

Supplementary Agenda

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

Supplementary Agenda

Item 4a – Written public questions

Item 4b – Written member questions

Item 5a - Petition to: Reduce the speed limit on the A24 South, up the hill from the Cockerel roundabout until past the old Kuoni site, from the current 50mph to a safer lower speed reflecting the residential area

Item 5b – Petition to: Withdraw the idea put forward in the recent parking strategy update paper that the council should support the introduction of on-street parking charges.



Venue

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

Date: Wednesday, 22
January 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

4a PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Pages 1 - 14)

Questions and Officer responses received from members of the public

4b MEMBER QUESTIONS (Pages 15 - 24)

Questions and Officer responses received from members of the Local Committee

5a PETITION TO: REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON THE A24 SOUTH, UP THE HILL FROM THE COCKEREL ROUNDABOUT UNTIL PAST THE OLD KUONI SITE, FROM THE CURRENT 50MPH TO A SAFER LOWER SPEED REFLECTING THE RESIDENTIAL AREA (Pages 25 - 26)

The full wording of the petition and Officer response.

5b PETITION TO: WITHDRAW THE IDEA PUT FORWARD IN THE RECENT PARKING STRATEGY UPDATE PAPER THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD SUPPORT THE INTRODUCTION OF ON-STREET PARKING CHARGES (Pages 27 - 28)

The full wording of the petition and Officer response.

Questions from Members of the public

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2020

LEAD OFFICER: JESS EDMUNDSON, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

DIVISION: ALL



1. Question submitted by John Moyer:

Just to update that the old 479 timetables (at North Street both directions) are no longer visible at all, as TfL have put up notices about a short term diversion of 465 They have been into the displays and made a change but not 479 related. So all adding to confusion there but at least the real time information is available at these stops.

There is enough CIL available now to plan RTI for other stops. Given 479 is a priority bus corridor will this be organised? A project plan can be submitted to CIL officers at MVDC. Ashted, Fetcham and Bookham CIL is available in addition to Leatherhead. MVDC has confirmed officers can submit a bid for CIL. Cobham already has RTI at most bus stops so it can be achieved if there is joined up working.

Response:

Highways, Transport and Environment are responsible for managing and delivering the real-time passenger information (RTPI) system in Surrey. We recognise from our residents, and working in partnership with the local bus operators, the importance of providing high quality information to better inform journey planning and attract more passengers. This is why we have installed over 300 RTPI displays across the county.

In consideration of the 479 bus route corridor in particular, there are a number of displays which have already been installed in Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead. We have also secured further developer funding to provide additional displays in Bookham and Fetcham, which will be delivered during the next financial year (2020/21). We are always looking at ways to secure further funding to deliver bus stop infrastructure improvements, including the provision of RTPI, and submitting a CIL bid to Mole Valley District Council is an example of this.

2. Question submitted by Cllr James Friend:

Given the recent number of accidents and near misses that have been experienced on the A25 road as it passes through Westcott, would the Local Committee please arrange for a road safety survey to be undertaken covering the stretch and junctions from Milton Court Lane to Coast Hill Lane to identify potential improvements that might improve overall safety for road users and pedestrians, including school children walking to and from Surrey Hills and Priory schools. The survey needs to include aspects of potential deterrents to inappropriate overtaking as well as potential speed management

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

actions. If funding is a key concern to the undertaking of such a survey then please can Mole Valley District Council consider part funding this one off item?

Response:

Road Safety

Every time there is a collision resulting in personal injury recorded by the police, the information is compiled and added to computer mapping to aid analysis. A summary of the information can be viewed by the public via www.crashmap.co.uk. Officers undertake analysis of collisions to assess whether there are any particular patterns and common factors to the collisions, or whether there are any particular locations with a greater history of collisions that may warrant more investigation.

There was a collision on the A25 Guildford Road in Westcott on 28 October 2019 involving 2 vehicles. The driver of one of the vehicles very sadly died as a result of this collision. The collision is being investigated by Surrey Police. Officers will wait upon the results of the detailed police investigation before drawing any conclusions as to the causes of this incident, and whether there might be any highway improvements that might mitigate the possibility of any future collisions.

From the data prior to the recent fatal collision there were a total of 15 collisions on this stretch of road (approximately 1.7 km long) in the period from December 2014 to November 2019 (the most recent period for which data has been compiled). This included one collision resulting in serious injury and 14 collisions resulting in slight injury. Two slight injury collisions involved pedestrians. Four slight injury collisions involved motorcyclists. For any collision the police can record a range of possible contributory factors. These may be subjective, and can often be selected after the event, away from the scene so need to be treated with caution, but can none-the-less give an indication of possible causes and any patterns:

- Six collisions involved shunts
- Seven collisions involved loss of control of the vehicle
- One involved "failure to look properly"
- One involved overtaking
- One involved exceeding the speed limit

Following consideration of the data for this stretch of road it is concluded that there isn't any obvious pattern of collisions that could easily be mitigated by highway improvements.

Speed Management

Speeds have been surveyed using speed detection radar mounted on lamp columns at two locations on this stretch of road for a one week period from 8 to 15 June 2018:

- Lamp column number four near the entrance to Surrey Hills School (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/Nj5Rv5529VDCD2kp7>). This showed mean average speeds of 36 mph and 85th percentile speeds of 41 mph.
- Lamp column number 11 near the thatched roof bus shelter (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Questions from Members of the public

<https://goo.gl/maps/9JzYXo8spN3EbkK49>). This showed mean average speeds of 30 mph and 85th percentile speeds of 34 mph.

This shows that there is some speeding on some parts of the route (near the school). Due to concerns over vehicle speeds two vehicle activated signs have been installed on this stretch of road previously. These light up to remind drivers of the speed limit if drivers are approaching too fast:

- Facing westbound traffic near the junction with Milton Avenue (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/N5YMggicRsgFFWXUA>)
- Facing eastbound traffic prior to the junction with Heath Rise (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/qRFd3JSAhKJP7WdV9>)

The speed limit between Dorking and Westcott was changed from 50 mph to 40 mph in March 2011. This may have helped to reduce the speed of westbound vehicles entering the 30 mph speed limit within Westcott.

The 30 mph section of road within Westcott is included on the Mole Valley speed management plan as a site requiring enforcement by the police. County council officers are meeting with police colleagues on 29 January 2020 to discuss the speed management plan, and will request an update and consideration of potential options for speed management and enforcement.

Inappropriate Overtaking

Double white lines are used to prohibit drivers from driving on that area of road used by the vehicles travelling in the opposite direction, generally where overtaking visibility is restricted either by bends or the brow of hills. For more double white lines to be considered for Westcott there would need to be clear evidence of injudicious overtaking being a problem (which is not apparent in the collision data) and forward visibility being restricted below the thresholds set out in national standards. As a double white line system has already been introduced within Westcott it is most likely that any stretch that meets the standards already has been provided with such lining. Providing more double white lining might encourage higher speeds which would be undesirable.

3. Question submitted by Ron Billard, Mole Valley Cycling Forum:

There are nowhere near enough multi user paths suitable for cyclists, walkers, mobility buggies. Those that exist tend to be poorly maintained and badly signed.

Now that everybody is recognising that there is a climate emergency and an obesity crisis, may we please request that the multi-user path alongside the A24 southbound of Dorking from North Holmwood to Beare Green Is regularly swept and signposted to show the route for cyclists:

North end of Spook Hill

South end of Spook Hill

Underpass at Holmwood Corner.

Underpass at Beare Green

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

Noting that the path clearance undertaken by Surrey County Council failed to achieve an adequate standard of surface suitable for other than mountain bikers or serious walkers, may we request that plans be drawn up for a pathway of a similar standard to that of the A24 north of Dorking, so that when money does become available SCC stands a chance of obtaining funding.

Response:

The existing shared footway/cycleway that runs alongside the A24 ends at the junction with Spook Hill in the north and the junction with Old Horsham Road at Beare Green in the south. There is currently no funding available to extend the existing footway/cycleway along Spook Hill, or to the underpasses at Holmwood Corner and Beare Green. However, schemes to provide a signed on road cycle route along Spook Hill and Old Horsham Road to connect to the existing underpasses under the A24 will be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme list for possible future funding.

Responsibility for sweeping the existing footways/cycleways within Mole Valley rests with Mole Valley District Council. Unfortunately the Local Area Team has no funding available to carry out work to side out the existing footway/cycleway and cut back vegetation along this 1.5 mile footway/cycleway.

It is appreciated that the Mole Valley Cycle Forum would like the existing shared footway/cycleway to be of a similar standard to that of the A24 north of Dorking. The cost of constructing such improvements would exceed that available to the Local Committee, which has a budget for minor local highway improvements. Such large scale strategic infrastructure improvement schemes should be included within Surrey County Council's Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme in order for other sources of funding for this scheme to be sought and so that initial design work can be carried out. Surrey County Council's Local Area Team will therefore request that Surrey County Council's Major Transport Projects Team, add this strategic scheme to Mole Valley's Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme.

Improvements to the existing footway/cycleway on the A24 Horsham Road between the junctions with Spook Hill and Old Horsham Road, so that it is similar to that of the standard on the A24 to the north of Dorking could be eligible for Strategic CIL funding if identified through Mole Valley District Council's emerging Local Plan. However, this scheme could be considered for CIL funding, by Mole Valley District Council, if it was part of a series of highway improvements. This would be required to be linked to new housing sites, if these progress through the Local Plan process. Any proposals of this nature would be identified later in the Local Plan process when there is more certainty about where new development is to take place.

4. Question submitted by Eric Palmer:

On the A25 eastbound from Dorking towards Reigate, there is an area of cross-hatching between The Watermill and the Wyevale Garden Centre which was implemented to keep vehicular traffic away from the edge of the road which is understood to be liable to subsidence. This has effectively reduced the width of the road which means vehicles are only able to give limited space when overtaking cyclists. Whilst cyclists could ride through the cross-hatching, it is strictly speaking not legal to use and in any case the hatching is not necessarily comfortable to ride through.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

Consequently, would Surrey Highways create a cycle lane through the cross-hatching adjacent to the edge of the carriageway? There is a precedent to this on the A24 southbound from Givons Grove through the Mickleham bends.

The southbound carriageway from Givons Grove Roundabout to Mickleham on the A24 just before the Frascati Restaurant has a narrow cycle lane which ends in a double hatched blocked end i.e. intending cyclists to cede priority to main road traffic.- any cyclist approaching this end point generally at speed (it is at the bottom of the hill) has to attempt to look behind 180 degrees) whilst main road motor traffic's view is straight ahead and unencumbered. The priority should be changed. The writer travels along this route four times a week and feels it represents a completely unnecessary hazard to cyclists.

Response:**A25 Reigate Road, Dorking**

The A25 Reigate Road, Dorking runs in an east west direction between Dorking and Reigate and forms part of the principal road network. There is a section of vehicle restraint system or crash barrier along the north side of Reigate Road between the drive to Castle Mill Lodge and the D311 Boxhill Road at Wyevale Garden Centre. This barrier is adjacent to a steep drop to the River Mole and is in place to prevent vehicles leaving the road.

There is a 290m length of hatched road markings bounded by a solid white line on the edge of the eastbound carriageway. These markings are along the majority but not the total length of the barrier, and vary in width. There is a double white line system along this section of Reigate Road that prohibits drivers from crossing the white line as overtaking visibility is restricted by the bends.

An investigation has been carried into the collision history on the section of the A25 Reigate Road between the drive to Castle Mill Lodge and the D311 Boxhill Road at Wyevale Garden Centre. During the period January 2016 to March 2019 (the latest dates for which data is available) there have been 2 collisions involving serious injury and 3 collisions involving slight injury. One of the collisions involved a pedal cyclist, when a stationary vehicle near the Coach Road moved off and collided with a pedal cyclist.

It is acknowledged that the hatching restricts the width of the eastbound carriageway. However the existing lining system has been designed to ensure sufficient carriageway widths for all classes of vehicles, including buses and Heavy Goods Vehicles that use this principal road.

It is requested that a cycle lane is created through the hatched markings at the edge of the eastbound carriageway. The variable width of the hatched markings means that it is not clear whether there would be sufficient width for a cycle lane along the entire 290m length of the hatching. If it were possible to provide a cycle lane in through the hatching then this would be of limited benefit, given the short distance involved. For these reasons there are no plans to provide a cycle lane through the hatching on the A25 Reigate Road in Dorking as is requested.

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

A24 London Road, Mickleham

The A24 London Road, Mickleham runs in a north south direction between Leatherhead and Dorking, and forms part of the principal road network. There is a cycle lane at the edge of the southbound carriageway with hatched road markings between the cycle lane and main carriageway.

A restaurant, Frascati, is located beside the southbound carriageway of the A24 London Road close to the junction with School Hill. There is a parking area beside the road and a bus stop in front of the restaurant. A gap in the hatched markings means that cars and buses accessing the parking area and bus stop can do so without crossing the hatching. Cyclists are required to give way at this gap in the hatching and there are give way lines across the cycle lane to indicate this.

An investigation has been carried into the collision history on the section of the A24 London Road between Mickleham Drive and the B2209 Old London Road. During the period January 2016 to March 2019 (the latest dates for which data is available) there have been 2 collisions involving slight injury. One of these collisions involved a pedal cyclist that collided with a vehicle at the junction of Old London Road.

It is suggested that the priority is changed so that cyclists no longer need to give way at this gap in the hatching outside the Frascati restaurant. Changing the priority would mean that upon occasion cars and buses would need to stop on the main A24 London Road carriageway to allow cyclists to proceed. This would lead to the potential for conflict between vehicles travelling southbound on the main A24 London Road carriageway and any stationary vehicle. For this reason there are no plans to change the priority on this cycle lane as is suggested.

There is an off carriageway cycleway on the verge beside the northbound carriageway of the A24 that southbound cyclists can use should they so wish.

5. Question submitted by Peter Seaward, Bookhams Residents Association

SCC Highways made considerable improvement to the water catchment facilities at the corner of Dorking Road/Chapel Lane/ Admirals Walk/Polesden Lacey Road, Bookham. The new set back gully was meant as a catch all for grit and other debris that otherwise would flow down Dorking Road. This system so far appears not to be achieving this as evidenced by the need to clear all the soakaways recently. Would Highways have another look at this grit/debris problem and possibly consider a cross catch pit trap in the form of a large cattle grid. This might help solve this long standing problem.

Response:

Works were carried out during financial year 2018/19 in Bookham at the junction of Dorking Road/Chapel Road/Polesden Road and Admirals Road to enhance the existing drainage system. The works included the provision of 4 additional gullies and capacity improvement works to the existing soakaway.

Unfortunately not all existing drainage assets at this location were recorded on the database of drainage assets. These assets were captured during a recent visit to the site, this visit has also highlighted some minor improvements that are proposed for this drainage system during the financial year 2020/2021.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

It is appreciated that more major improvements to this drainage system are desired by local residents, and some drainage improvements in Bookham are being explored through the Bookham Flood Forum. However a scheme such as is described would not be suitable in this location, and no funding has been currently identified for further major drainage improvements at this location.

The cyclic cleaning programme for road gullies and soakaways is undertaken separately. It should be noted that in certain locations, such as this one, cleaning needs to be carried out at night due to the proximity of gullies to the road junction. All assets will now be cleaned as per the scheduled programme for this road.

6. Question submitted by Jon Favell:

What are the plans to tackle the failing road surface along the A245 By Pass Road (Leatherhead)?

There is widespread delamination occurring, specifically in the westbound direction, which is further compounded by over 65,000 HGVs per annum and widespread speeding. There appears a very real intention to return the road to base concrete, which doesn't feel appropriate or fair given the volume and nature of transit it has to support, i.e. a further increase in house vibrations and noise pollution levels for the long suffering residents.

Response:

A245 By-Pass Road, Leatherhead was assessed for planned maintenance works by officers and unfortunately did not prioritise when compared with other roads county wide which are on Horizon 2 programme. The last occasion this road was fully resurfaced was 2002.

Surrey County Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand and reductions in funding. To maximise funding from central government Surrey prioritises schemes on its planned maintenance programme in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management.

All roads on the planned maintenance programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved process. This process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

Full list of schemes is published on our website <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

We will continue to inspect these roads for individual Safety Defects, and arrange repairs as appropriate.

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

7. Question submitted by Roger Troughton, Mole Valley Cycling Forum:

According to the DfT's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) published April 2017, this has within it a requirement for councils to prepare Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs).

Without these in place, councils and regional areas will have no ability to bid for any central government pots of money to improve cycling and walking networks.

Is it possible to point us in the direction of the LCWIP for Mole Valley? If there isn't one, when will it be in place? If there are no plans to produce one, who should this be escalated to?

Response:

The [Mole Valley Cycling Plan](#) was adopted by the Local Committee in September 2014. The elements of infrastructure proposed in the Cycling Plan were subsequently published online and can be viewed through the [Surrey Cycle Infrastructure Map](#).

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) provide a best practice evidence-led method for local authorities to plan both walking and cycling infrastructure. Surrey County Council has been in the process of piloting the method in Woking over the past year through resources granted by Department for Transport and the LCWIP is expected to be completed in the next 2-3 months.

Going forward, it is the council's intention to support districts and boroughs by helping them to produce LCWIPs for other areas of the county in due course, including Mole Valley. These LCWIPs will expand on and supersede existing Cycling Plans (where already in place) and apply lessons learned from Woking. However, the timescale for this is uncertain as no council funding has been allocated towards resourcing the development of LCWIPs at this stage. As things progress, this may be something individual district and borough councils can help with by allocating resource to assist the development of LCWIPs within each area. Local level expertise and area knowledge will be vital to support the planning and development stage of each LCWIP, and to see the process through to implementation of proposed measures.

8. Question submitted by Mike Giles, Westhumble:

In common with many areas in the Mole Valley and broad swathes of the UK as a whole, the villages of Mickleham and Westhumble experience unacceptable levels of exhaust noise, principally from motorbikes, with the odd high-performance sports car thrown in. Maximum noise tends to be generated by motorbikes or performance cars travelling at speed, but very significant levels often occur during acceleration, even below specified speed limits, or worse still, from stationary vehicles in car parks, seemingly demonstrating their impatience for other riders to be ready to set off. Like Heineken, these high levels of exhaust noise reach parts that other traffic noise cannot reach and can be clearly heard at surprising distances from the main roads.

A readily achievable partial solution to our problem on the A24 is the extension of the average speed camera system, which is demonstrably successful elsewhere and has significantly reduced the amount of noise heard from the camera controlled section of the A24, compared to the levels still emanating from the unmonitored stretch into Dorking. There is, of course, a seasonal element to the frequency of this problem, but instances can occur at almost any time, from early morning to late night.

Can SCC Highways Department please give an assurance that, in common with the Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey, it recognises the

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

problem created by this noise, which the government has acknowledged as a hazard to health, and confirm that SCC is fully aware of Department of Transport tests begun in June, involving 'noise cameras' in Kensington and Chelsea, along with temporary sites in Hampshire during November, and can they further confirm that, along with other agencies, they will be developing an integrated plan to control noise on all roads and in car parks in this area, with equal regard to regulation of speed, in particular dangerous speeds through villages which serve as 'escape routes' from the camera controlled highway.

Response:

It is acknowledged that a minority of vehicles using Surrey's roads can be excessively noisy. It is also acknowledged that such noise can travel some distance, and can affect a number of local residents in a particular area.

The enforcement of excessively noisy vehicles is a matter for the Police and Environmental Health Teams at District and Borough Council's, it is not the responsibility of Surrey County Council as Highway Authority.

There is currently a Department for Transport (DfT) trial in progress into acoustic cameras. These cameras are being investigated for their potential to identify excessively noisy vehicles. As the enforcement of such vehicles is not a matter for Surrey County Council and the results of the DfT trial are not yet published, Officers are not able to comment on Surrey County Council's position on any future noise control plan.

The use of safety cameras (such as average speed cameras) to encourage improved compliance with the speed limit, is reserved for locations where there has been a serious history of collisions and where speeds have been measured and found to be a problem. This is to ensure that police enforcement and court prosecution resources are prioritised at the sites that need them the most. It also helps maintain public support for safety cameras as a road safety tool rather than being perceived incorrectly as a "tax on the motorist".

There are no plans to consider the extension of the existing average speed cameras system on the A24 as a tool to manage road traffic noise on the A24. It would also be questionable as to whether the use of average speed cameras would successfully tackle the problem – excessive engine noise can be created by hard acceleration within the speed limit, or even by revving engines of stationary parked vehicles.

9. Question submitted by David Allbeury, Westhumble Residents' Association:

- a) The Plantlife campaign, launched last year, advocates a departure from standard council regimes for maintaining verges and central reservations, by reducing the frequency and changing the timing of most grass cutting. This encourages the flourishing of wild flowers, aided and abetted by additional seeding, thereby improving the environment for wheeled and pedestrian road users alike, whilst benefiting wildlife, with the added spin-off of reduced costs. Longer grass and wild flowers on rural roads can be most attractive, swaying in the breeze of

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

passing traffic and compensating to some extent for the loss of wild flower meadows, whilst on central reservations taller vegetation can also reduce the glare of oncoming headlights at night.

Will Surrey County Council Highways Department give an assurance that they have been party to communications with Plantlife and that, amongst SCC's New Year's resolutions, they will be following the advice offered by them, in common with other UK councils.

Response:

SCC have attended two symposiums last year, where representatives of PlantLife were present. A trial is being undertaken on the Southern end of the A24 this coming financial year, where some areas will have a 1m swathe cut on all verges, but no more on the first cut. The second cut will have a full width cut, to prevent woody vegetation taking over the grass verges. The A24 has multiple cross over points and junctions onto and off the dual carriageway, and many parts of the road are not suited to a Plantlife style cut.

- b) Further, that savings inherent in the reduced frequency of grass cutting on road verges and central reservations in general will be devoted, at least in part, to areas which are currently not maintained adequately, giving rise to visibility issues for motorists and warranting more frequent attention than they currently receive, such as the central reservation at the junction of the A24, with Westhumble Street, where visibility is often obscured for traffic turning into Westhumble Street from the Burford Bridge roundabout, or locations not on a regular maintenance schedule at all, such as the raised verges on the south side of Chapel Lane, between the railway bridge and Pilgrims Way.

Response:

The A24 at Westhumble is cut twice a year. Last year we received three complaints in May about sightline issues, which was addressed by our normal phase 1 cut, just two weeks later. We received no further complaints that year, and undertook a second cut in accordance with our schedule at the very start of October.

Cutting the grass on the A24 is only part of the cyclical maintenance that Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District undertakes working in partnership. The temporary traffic management allows street cleansing, litter picking, gully emptying, sign maintenance and road maintenance to be carried out, and grass cutting is a minimal cost of all these in comparison.

The raised verges in Chapel Lane do not consist of grass but are a mixture of wild flowers and woody vegetation. It would not be possible to use a grass cutting contractor to maintain these areas of verges.

- c) It would also be appropriate to cut areas of grass within town boundaries more frequently than previous practice to distinguish between rural and urban environments, particularly the central reservation coming into Dorking from the

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

Denbies roundabout and the Cockerel roundabout at the junction of the A24 and A25, where more 'manicured lawns' would not be out of place.

Response:

It is illogical to cut some grass more frequently, whilst leaving other grass to grow long. The specification for urban grass is four cuts a year, and rural grass 2 cuts a year. This specification will not change, in order to make grass look nicer (or more manicured). Mole Valley District Council choose not to top up the money that Surrey County Council provides to ensure that the grass is cut to make the highway safe. Other Districts and Boroughs, cut the grass more frequently in urban areas, by topping up the maintenance budget.

10. Question submitted by Martyn Williams, Leatherhead Residents Association:

Even if the Committee accepts the officer recommendation as regards Option 2 for implementation in the medium to long-term (which prohibits parking on the High Street) why not permit extended afternoon parking in the short term to see whether it leads to any improvement in footfall. It can always be cancelled if it doesn't work or , if notwithstanding that it does ,the Council decide to proceed with option 2 nonetheless

Response:

Effectively we would have to spend the same money on implementing a permanent solution, as we would a temporary one, which may well then require removal once the temporary period has finished – this would then require more funding to be spent on removing anything that was put in as a temporary solution, such as signing.

11. Question submitted by Susan Leveritt, Leatherhead Residents Association:

For years, traders in the upper part of the High Street have loaded from Elm Road behind, and for the lower High Street traders, goods vehicles would stop in Church or North Street loading zones and trolley the deliveries around to the High Street. Now, the Transform Leatherhead team, for Option 1 (with parking) have planned for loading bays to be located actually on the High Street in the separately paved upper and lower "parking lanes", resulting in their only being enough space left for 8 cars to park in the lanes. Strangely, even though delivery requirements should be identical for parking or no parking options, Option 2 does not have the upper loading bay.

If these unsightly loading zones are created, they would attract vans to use the 20 minute parking to have their lunch, possibly leaving their engines going as happens in the North Street loading bay. This would hurt the air, as would the Waitrose & Greggs lorries, which the experienced drivers PREFER to back into the Church St loading bay and then exit again the same way, rather than negotiating the very sharp >90 degree angle into the High Street, further exacerbated by embedded bollards alongside. The lack of common sense is hurting the air.

The question is this: Could we please scrap the additional unattractive loading bays on the High Street, enabling space for more nicely designed spaces for cars to park after the pedestrian zone, and bring more businesses to the traders? And wouldn't that also

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

mean benefitting from the after-school buzz that we enjoyed before parking was taken away?

Response:

The request for loading bays in the High Street came directly from retailer feedback as part of the consultation. These retailers, whilst supportive of the removal of parking generally required the ability to load/unload close to their shops due to concerns it wasn't practical to trolley goods more than a short distance, especially in bad weather.

The new loading bays including in the proposals would be available outside the pedestrian hours of 10am-4.30pm Monday – Sunday. This would avoid the scenario described above.

The terms of the planning consent for the Waitrose store requires the HGV to exit Church Street in forward gear by way of the High Street.

As the Leatherhead Residents Association is aware, the July 2019 public consultation did include a proposal to create formalised on-street car parking spaces on the High Street to reflect as close as possible the LRA's proposals, but as set out in the report before Local Committee, this received less support.

12. Question submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy:

How does Surrey County Council propose to address the evidence of speeding in Kennel Lane, Fetcham which is apparent from the latest speed survey?

Response:

Surrey County Council work closely with Surrey Police to maintain a local speed management plan for each and every District and Borough in Surrey including Mole Valley. This means that any time concerns are raised by local people over the extent of speeding vehicles or because of a pattern of collisions thought to be associated with speed, the county council will investigate the extent and nature of the perceived speeding problem using Speed Detection Radar boxes. This equipment consists of a box that can be attached to a lamp column or other convenient item of street furniture, usually for a week, without anyone really knowing it is there or what it is for. This information is compiled for a range of sites which are then reviewed at meetings every six months for each District or Borough involving police and county council highways and road safety specialists. At the meetings the sites that have been investigated are prioritised depending upon the extent and nature of the speeding problem, the number of casualties and levels of public concerns, and possible interventions are discussed and agreed. Interventions will depend upon the nature of the site and the seriousness of the problem and may include community speed watch, police enforcement (which may consist of speed camera enforcement from within a stationary van, handheld speed camera, or hand held radar to pull drivers over), or could consist of highway engineering improvements such as electronic vehicle activated signs to remind drivers of the speed limit, or traffic calming (subject to funding and consultation). It should be noted that traffic calming schemes can be expensive and are not always universally popular.

Speeds were measured on Kennel Lane from 26 September to 7 October 2019 using a Speed Detection Radar box mounted on lamp column number seven (approximately 30m to the south of the junction with The Oaks). This showed average mean speeds of

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

34 mph northbound and 35 mph southbound. The 85th percentile speeds (the speed above which the fastest 15 per cent of vehicles were travelling was 39 mph northbound and 42 mph southbound). This shows that there is a comparatively high level of speeding on this stretch of road compared to many other locations with a 30 mph speed limit. We have checked the county council's database of collisions resulting in personal injury recorded by the police. A summary of this information can be viewed via www.crashmap.co.uk. This shows that since 2014 to the end of November 2019, there has been one collision on 23 August 2016 between a pedal cyclist and a pedestrian resulting in slight injury to both. Although any one collision is one too many, this one collision does not highlight a problem with a history of collisions associated with speeding vehicles. This data, along with data for other sites across Mole Valley is due to be discussed at the next Mole Valley speed management plan meeting scheduled for 29 January 2020 where the type of intervention will be discussed with the police.

13. Question submitted by Andrew Matthews:

The new car parking meters installed at Norbury Park are to be removed in April. The cost of installation and removal is significant. In order to salvage something from the misadventure, could it be considered that Electric Car Charging points are installed in their place?

Response:

Following the Cabinet decision in December to cease charges to park in countryside estate car parks, the service is currently developing proposals for a voluntary payment scheme, to support future investment in the countryside. The voluntary payment scheme is likely to utilise the current pay meters as a way of avoiding any cost of removal. The voluntary payment scheme is due to go live in April 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank

Questions from Local Committee Members

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2020

LEAD OFFICER: JESS EDMUNDSON, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

DIVISION: ALL



1. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson:

A request is for a controlled pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane at the end of the path from Meadowbank to Triangle Stores (where the traffic island already is and where a controlled crossing was previously situated many years ago) has been made by both St Martin's School and The Ashcombe School as many pupils from both schools cross the road at this point.

The request was made by the two schools when they presented a petition with a very significant number of signatures to the Local Committee calling for such a crossing to be installed. The request followed a meeting with County Officers where the significant number of children crossing the road at this point was clearly seen and followed the withdrawal of the school crossing patrol officer (lollypop lady) as it was deemed too dangerous for this service to be continued at this location.

The introduction of the controlled crossing would meet two major criteria: it will create a safe walking route to two schools and it will reduce congestion at peak times as cars will be removed from the road in the rush hour as more children will walk to school.

The latest report on CIL shows that the following CIL has been collected and remains unused: Dorking Neighbourhood CIL £11,585 - Dorking Strategic CIL £66,689.

The County Council has stated:

"The identified estimated cost of this proposed scheme is beyond the funding available to the Local Committee at this time. The scheme remains on the ITS list until such time as there is revenue funding identified for feasibility and scheme development. If at that point a crossing is still feasible then the costs of delivery will be identified and any available funding sought. This could be CIL funding and would be dependent on there being development in the vicinity that could provide that level of funding."

The District Council, which has responsibility for CIL, has stated:

"The project is currently not on the list of the Local Committee's short term projects. In principle this sort of project could be eligible for CIL funding, but at the moment the solution to the problem has not been agreed and there is no costed design. If the project is promoted by the County Council we can consider an application at that stage, but we are not there at the moment."

and

ITEM 4b

Questions from Local Committee Members

“The matter is one for the Local Committee, not MVDC; the issues are purely highway-related. You will understand that funds cannot be allocated from CIL for a scheme that currently does not exist and for which there are no costs. The nature of the project is such that it could qualify as a potential project if the Local Committee agrees to prioritise it and undertake some design and costing.”

The scheme is thus stalled as the County Council will not consider this project as it will not undertake the preliminary work necessary to underpin the project and the District Council, even though it acknowledges that the project is one that could be eligible for CIL funding, cannot consider the project as the County Council will not undertake the necessary initial work to get the project “off the ground” notwithstanding that the District Council has collected, and will continue to collect, CIL that could potentially be used to fund the project.

Can an explanation be provided how:

- (i) the Dorking Neighbourhood CIL can be accessed, given that there is no third tier council that covers Dorking Town, in order to fund the necessary preliminary work that is needed to kick-start this vital project;
- (ii) the County Council is progressing schemes on the ITS list that may not be the highest priority on the list but for which there is potential CIL money available for implementation, the CIL having been received from development projects in that neighbourhood ie how it is ensuring that the maximum number of requested schemes are actually implemented through recognising what funding is potentially available for use; and how
- (iii) this project can be considered and developed through the emerging Mole Valley Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan given the “chicken and egg” nature of the responses by the County and District Council which simply results in complete inertia and gives two-tier local government a bad name.

Response:

- i. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced by the Planning Act 2008, as a tool for local authorities in England and Wales to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area. It came in to force on April 2010 through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, and now as amended by the 2012 and 2013 Regulations.

The levy can be used to fund a wide range of strategic infrastructure including transport, flood defences, schools, hospitals, and other health and social facilities. The largest portion of the levy is allocated to this Strategic CIL, with between 15% and 25% of the levy allocated to Neighbourhood CIL.

Where all or part of a chargeable development is within the area of a Parish Council, the charging authority must pass a proportion of the CIL receipts from the development to the Parish Council to support addressing the demands that development places on the area.

The community can still benefit from the neighbourhood portion of the levy where there is no Parish Council, such as in Dorking. The charging authority, in this case Mole Valley District Council, will retain the levy receipts and engage with the community where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Local Committee Members

The law does not set out a specific process for agreeing how the neighbourhood portion of the levy should be spent. Surrey Highways are an eligible body under the Regulations to receive and use Neighbourhood CIL funds. There has not yet been a request to submit bids for neighbourhood CIL funding and it is not yet known what level of scheme development (feasibility) would be required for any future bids. However, there is an application form and guidance available from Mole Valley District Council.

Mole Valley District Council have been contacted about the currently available CIL contributions, and have advised that there is currently insufficient funding available to enable the construction of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing. The construction of a Zebra crossing would likely also not be possible, or require all of the Neighbourhood CIL funding currently available. Neighbourhood CIL can be used to fund all types of infrastructure including flood defences, schools, medical facilities, sporting and recreational facilities and open spaces. Therefore there is a significant demand on this funding.

There are broadly concerns about using limited neighbourhood CIL funding for feasibility where a project may not go ahead, following feasibility assessment, for a variety of reasons. The initial site visits in Chalkpit Lane have indicated concerns about a feasible location for a formal signalised crossing. Therefore there is a risk that the project may not be able to go ahead after using limited funds on a feasibility assessment.

- ii. The Strategic and Neighbourhood CIL is a levy on new development to support growth in the area, and is operated and managed by Mole Valley District Council.

The ITS list is a list of schemes that have been requested from local communities regarding an existing highway issue rather than new infrastructure needed to support new development in the area. Therefore the vast majority of schemes listed within the ITS list, such as traffic calming, new pedestrian crossings and speed limit reductions would not be eligible for Neighbourhood CIL funding. Also any highway schemes that would be eligible for Strategic CIL funding will be identified through Mole Valley District Council's emerging Local Plan.

The ITS list is prioritised, as guidance to Members of the Local Committee, for deciding on the future programme of schemes funded from the delegated budget. Wherever possible, external funding is sought to progress schemes on the ITS list. The future programme is presented to the Local Committee for decision, and there is not always sufficient budget or resources available to progress the highest priority schemes.

- iii. The construction of a formal pedestrian crossing in Chalkpit Lane will serve the local neighbourhood, rather than a wider area of Dorking, and it is therefore most likely to be considered as a Neighbourhood CIL funded scheme.

The proposed pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane could be considered for Strategic CIL funding, by Mole Valley District Council, if it was part of a series of highway improvements on the west side of Dorking. This would be required to be linked to new housing sites if these progress through the local plan process. Any proposals of this nature would be identified later in the local plan

ITEM 4b

Questions from Local Committee Members

process when there is more certainty about where new development is to take place.

2. Question submitted by Cllr Claire Malcomson:

We were advised that other dangerous hot spots will be getting the opportunity of having average speed cameras installed before Mole Valley. Please can we be updated as to how long the A24, through The Holmwoods and up to Beare Green, will have to wait for its own cameras?

Response:

The provision of average speed cameras is considered together by the police and county council at locations where there has been a serious history of collisions and where speeds have been measured and confirmed as excessive and part of the problem. At the present time the county council are in the process of procuring average speed cameras for the A320 St Peter's Way in Chertsey, and for a portion of the A31 Hogs Back in Guildford. The feasibility of providing average speed cameras on the "Pirbright Bends" (Mytchett Place Road, Gole Road and Gapemouth Road) in Pirbright, Guildford is also being investigated. For the latter there has been 24 collisions in the three years to the end of 2018, including eight resulting in serious injury. On the A24 Horsham Road between the roundabout junction with Flint Hill in Dorking to the Beare Green roundabout, there has been a total of 14 collisions in the same period, with three of these resulting in serious injury. (Summary information on personal injury collisions can be viewed on www.crashmap.co.uk). Consequently the council and police do not currently have any plans to introduce average speed cameras on A24 Horsham Road. Data on collisions throughout Surrey is continually updated, and analysis is undertaken to prioritise resources towards the worst collision hotspots.

3. Question submitted by Cllr Claire Malcomson:

As the assessment of the verges was done in September, to see where they need to be cut and where they can be left for wildflowers to grow and attract pollinators, can SCC reassure us that a new programme of cutting will be implemented in the Spring, that makes sure as little is cut as possible, whilst keeping the road safe? And what this strategy will be? Will SCC invest in Cut and Collect machines to maximise this?

Response:

SCC have assessed the A24 between North Holmwood and Clarks Green roundabout and identified some central reservation areas, where they will only cut a 1m swathe in both directions, leaving the rest (on cut 1) uncut to allow wild flowers to grow. All the verges will be cut full width on cut 2.

There is also one area where lane 1 will have a 1m swathe cut, allowing the rest of the verge to be left, until cut 2.

This will be a trial only for 2020 initially.

Lane 1 verges will not be allowed to be uncut, where there are numerous trees and bushes. If these areas were uncut, the areas would quickly become overgrown with woody vegetation leading to high costs for future maintenance, and little chance of flowers surviving.

In Lane 2, the verges that have been identified do not have a ditch or French drain running along them, and are wide enough to permit a 1m swathe in both directions, as well as leaving a large enough area to benefit from being left uncut.

Questions from Local Committee Members

Sight lines will be maintained by cutting the full width 100m from any junction or crossover point.

SCC have no ability to invest in Cut and collect machines as all of the grass cutting is contracted out. The new Countryside framework is not due for award until March 2020, and whilst there is a rate for the use of cut and collect methods of working, we are unable to comment on any potential use of that methodology until the prices and contractors have been confirmed. Surrey County Council have no extra money for verge maintenance this year, and Mole Valley chose not to contribute funds to enhance the maintenance. The standard is 4 urban cuts and 2 rural cuts, without collection of arisings.

4. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson - Headley Road, Leatherhead:

The damaged and missing chevrons on Headley Road, Leatherhead opposite Highlands Farm were reported to the County Council in July 2019 and it was confirmed under Reference 1273613 - HEADLEY ROAD, LEATHERHEAD that new road signs were to be installed. On the basis that these would have been ordered in Q3 for installation in Q4 (ie by 31 December 2019) under the standard timescale for such works, can an explanation be given as to why the chevrons – which are an essential safety feature on a sharp bend - have not yet been replaced and can a date be set in January 2020 for the replacement signs to be installed?

Response:

The chevrons were not ordered until January 2020, due to an administration error. These signs have now been ordered and are to be installed by the end of March 2020.

5. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson - A24 Deepdene Avenue, Dorking:

Residents were advised in late 2019 that the A24 Deepdene Avenue northbound and southbound carriageways between the Deepdene and Denbies Roundabouts would be resurfaced, yet when the work was completed significant stretches of the road were not resurfaced. Can an explanation please be given as to why the information provided to residents (and councilors) was misleading and suggested that much more resurfacing than was intended would be carried out.

Furthermore, there are now some very significant (deep) potholes in the southbound carriageway between the Railway Bridge and the Deepdene Roundabout which need urgent attention. Can a date for the repair of the road be given and can a justification be given as to why this section of road was not resurfaced when the rest of the road was resurfaced as it would have been much more cost effective to do so?

Response:

A24 Deepdene Avenue, Dorking was not originally included in the 2019/20 planned maintenance programme and had also not been prioritised when compared with other roads county wide for Horizon 2 which is a long term approach to considering roads for future scheme planning.

All roads on the planned maintenance programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved process. This process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

ITEM 4b

Questions from Local Committee Members

Full list of schemes is published on our website

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

Criteria that had rated the scheme low in the priority process included a low percentage of structural defects and low number of risk related issues such as skidding accidents. However, urgency increased when the number of reported risk related defects went up. The scheme was therefore nominated for works utilising an additional budget allocation from the severe weather fund.

At a later date, and due to this being an A class road and the higher associated costs incurred, the scheme was moved to the major maintenance programme by officers. This happened after the start of the financial year and since budgets had already been allocated the extent of works was restricted to 3 sections of the worst deteriorated areas to keep within approved overall programme costs.

Information was provided to stakeholders in accordance with our customer engagement plan. A residents leaflet was sent out which included a map outlining the limits of closures rather than extents of surfacing and we regret any confusion caused. The website did set out in detail the extents for each of the various phases of surfacing

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/roadworks/a24-london-road-and-deepdene-avenue-resurfacing>

We have taken account of the concerns raised in the councillor's question and have schedule an assessment of the remaining sections. We will update Hazel of the outcome of that assessment.

We will continue to inspect these roads for individual Safety Defects, and arrange repairs as appropriate.

6. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson – On- street parking in Dorking Town Centre:

Matt Furniss, the County Council Cabinet Member responsible for Highways in Surrey has requested that the Local Committee should look at on-street parking charges again in Dorking. In order to enable the Local Committee to assess the reasonableness of this request, can the number of designated on-street parking places at each location in the town be listed together with a preliminary assessment of the number of pay machines that would be required, and comments as to how many parking spaces each payment machine would need to service for the scheme to be cost effective and produce an appropriate return on the capital invested?

Response:

There is insufficient time before the committee to assess in any detail the various 'pay and display' options that could be implemented in Dorking. The SCC parking team would be happy to look at the options with local members should the local committee wish to take this proposal forward.

7. Questions submitted by Mr Tim Hall:

What are the On Street Parking Enforcement for Mole Valley in financial figures in the last four financial years (by year)?

1. What are the sources of income by category? (PCNs/Resident Parking Permits etc) by year.
2. Which are the costs by Budget Head (Staffing/Administration/Travel etc).
3. What are the overall deficit or surplus figures for each of the last four years for Mole Valley?
4. How do the figures in 3. Compare to the other ten Surrey Districts over the same period?

Response:

In response to Q1 to Q3, please see the table below showing a breakdown of parking income and expenditure supplied by MVDC for the Mole Valley on street parking account for the last 4 financial years.

Type	On Street	On Street	On Street	On Street
Accounting year end	Mar-19	Mar-18	Mar-17	Mar-16
Income				
Income from Resident Permits	£59	£28	£24	£12
Income from Visitor Permits				
Income from Parking Charges				
PCN Income	£124	£122	£104	£104
Other Income (Non PCN)	£4	£9	£8	£2
Total Income	£187	£159	£137	£119
Expenditure				
Enforcement Contractors	£6	£1		
Enforcement Staff	£169	£165	£86	£90
Equipment/Operations	£6	£17	£8	

Questions from Local Committee Members

Non Enforcement Staff	£47	£46	£64	£67
Traffic Penalties Tribunal/Appeal		£2		
Overheads	£23	£16	£15	£28
Other				
Total costs	£253	£249	£175	£185
Deficit	£66	£89	£38	£66

Note, Income from visitor permits is included in Resident Permit total

ITEM 4b

In response to 4. Please see summary table of income/expenditure for Surrey districts and boroughs.

Summary of on street parking income and expenditure in 18/19

Authority Name	<i>Epsom and E</i>	<i>Elmbridge</i>	<i>Guildford</i>	<i>Mole Valley</i>	<i>Runnymede</i>	<i>Reigate and Banstead</i>	<i>Spelthorne</i>	<i>Surrey Heath</i>	<i>Tandridge</i>	<i>Waverley</i>	<i>Woking</i>
Type	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	Total	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>	<i>On Street</i>
Accounting year end	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	01/04/18 to 04/11/18	31/03/2019	31/03/2019	31/03/2019
Total Income	£423,832	£1,043,094	£1,395,224	£187,830	£149,670	£298,259	£153,931	£271,860	£136,779	£392,987	£956,723
Total costs	£393,808	£666,678	£810,284	£253,925	£146,016	£633,566	£152,656	£350,110	£140,066	£210,850	£645,027
Surplus amount (-ve is deficit)	£30,023	£376,416	£584,940	-£66,095	£3,654	-£335,307	£1,275	-£78,250	-£3,287	£182,137	£311,696

8. Question submitted by Mr Stephen Cooksey:

Would officers please investigate the possibility of introducing a box junction at the junction of Westcott Road, Vincent Lane and Howard Road in Dorking to help relieve the problem of vehicles blocking access when traffic lights change? Such boxes have been introduced and work successfully in other parts of Dorking regardless of enforcement issues.

Response:

The A25 Westcott Road/Vincent Lane/Howard Road/Drill Hall Road junction is a cross roads junction on the one-way system in Dorking.

In 2017 a study was carried out into congestion problems in Dorking Town Centre, this study produced a range of small scale options to reduce congestion. The study did not identify the installation of a yellow box at this junction as a small scale option that could reduce congestion in Dorking Town Centre.

Half-yellow boxes, in which only one lane is marked, are appropriate at T-junctions where the traffic blocks back from one direction only. However, half-boxes such as this should only be used on the minor road side of the main carriageway, to allow emerging traffic to turn right where the queue of traffic in the major road is to the left, such as the yellow box marking at the A2003 Station Road/A25 Westcott Road junction. A half-box on the side of the road opposite a T-junction, which is being requested here, generally serves no useful purpose. Even though it will create a gap in a queue of traffic, drivers turning right from the minor road will not be able to enter the box as the exit will be obstructed. Also traffic travelling on the A25 Westcott Road into Dorking Town Centre will be prevented from proceeding because they will have to give way to traffic travelling out of Vincent Lane more frequently, leading to longer queues on the A25 Westcott Road.

For the reasons above Surrey County Council has no plans to introduce a half-yellow box at the junction of Westcott Road, Vincent Lane and Howard Road in Dorking.

9. Question submitted by Mrs Clare Curran:

In recent weeks, Bookham High Street has become very congested, often because large vehicles have been using it and cars have been unable to pass them. Sometimes this has led to tailbacks on the A246 or on Lower Road.

Some shoppers and retailers find this frustrating and suggest that congestion like this deters residents from shopping locally and from using the High Street. Other residents are concerned about the safety of pedestrians in the village centre, particularly those who cross the road.

Accordingly, I have had several suggestions that the High Street would be more convenient, safer and free flowing if it were made one way. Other residents have suggested that the High Street might be altogether safer for shoppers and a more attractive environment if it were to be pedestrianised between Lower Road and Guildford Road.

Could officers please set out how these options could be evaluated and considered? If one or other option were to be considered feasible and desirable, what would be the process to work the project through? What would be the timescales and cost? Who are the different organisations and groups of people who would be consulted? What are the different factors that would need to be taken into account?

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4b

Questions from Local Committee Members

Response:

Bookham High Street is located off of the A246 that runs east to west between Leatherhead and Guildford. It links the A246 Leatherhead Road to the south with Lower Road to the north. The High Street is an important part of a busy and vibrant village centre, and therefore contains a number of shops and businesses, which people need to access.

There are issues with traffic flows and congestion relating to the various competing activities that have to be accommodated within the narrow highway limits on the High Street.

In 2013 concerns were raised that the narrow carriageway width on the High Street and the parking along the entire length of the east side, did not provide many opportunities for two vehicles to pass one another, particularly if being used by large vehicles.

As a result of these concerns, the South East Area Team was asked to look into carrying out improvements to address these concerns. Following consultation carried out in 2013, with residents, businesses and Bookham Residents Association, sections of double yellow lines were installed in High Street in order to provide passing spaces to make it easier for vehicles to pass each other. An informal pedestrian crossing on a raised table top road hump was also installed, in order to provide a facility for pedestrians to cross safely without having to cross between parked vehicles.

At this time the possibility of installing a one-way system in High Street was also considered, and consultation was carried out regarding whether or not a one-way system would be supported. However, opposition to the one-way system was received from residents and retailers, who were concerned about the increased vehicle speeds and the redistribution of traffic to surrounding roads, particularly East Street, which would result from the introduction of a one-way system in High Street. There were also concerns that a one-way system would have a negative impact on businesses in the High Street due to one end of the High Street being effectively closed to traffic. The pedestrianisation of High Street would raise similar concerns to those raised regarding the possibility of installing a one-way system in High Street. These concerns will remain and therefore there are no plans to introduce a one-way system or pedestrianise High Street, Great Bookham.

10. Question submitted by Cllr Nancy Goodacre:

The closure of sections of public footways during building developments causes significant inconvenience to local residents, such as the long-term closure in Keswick Road. Why are section 50 licences or other measures not being used effectively to control this?

Response:

Based on the information received, officers cannot find evidence of a long term footway closure at this location, but would be happy to work with the questioner further if more information could be provided about the specific development and/or location.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL



SURREY

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2020

SUBJECT: PETITION TO: REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON THE A24 SOUTH, UP THE HILL FROM THE COCKEREL ROUNDABOUT UNTIL PAST THE OLD KUONI SITE, FROM THE CURRENT 50MPH TO A SAFER LOWER SPEED REFLECTING THE RESIDENTIAL AREA

DIVISION: DORKING SOUTH AND THE HOLMWOODS

PETITION DETAILS:

Mole Valley Local Committee Petition (22 Jan) Summary:

Petition to improve road safety for both pedestrians and road users by reducing the speed of traffic that effects the junctions of Deepdene Drive, Deepdene Avenue and South Drive as they enter the main A24. There have been a number of incidents where collisions have occurred between cars both entering and exiting the A24 and unfortunately on 23 July a fatal traffic incident took place when a car entered the A24 from South Drive causing a collision with a van travelling up the hill which resulted the death of the car driver. All of these junctions have severe difficulty entering the main A24 safely due to both the volume and speed of the traffic and the poor visibility. We understand that the old Kuoni site may soon become a housing development which will only further increase the problems and danger of traffic entering and exiting the A24.

RESPONSE:

The section of the A24 Deepdene Avenue, between the Cockerel roundabout and the junction with South Drive, provides access to a number of residential properties as well as access to Deepdene Drive, Deepdene Avenue and South Drive which are residential roads. This section of the A24 has a 30mph speed limit in place from the Cockerel roundabout to just south of its junction with Deepdene Drive. However the speed limit changes to 50mph just south of Deepdene Drive, therefore Deepdene Avenue and South Drive, join the section of A24 where the speed limit is currently 50mph.

A review has been carried out of personal injury collisions that have occurred on the A24 Deepdene Avenue, between the Cockerel roundabout to just beyond the junction with South Drive during the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 21/11/2016 to 20/11/2019). During this period there has been 3 personal injury collisions, with 2 involving slight injury and the one fatal collision.

The circumstances of the fatal collision will be discussed at a future meeting of the Road Safety Working Group, once the Surrey Police investigation has been completed. This group consists of road safety experts from both Surrey Police and Surrey County Council and engineers from Surrey Highways.

The concerns about road safety at the junctions of Deepdene Drive, Deepdene Avenue and South Drive expressed by the petitioners, together with the collision history at these junctions will be taken into consideration as part of that discussion.

Regretfully, the Local Committee are not in a position to take a decision about any infrastructure changes until the reports and advice are received from the Road Safety Working Group and Surrey Police.

However, previous requests have been received from Mole Valley District Council, following the opening of the Deepdene Trail, to reduce the speed limit on the A24 Deepdene Avenue (between the existing 30mph speed limit and the North Holmwood roundabout). In March 2019 speed surveys were carried out to assess whether or not the existing average mean speeds complied with Surrey County Council's Speed Limit policy for a lower speed limit. One of these surveys was carried out next to street light number 17, which is between the junction with South Drive and the start of the existing 30mph speed limit.

The results of this survey and other surveys carried out along the A24 Deepdene Avenue between the existing 30mph limit and the North Holmwood roundabout show that this whole section of the A24 complies with Surrey County Council's speed limit policy for a 40mph speed limit using signs alone. Therefore a scheme to reduce the existing speed limit from 50mph to 40mph will be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme List for possible future funding and other sources of funding will also be sought.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to note the officer's response.

Contact Officer:

Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL



LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2020

SUBJECT: ON STREET CAR PARKING CHARGES

DIVISION: ALL

PETITION DETAILS:

Withdraw the idea put forward in the recent Parking Strategy Update paper that "The Council should support the introduction of on-street parking charges" on all time-limited free parking spaces on the main thoroughfares in our towns and larger villages and that Local and Joint Committees should not support the reason suggested for introducing such charges as being "to help improve access to retail areas" as this will have the opposite effect on our fragile retail sector

RESPONSE:

The recommendation to the cabinet in the parking strategy update on the 28 January is as follows:

1. Local and Joint Committees should consider as part of the parking review process the introduction of on-street parking charges where appropriate to help improve access to retail areas or other facilities.

Parking charges (or a pay and display system) operate in most if not all off street car parks and allow efficient enforcement of the time limits set for parking. This type of approach could be particularly useful in many short stay on street parking bays where it is important to ensure vehicles do not overstay the time limit. This allows better turnover of the spaces and improves access to shops and businesses for customers.

There are no plans to introduce on street parking charges in Dorking or elsewhere in Mole Valley and the decision whether to implement them will lie with the Local Committees.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to:

- (i) *Note the officer's comment.*

Contact Officer:

David Curl, Parking Strategy & Implementation. Team Manager

This page is intentionally left blank