

Supplementary Agenda

Supplementary Agenda

- Item 5a -Public written questions
- Item 5b -Member written questions
- Item 6 – Petitions
- Item 8 – Public statement

We welcome you to

Mole Valley Local Committee

Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You



Venue

Location: Council Chamber,
Pippbrook, Reigate
Road, Dorking,
Surrey, RH4 1SJ

Date: Wednesday, 6 June
2018

Time: 2.00 pm



SURREY

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

5a PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Pages 1 - 4)

To receive any questions from Surrey County Council electors within the area in accordance with Standing Order 66.

5b MEMBER QUESTIONS (Pages 5 - 12)

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47.

6 PETITIONS (Pages 13 - 14)

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 65 or letters of representation in accordance with the Local Protocol. An officer response will be provided to each petition / letter of representation.

1. A petition has been received calling for the implementation of a residents' parking scheme in Howard Road and Arundel Road in Dorking.

8 DORKING TRANSPORT STUDY UPDATE [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR INFORMATION] (Pages 15 - 20)

This report is to update members on the current status of Stage 3 of the Dorking Transport Study. The study was commissioned to provide evidence to support a potential future funding bid for a transport package for Dorking Town Centre which could be submitted to the C2C LEP to address increasing town centre congestion problems.

11 COMMUNITY SAFETY FUNDING AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO TASK GROUPS AND EXTERNAL BODIES [EXECUTIVE FUNCTION] (Pages 21 - 22)

The local committee (Mole Valley) has a delegated budget of £3,000 for community safety projects in 2018/19. This report sets out the process by which this funding should be allocated to the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership and/or other local community organisations that promote the safety and wellbeing of residents. The report also seeks the approval of Local Committee task group members and the appointment of representatives to external bodies

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: 06 JUNE 2018
LEAD OFFICER: SARAH J SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

DIVISION: ALL DIVISIONS

Questions from Elizabeth Daly

1. What studies has Surrey County Council made and/or is it planning to make of the short-term and long-term highways implications, threats and opportunities for Bookham residents of the Howard of Effingham/Berkeley Homes development, in particular having regard to existing concerns about:
 - a) the speed of traffic in Rectory Lane and the safety of vulnerable users of The Grange and Gracewell Homes;
 - b) heavy goods traffic, speeding and rat-run issues in The Lorne and Hawkwood Rise;
 - c) the volume and speed of traffic along Lower Road and the A246, as well as other adjoining roads such as Little Bookham Street;
 - d) the safety of students walking and cycling to school along Lower Road and crossing the A246?

Response:

A planning application for outline planning permission for the erection of a replacement secondary school and up to 258 residential dwellings was submitted to Guildford Borough Council in October 2014. Guildford Borough Council refused planning permission for this development, however following an appeal and public enquiry the Secretary of State granted the planning permission.

As part of the planning application, a Transport Assessment was submitted ([14_P_02109-TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT](#)), which can be found on the Guildford Borough Council website. The content of the Transport Assessment was assessed by Surrey County Council's Transport Planning Development team. The content of the Transport Assessment demonstrated that the impact of the development on the local highway network was not significant enough to warrant the Transport Development Planning team to object to the planning application on the impact of the development of the Mole Valley highway/transport network.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

The Transport Assessment addresses some of the issues that you have raised in lettered points a) to d) above. However, over recent years traffic calming measures have been installed in Lower Road between the Howard Effingham School and the junction with Glebe Close. Also an off road shared footway/cycleway has been installed alongside Lower Road from the Howard Effingham School to the junction with Glebe Close. Despite this the Transport Assessment does not address the concerns that have been raised about the speed of traffic in Rectory Lane and the safety of vulnerable users of The Grange and Gracewell Homes. It also does not address the concerns that have been raised about heavy goods traffic, speeding and rat-run issues in The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise.

Both Rectory Lane and The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise link Lower Road to the A246 which connects Guildford to Leatherhead. A review of the personal injury collisions recorded by Surrey Police, shows that there have been no reported collisions on Rectory Lane or The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/12/14 to 30/11/17). Surrey County Council does not hold any speed survey data for either Rectory Lane or The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise, therefore these roads will be added to the list of roads, which require a speed survey to be carried out on them.

The Transport Planning Development team have requested Construction Transport Management Plans (one for the development on land known as Browns Field and one for the development on land known as Lodge Farm), and development cannot commence until these have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

The Construction Transport Management Plan for the development site known as Brown Fields must provide the following details and arrangements, and must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) The parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors,
- b) The loading and unloading of plants and materials
- c) The storage of plants and materials
- d) The public highway routing of heavy goods vehicles involved in the construction of the development to and from the site, to avoid unsuitable roads
- e) Measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- f) The on-site turning of construction vehicles

The Construction Transport Management Plan for the development site known as Lodge Farm must provide the following details and arrangements, and must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) The parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) The loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) The storage of plant and materials
- d) The routing of heavy goods vehicles involved in the construction of the development to and from the site, to avoid unsuitable roads
- e) Measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway
- f) The on-site turning of construction vehicles

- g) Proposals to avoid the movement of and by heavy goods vehicles, plant and equipment on Lower Road, Effingham during the weekday periods when pupils arrive and depart from schools in Effingham village have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Rectory Lane and The Lorne/Hawkwood Rise will be added to the list of speed surveys to be carried out. These surveys will be carried out as soon as funding is available and possibly in the 2019/2020 financial year.

2. What opportunities will there be for Bookham residents and district councillors to influence highways decisions relating to the Howard of Effingham/Berkeley Homes development both for the construction phase and for the longer term?

Response:

The opportunity for residents and district councillors to comment on the longer term impact of the development on the highway was during the planning application stage, when a number of comments/concerns regarding the development were received from residents/district councillors. Unfortunately despite the comments/concerns received the planning application was approved on appeal, by the Secretary of State.

The Mole Valley Local Committee has already prioritised a feasibility study from the Integrated Transport Scheme budget for this financial year to look into possible pedestrian improvements at the Lower Road/Rectory Lane/Little Bookham Street junction. Work on this feasibility study is to be completed by March 2019 and will be shared with the local divisional member for comment once completed.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE: 06 JUNE 2018****LEAD OFFICER: SARAH J SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER****SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS****DIVISION: ALL****Questions submitted by Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East):**

Drainage Contract and Cleaning

1. Can I ask how many gullies and drainage assets were cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/8?

Response:

There were 14,407 cleans of individual drainage assets in Mole Valley in 2017/18.

2. How many drainage assets were not cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/8?

Response

2,017 individual drainage assets were not cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/18, often because of cars parked over gullies at all attempts to clean.

Breakdown:

The total number of registered individual drainage assets in Mole Valley:
12,475

Total amount of visits to those assets: 16,424 (not all assets can be cleaned on every visit due to parked cars obstructing the asset).

Total amount of assets cleaned: 14,407 (some assets are cleaned more than once, often due to frequently high silt levels in the gully).

Total amount of assets not cleaned: 2,017

3. How many drainage assets were added to the asset register in each of 2016/7 and 2017/8?

Response

It is appreciated that there were a large number of individual drainage assets, such as gullies, that were not on the interactive Surrey map, and that this made it difficult for residents to report blocked gullies using the “report it” tab on the website.

Some of the “missing” gullies were missing from the asset register, while others were missing from the interactive map on the “report it” tab on the website, but were still included within the asset register.

In 2017/18 there were 478 missing assets added to our interactive mapping system. The Local Area Team holds a list of roads where there are known missing assets and are currently checking that these are now on our asset register and on the interactive map on the “report it” tab on the website so that residents can report any problems with these assets.

Information on the number of assets added to the register in 2016/7 was not available before the deadline for a response, the Area Highway Manager will provide an update as soon as this information is available.

4. How many drainage assets have not yet been added to the asset register or were not on it at 1st April 2018?

Response

The local team have identified a further 13 sites / locations (approximately 48 “missing” assets) as of 1st April 2018. These have been added to the client jetter to map these missing assets as otherwise they would not be able to be added to the asset register. They are being dealt with as resources and priorities permit and the local area team are seeking additional centrally funded resources to map these assets and to address blocked or damaged assets. Once cleaned, recorded and outlets checked they will be added to the interactive mapping system and programmed for inclusion in future cyclic cleaning

Questions submitted by Chris Townsend (Ashtead)

1. The pedestrian crossing on the A24 nearby Bramley Way - what has happened to the Design stage of this project - this has been outstanding for around a year?

Response

The design team is currently progressing the feasibility report, assessing four possible locations for the pedestrian crossing on the A24 Epsom Road in the vicinity of the junction with Bramley Way. The feasibility report will be complete by the end of June 2018. Once the report is complete, it will be sent

to the divisional member for comment, and a decision on the preferred location.

It is acknowledged that this design has taken longer than had been hoped; this is due to the limited design resource available.

2. The traffic lights at Downsend School (junction of A24 and Grange Road etc.) are out of sync. !! Traffic queues build up during the day (particularly at peak times) causing considerable delays - half term this week and queues are still there. Is traffic coming to and from the M25 causing these problems - can we please check as it does seem to be the traffic lights that cause the delays?

Response:

A Traffic Systems Engineer has assessed the signals at the A24 Leatherhead Road/Grange Road/Ermyrn Way junction. The results of this assessment showed that there was a problem with the existing configuration of the signals and a detector fault. An engineer is due to attend the site during the week commencing 4th June to resolve the problem with the existing configuration and to further investigate the fault.

3. When are the 20mph limits coming into force around both St. Giles School and CLFS (Dene Road and Park Lane)?

Response:

Traffic calming measures are needed to help enforce the existing advisory 20mph speed limit outside St. Giles Infants School and the City of London Freemans School. Traffic calming measures would also enable a permanent 20mph speed limit outside of these schools to be made.

In the 2015/16 financial year funding was allocated from the Local Committee Integrated Transport Scheme budget to design traffic calming measures to support the proposed permanent 20mph speed limit. However, following the reduction in the Integrated Transport Scheme budget there is no funding currently available to construct the traffic calming measures.

The Local Area Team will continue to seek any external funding opportunities for this scheme.

4. When is the work in Ottways Lane, Ashted due to finish as residents are very concerned as to the time it is taking?

Response:

These are SES Water works to replace old iron water mains and services to properties.

SCC Officers have been liaising with SES Water regards progress of the works as it has been recognised that works have fallen behind the original agreed programme.

Completion of the main laying is now scheduled for mid-June. SES Water will then move into Timber Hill, running in line with service connections through to mid-July.

SES Water have commenced the road crossing of the A24 at the junction with Ottways Lane on Monday 4th June. This is to connect with the main on the other side of the carriageway. These works were deferred to avoid a clash with the Epsom Derby weekend.

SCC Officers continue to liaise with SES Water regards progression and completion of this scheme, regularly attending site to monitor progress.

Questions submitted by Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods)

1. A few weeks ago essential repairs closed Ashcombe Road for a day with resultant traffic deadlock in the centre of Dorking lasting some hours. I understand that further work including a further closure is planned for next month. What arrangements are being made to prevent traffic gridlock in Dorking town centre when the next closure of Ashcombe Road takes place?

Response:

The surface dressing works have been scheduled to take place on Saturday 23 June when traffic will be lighter. The work is expected to take half a day and the road will be reopened as soon as the new surface has been laid. Road markings will be re-painted approximately a week later, but the road will not be closed while the lining takes place.

Advanced warning signs will be placed on the road on 6 June. We will post tweets on @SurreyTravel and @MoleValleyLC Twitter accounts, if members could re-tweet our messages we would appreciate it.

Surface dressing is a highly weather dependent road treatment. The road surface must be dry and warm enough for the material to be laid. Because of this there is a surface dressing "season" which runs from June to August. The specialist surface dressing contractor is only in Surrey for two weeks and after 23 June they are scheduled to move on to another contract so Surrey County Council have had to try to find a date within that two week window or risk the work not taking place this year.

In addition to the limited amount of time we have the contractor in Surrey, there are exams ongoing in The Ashcombe School up until Friday 22 June. Surrey County Council has been talking to the Head Teacher of the school to work with them to find a date that would cause the least disruption to the children sitting exams.

2. Since the 'upgrading' of the traffic light system took place in Dorking town centre a few months ago there have been a series of apparent faults particularly at the Vincent Lane / Westcott Road junction which have caused serious traffic congestion in the town centre. Could residents be assured that the system is now clear of any faults and is now working at maximum capacity?

Response:

Following the upgrading of the traffic light system in Dorking town centre, Surrey County Council's traffic operations team received a number of reports from the public that Dorking town centre was experiencing traffic congestion, particularly at the Vincent Lane/Westcott Road junction. Engineers visited the site who found no fault at the Vincent Lane/Westcott Road junction, but found a faulty detector at the Pump Corner junction, which has since been replaced.

However following further reports of congestion, additional investigations were carried out, as a result signal timings were tweaked and changes to the configuration of the signals are planned to be completed by 8th June 2018. Further recent investigations have also revealed another detector fault, which will be investigated when work to change the configuration of the signals is carried out.

Once the above works are completed this will help to alleviate some of the congestion within Dorking, however it will not resolve it completely. This is because Dorking, inherently has a capacity issue which makes it particularly sensitive to congestion, namely that West Street is only one lane due to existing buildings and receives traffic filtering in from a number of approaches (Junction Road, Station Road, Vincent Lane and Westcott Road). However, it is hoped that once the above works are complete, this will help to alleviate some of the congestion in Dorking.

Question submitted by Paul Kennedy (Fetcham West)

1. What are Surrey County Council's procedures for ensuring that utility companies restore the roads and footpaths they dig up to a good condition, and what is the council's assessment of the effectiveness of those procedures as they affect Mole Valley, having particular regard to the condition of the roads following recent works in the the Fetcham/Bookham/Leatherhead area?

Response:

Surrey County Council has 9 dedicated Streetworks Officers whose role is to inspect Utility Companies' activities across Surrey, both whilst in progress to check for compliance to Permit conditions for granted works and to ensure appropriate site safety measures, and also upon completion of works to ensure the highway has been reinstated correctly. This team of Streetworks

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Officers report to the Streetworks Compliance Team Leader, based at the NMIC in Leatherhead and they operate a very robust, effective function undertaking inspections of a percentage sample of all works as well as responding to any concerns/complaints about works undertaken. Where defective reinstatement is identified, the Utility Company is required to make good at its cost, to the county council's satisfaction.

Utility Company reinstatements of the public highway are guaranteed for 24 months after completion and so further inspections are also scheduled towards the end of this guarantee period, in order to pick up the need for any remedial works before the guarantee period expires. The reinstatement completed by the Utility Companies is required to meet a National specification; the Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in the Highway (SRoH).

The volumes of inspections Surrey can re-charge for, regardless of whether the reinstatement is passed or failed are set out in the Code of Practice (CoP) for Inspections, New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, (NRSWA). Both the SRoH and the Inspections CoP are currently under review by the Department for Transport and members of the Highways and Utilities Committee (HAUC) – England.

It should be noted that current legislation allows utility companies to complete 'temporary reinstatement' upon completion of their works, using an interim material, provided the reinstatement is level. They are required to return to complete 'permanent' reinstatement within 6 months of their original works being completed. This temporary reinstatement is often mistaken as the final surface, which can lead to concerns from the general public, until permanent reinstatement is completed.

Questions submitted by Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

When roads cross culverts, frequently there are railings alongside the road as a safety measure. However, a number of these safety railings in the Wotton and Abinger area have fallen into disrepair.

As there appears to be an increasing backlog of repair work in relation to these railings which are adjacent to culverts:

- (i) What regular inspections are made of the railings beside roads and alongside culverts to ensure that the railings are fit for purpose?
- (ii) For such railings in Wotton and Abinger Parishes, what repair work is currently outstanding and scheduled to take place to ensure that all such railings are fit for purpose? and
- (iii) What budget is held for ongoing repair work to these railings and, if there is no specific budget, how will the repairs to such culverts, which is a safety issue, be carried out in a timely manner?

If no inspections are made and no list of outstanding repair work exists, will a review of all culverts and associated railings in Wotton and Abinger Parishes take place before the next meeting of the Local Committee? Will a report be presented setting out: the condition of the railings at each culvert, a description of the necessary

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

remedial work that needs to be carried out, and the way the necessary safety work will be funded in the current financial year?

Response:

Culvert protection barriers are not inspected as part of the highway safety inspection process. However, if a damaged culvert protection barrier is identified during the course of a safety inspection, and if the damage would pose a hazard to pedestrians or vehicles, then a repair would be ordered. Otherwise, the local area team would be informed and would arrange for repair as appropriate. It should be noted that large culverts are considered to be a structure (eg small bridge) and this would be dealt with by Surrey's infrastructure team.

Where damage to culvert protection barriers are reported to Surrey, these are inspected by the Local Highway Officer and appropriate action taken. Where damage is the result of a traffic collision, follow up action is taken by Surrey's contractor to make safe (where considered necessary) and to put in hand permanent repairs.

The local area team is not aware of any culvert protection works outstanding or scheduled at this time in either Wotton or Abinger.

There are no specific budgets for culvert protection works. However the Local Committee's revenue budget can be used when available. Where damage has been caused by a known third party then funds are recovered for the repair by our contractors.

If the divisional member is aware of any damaged culvert protection barriers in her division, it is proposed that she contact the Mole Valley Maintenance Engineer. These sites will then be inspected, a solution agreed and repairs ordered, subject to the allocation of funding.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE:** 06 June 2018**SUBJECT:** PETITION – Residents parking scheme in Howard Road and Arundel Road**DIVISION:** Dorking South and the Holmwoods**PETITION DETAILS:**

Residents of Howard Road and Arundel Road would support the introduction of a Residents' Parking Zone in Arundel Road and Howard Road and accept the annual charges associated with the order. We therefore request the County Council take whatever steps are necessary to implement a Residents' Parking Zone in these two roads

OFFICER COMMENT:

Thank you for the petition you submitted, requesting a residents' permit scheme on Arundel Road and Howard Road, Dorking.

We have received numerous requests for changes to the existing parking restrictions and controls or the introduction of new ones since the previous parking review. Once we have completed our assessments of them all, in June 2018, we will present a report on the outcome, with our recommendations for what changes should be made, to the local committee (Mole Valley) at its meeting on 5 September 2018.

After we have made the assessments and recommended introducing the permit scheme, and the committee were to agree with the recommendation, we would need to undertake the legal process involved in introducing or changing parking controls. This requires us to formally advertise our intention to do so, and we will also carry out a consultation with residents of Arundel Road and Howard Road.

Once we have considered any responses to the advertisement and/or consultation, we will have to make a traffic regulation order, so that our enforcement staff can take action against people parking illegally. This process does take several months to complete, but progress can be followed on our website at www.surreycc.gov.uk/parking/molevalley

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to:

(i) Note the officer's comment

Contact Officer:

Steve Clavey, Senior Engineer (Parking)

Tel: 0300 200 1003

1. The Committee might wish to be made aware that a group of professional Mole Valley residents and others, including myself, have been making consultation observations to the MVDC in regard to its proposed Local Plan ("MVLN") 2018 to 2033 and the Community Infrastructure Levy ("CIL"). That includes a good amount on transportation (rail, road and air) and land drainage and flooding control.
2. Our highways technical sub - group presently comprises 7 civil engineers (2 of whom are ICE Fellows), 2 economists, a structural engineer, a surveyor, a geologist, a construction engineer and a lawyer. We all have very good infrastructure experience, adding up to a total of over 600 years between us, and it is fair to say that we are of "slide rule" generation and of mature years (most of us 67 to 75, some a little younger) and have good technical, analytical and assessment skills in our individual and collective fields of knowledge. We also have the experience advantage that we are very familiar with manual calculations as well as computerised ones and so can readily cross check computerised outputs quickly to ensure that they are realistic and make engineering output sense - a skill not always available to younger engineers now but accepting that they will be more "tech savvy" than our generation.
3. Independently, we have been making MVLN observations to MVDC since September last year, and that appear, now, to have some overlaps with your Committee's highways work in Dorking and elsewhere, including Leatherhead. Most of our submissions to MVDC have been caveated "Confidential" at this pre-publication time but provision has been made expressly that MVDC can share the information with others in associated official roles. That includes your Committee Members and SCC's material highways engineers (but not SCC/MVDC's consultants without our further express permission).
4. As regards officer Report paragraph 3.2 iii) for 6 June 2018 Committee, a possible Dorking Western Bypass; we too identified that and disclosed its generality and one approximate route alignment (we considered two) to MVDC earlier this year but we took it a stage further than your consultants appear to have done and linked it back to the A24(DC) a little south of North Holmwood traffic roundabout. We also identified to MVDC an alternative to it which we have described as the Dorking Western Relief Road ("DWRR"). In our analysis and designs the former and the latter do not serve identical functions but have affinities. The DWRR makes best use of a combination of improved sections of existing highways and new construction whereas our design for a Western Bypass is almost entirely a new "green field" routing. By a long way, economically and functionally and environmentally, our DWRR proposals are streets ahead of a Western Bypass alternative.
5. We concluded therefore that a possible Dorking Western Bypass (DC) is premature before mid-century at the earliest, that better and that more cost effective and quicker to implement alternatives presently exist and on those grounds we accordingly did not pursue it to 1:500 scale design detail but there are some technical/cost related issues to such a Bypass that are clearly problematic - and identifiable so even from just the outline design stage assessment (we use 1:1250 scale plans and digital imagery and key levelling and key measurements only combined with rapid semi-detailed site visits for that analysis level).

6. We produced two tunnelled schemes (both DC's) under the Nower but getting to the northern edge of the Nower southwards to start it is not straightforward (south of the tunnelled Nower, there is little technical or cost problem in the open farmland - but it is in the Greenbelt) and the northern section is not demolition free even in a large sweep curve to the west of Dorking and to the West of the industrial area south of the Nower. The tunnelling at the Nower (in mainly dry to moist, competent, Hythe Beds with some low volume springs at the underlying and exposed Atherfield Clay junction south of the Nower and with one known NW trending cross cutting modest throw strike slip fault) is not technically difficult but it is extremely expensive.

7. In the north section (A25 to A24) at the Pippbrook valley intersect however, there would be a possible flood control opportunity by using the highway embankment (appropriately Panel Engineer designed) as a fairly shallow (<3m deep) impounding flood routing balancing and control facility (infrequent farm land flooding for short durations to, at overtopping level, peak lop from about 28m³/s max inflow to controlled 6m³/s storm relief flood routed outflow, and at under 1m³/s base flow) but we felt that that is for the distant future too.

8. At the most northerly end of any Dorking Western Bypass there are unfortunate combinations of vertical alignment difficulties with the GWR railway, with highway gradients, with curves and sightlines for speeds greater than 85Km/h design speeds (50 MPH speed limits) and to avoid some very expensive deep retaining walls in one part the horizontal alignment would have to be taken north onto the Denbies flatter land and then swept back south to an existing footbridge position to cross the London to Horsham Railway line with satisfactory rail height clearance (we used 4.72m bridge soffit to *maximum possible* canted rail top because in our associated MVLP railway work we have identified a scheme with the intended Cross-Rail 2 - present design terminating at about Raynes Park - that would allow a sub 30 minute fast service London to Leatherhead and up to 10 paths per hour (6 minute frequency service) and a reduction from about 55 minutes London to Dorking to 33 or 34 minutes - both dramatic railway use improvements for Mole Valley - and so the maximum canted level that I mention here is important as the maximum cant deficiency - 255mm used by us - will be needed for that speed increase on that material railway curve a little north of Dorking Station).

9. As it ends up, this all leads to an extremely expensive, and not necessarily technically straightforward, premature Dorking Western Bypass scheme (we also got negative BCR for the MVLP year 2033) and even in the north part (between the A24 and the A25) we concluded that the DWRR was a far better bet on cost and utilisation bases and should be pursued instead. A Western Bypass would hence not be appropriate in our judgement nor necessarily would it be of best (or any material) benefit to an A25/A24/centre Dorking traffic flow balancing solution for either new development needs or congestion solving outputs. In truth, for East - West, and *vice versa*, carriage, it also ends up in the wrong place and would require traffic to "turn back" on itself at the A24 which then leads to connecting A24 junction flow problems and appreciable extra E-W/W-E journey length and inconvenience. To use an older expression from the Highways Act it would not, either, be lawfully "...commodious..." in our view.

10. We agree that the A24/A25 traffic roundabout junction at Deepdene Avenue has a material capacity deficit and identified that case to MVDC in our MVLP

communications early this year and also that it would be unwise to replace it with a signalised junction. Any such "solution" there is asking for trouble.

11. However, we do not agree with Officer report Paragraph 3.7 that private land take is necessarily needed for a larger and/or more streamlined roundabout re-design there - but it would depend on roundabout sizing and the traffic flows allowed for - we stated our values to MVDC with our MVLP comments. Those values are very high and cannot be sustained by a single width A24 carriageway south of the roundabout - it also, northbound, has a most unfortunate approach angle but we have taken that into account in our re-design assessment. We provided MVDC with a drawing showing how work could be done within the Highway land *but* that the back edge of west footway on the A24 north side would have to co-exist with the front face of at least one of the blocks of flats, which obviously is less than ideal. Nevertheless, that Officer report Paragraph 3.7 is correct in saying that any substantial junction re-arrangement work there would be expensive (it is also, constructionally, difficult and recognising that we did provide MVDC with a traffic diversions plan with it and some CIL expenditure related reasons for that).

12. Appropriately our own CIL funding "to facilitate new development" reasons are, for legality, distinct from the Committee's "cure congestion" remit and reasons but if our MVLP consultation south of Dorking and/or in and about Dorking new development proposals are followed then CIL receipts could be used, we believe lawfully, to facilitate both the new development transportation requirements and, in corollary, ameliorate the Dorking traffic congestion at the same time (we have also MVLP infrastructure commented on Leatherhead and two other places but do not discuss that here). The MVDC CIL receipts should be accumulating at about £2M/annum at the needed MVDC development rate and so by year 5 (present total MVDC CIL unspent receipts about £1.5m) a reasonable proportion of the needed Dorking highway work could be MVDC CIL funded. CIL funding cannot however, lawfully, be used merely to cure existing congestion problems and so the expenditure and scheme reasoning and need must have a new development facilitation *foundation* requirement basis to it - our proposals do that as identified to MVDC in the MVLP consultation.

13. Officer report Paragraph 3.23, Pump Corner; and the Western Bypass Paragraph 3.25; we independently agree on the lack of real benefits and on the cost issue and agree with your consultants and/or Officers that neither scheme possibility should be pursued.

14. I deal lastly with a small part of the persistent vexing problem of traffic delays in Westcott and Dorking on and from the A25.

15. Under free flow free exit conditions the journey time range for *daylight* traverse of A25 One Way Vincent Lane (we use 553m control to control) we found to be, lights on green phase, from a large number of accurately timed motor vehicle runs, 43 seconds with a range of plus 4 seconds minus 2 seconds. The circuit (again all green phases and free flow lanes and free flow exit conditions) south junction Vincent Lane, Pump Corner, South Street, Vincent Lane south junction return we timed as 2 minutes 4 seconds with a range of plus 9 seconds minus 2 seconds.

16. This needs to be compared with the experienced very frequent and substantial delay times under constrained flow conditions - one of which we recently recorded

on a Saturday afternoon as 14 minutes 42 seconds in the Vincent Lane leg and with the A25 almost at a standstill, East bound, (slightly later at 16.40 at our Westcott pedestrian crossing control point) with an A25 (staggeringly bad) Westcott to Vincent Lane junction travel time of 52 minutes instead of 3 minutes or so free flow (our accurate base data timing is 2 minutes 51 seconds with a range of plus 4 seconds and minus 3 seconds free flow but in this case to a red phase "no vehicle in front" controlled stop at A25 junction Vincent Lane. If on green phase then deduct 2-3 seconds.

17. Patently it is not the carriageway lane capacities that are any present primary flow obstructing problem (except in Vincent Lane maybe because of existing "in lane" constraints and in the High Street because of obstructing parking at times close to Pump Corner) it is entirely the traffic light dwell and time loss and junctions capacities deficits in Dorking that are the initial issue - and that *must* be addressed. It cannot be left as the officers' reports are intimating because the traffic flow *volume* problem simply cannot be cured by non-related walking and cycling improvements as close to 100% of the A25 input and output E-W and W-E at key node traffic flows at A25 Vincent Lane junction and A24/A25 junction (London Road west side) are generated *externally* to Dorking town centre. So *internally* effected "walking/cycling" improvements - no matter how good - will have no valid intervention impact on those "passing through" traffic flows which are the ones needing a greater (junctions) *capacity* cure. Whilst Internet and homeworking is presently subduing traffic flows generally (but not on trunk and motorway roads) we assess that it will be relatively short lived and that when self driving cars become the norm (after 2030 we assess) the homeworking and the vehicle movement can take place at the same time and the internet damping would then be no more and hence traffic volume trends will then increase again materially - though the peaks might be longer and a little flatter. More Internet provision, seemingly being relied upon by the Committee, might therefore give a short respite but, we believe, no more once self driving cars become the norm.

18. We are hoping to see that your consultants will produce a node by node and a node to node detailed flow analysis that quantifies the speed of flow profiles, the traffic flows thereto, the delay speeds, the hold up delay times and lengths and delay time and ill-health treatment costs and losses with the inevitable engine idling localised pollution emissions (and the noxious component percentages) in that stacking and congested flow constraint matrix and most especially in the prospective "bad" pollution canyon of West Street. The EU legislative provisions are also material to the traffic engine idling and standing emitting pollution investigations inclusions and their related costs outputs to both highway users and the public in general and to those in and about West Street especially, and what SCC, as liable Highway Authority, should be doing about it. And of course all of the options costs and benefits calculations so that a rational assessment of ranking choice can be made duly and on an equal footing.

19. We too (but for different CIL funding reasons) put forward a reversion to the pre - 1968 two way traffic system in Dorking, with modifications, but from further work (not yet released to MVDC) other possibilities have been identified and whilst the designs and plans and sections are complete at 1:500 scale and larger we are still assessing the economics and costs of those alternatives.

20. Your consultants however are quite correct that new two way traffic arrangements in Vincent Lane would require land take (we have fully completed designs for both 6.75m and 7.3m singles at 1:500 scale so can be sure on these land take elements) locally at the north end - minor and a wall and tiny parts of back gardens land only on the east side (the west side is mainly industrial access frontages, car parking and the like) - but, in our designs, on the East side, at the south end, up to 2.34m of front gardens land take is unavoidable in one design and land take opposite would be unrealistic as their front gardens are already tiny. There is no need for demolitions in any event but an electricity sub-station outside Book House at the NW end will need re-locating - primarily a cost issue only. However, one of my colleagues (who has done the Vincent Lane design) has (only yesterday 1 June 2018) modified his design such that that figure can be reduced to 2.12m. Then the land take area is 117m² out of a scheme total of 6272m² or merely 1.86% - which is extremely low for this class of highway work in an urban area.

21. In our view therefore, it is not a good and valid reason to discount your consultant's "two way traffic" proposals on the mere ground that land compulsory purchase would be needed - that, in our view, is not lawful. If that criteria were to be lawful then compulsory purchase powers would never be needed nor used. So the law is quite clear: it is not lawful for SCC officers to claim that a highways scheme consideration is thwarted by the mere need to apply compulsory purchase powers (see officers' reasons in previous report for your March Meeting) and you should direct them otherwise to proceed lawfully and fully establish the consultant's two way traffic proposals before, (and we doubt that you could lawfully do so) if rational, discounting them. We believe that you cannot lawfully do so but that is a matter for the future if it transpires. We would also remark that the purpose of the Queen's highway, as settle in law at the highest level in the House of Lords [Supreme Court now] is to allow free and unobstructed passage, to and fro, and that, except where expressly permitted by lawful TRO, in lane parking is always an obstruction in law (and frequently too in fact). Hence the Officers cannot, in law, rely on parking loss in South Street to defeat your Consultant's two way traffic system proposals. Whilst we do not say that these are yet the actual figures to use, if the average 6 day daily material time delays came to 8 minutes per vehicle (excluding the HGV low percentage) at the Vincent Lane A25 junction and A24/A25 junction and was cumulated then a delay value of about 5467 daily hours and £32.4M delay value per annum would arise. That is a very sound reason for spending a few million pounds in material amelioration works in Dorking in our view.

22. Your consultant's two way traffic proposals for Vincent Lane and South Street are, in our view, lawful and technically sound and would be reasonably and realistically cost effective. Accordingly (with a modification as to the use of Junction Road too), we agree that your consultant's "two way traffic" solution is *one* valid solution to ameliorating the persistent and gross traffic delays in Dorking. We would further observe too, if finances are constrained initially, that the work in South Street could be very quickly and economically achieved by usage of TRO's and sensible white re-lining in the shorter term and that that should not be discounted either. In our view Vincent Lane would need a complete reconstruction (including new SW drainage) from formation up and that will be expensive: our preference is for a 7.3m single (but with a side wall safety margin strip of at least 450mm at the south end if the footway outside Nos 1 to 20 is to remain raised there). We have traffic diversion

plans for the Vincent Lane work, in 9 stages, but have not yet disclosed them to MVDC.

**Surrey County Council's Local Committee
(Mole Valley)
Dorking Major Schemes Task Group
Terms of Reference**

1. The Group's principle purpose is to consider major transport schemes at key decision milestones to provide recommendations to the Local Committee to appropriately inform the committee's decisions.
2. The scope of the Task Group will be:
 - i. The Dorking Transport Package Phase 1 - overseeing the completion of the project and the recommendations set out in the Coast to Capital Action Plan, along with annual scheme monitoring; and
 - ii. Any subsequent similar scale scheme proposals.
3. Officers supporting this Task Group will consult that Group and will give due consideration to the Group's reasoning and recommendations prior to reporting to the Local Committee.
4. The Task Group will comprise three county councillors, (Chairman and two further county members) and two district councillors.
5. As an advisory group to the Local Committee, Task Group members will act in the interests of Dorking as a whole, rather than representing the interests of their divisions or wards.
6. Recommendations to the Local Committee will be supported by a summary of the reasoning behind the Task Group's position and reflect any professional advice from officers.
7. The Task Group will meet in private, at appropriate times during the year and actions from the meetings will be recorded and made available to the Local Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank