (on lighting column)	2014	Not measured	Not measured
		March 2017	32.5 33	32.4 32
		Sept 2017	32.5 33	31.5 32
5	Between Aspen Close and Vincent Road (on junction warning sign)	2014	Not measured	Not measured
		March 2017	29.9 30	30.5 31
		Sept 2017	30.4 30	31.2 31