

Supplementary Agenda

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

Supplementary Agenda

Item 6 – Public Question

Item 7- Member Question



Venue

Location: Virtual meeting

Date: Friday, 6 November
2020

Time: 10.15 am

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

6 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(Pages 1 - 2)

To answer any questions from residents or businesses within the Tandridge District area in accordance with Standing Order 69. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

7 MEMBERS QUESTIONS

(Pages 3 - 6)

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47. Notice should be given in writing to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer of formal questions by 12.00 noon four working days before the meeting.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 6 November 2020

SUBJECT: Public Question: Whyteleafe Hill

DIVISION: Caterham Valley



Background

On Thursday, 15th October, at around 11.45 pm, there was a traffic accident on Whyteleafe Hill involving a car hitting a degraded and poorly maintained speed bump, losing control, leaving the carriageway, colliding with and destroying a lamp post, complete with bus stop sign and the nearby bench, damaging two parked vans and coming to rest in a hedge on the other side of the road.

This is the latest in a sequence of accidents that have taken place at this site. The most recent previous one occurred in February 2019 and also resulted in the destruction of the bus stop, bench, other vehicles and - on this occasion - a resident's front wall.

These repeated incidents are caused by the poor quality of the road surface around the speed bumps and, particularly, by the sunken patch before the bump near 146, Whyteleafe Hill. Surrey Highways has been asked to review the situation, and inspected the road on 19th October. The response noted the defects around the speed humps but said that `current repair criteria` were not met.

I believe that this response is extremely complacent given the potential for very serious consequences if further accidents were to take place here.

Question

Given the unacceptably high chance of serious injury or fatality should further accidents occur at this site, will the highways authority reconsider its response and undertake to act urgently to repair the surface of the road at this location on Whyteleafe Hill?

Response:

The C227 Whyteleafe Hill, Whyteleafe is a 30mph speed limit road with existing traffic calming that includes speed cushions.

It is understood that there had been an accident that damaged the light column, that has the bus stop located on it near to No. 130 Whyteleafe Hill, in February 2019 and again in October this year. The most recent accident was reported to our contractor Skanska, who are our street lighting contractor, on 16th October.

C227 Whyteleafe Hill receives monthly driven and annual walked highway safety inspections, and any safety defects that meet the intervention level set out in our Highway Safety Inspection Policy are repaired. Further details of this Policy can be found on our

ITEM 6

website here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plans-consultations/policies-and-plans/highway-safety-inspections-standards-and-procedures>

There had been only one defect since January 2020 and this was on the speed cushion near to No. 130 Whyteleafe Hill. This defect was reported on 1st October 2020 and repaired on 8th October 2020. Residents may find it useful to report any issues that they could have with roads on our website here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/report-a-highway-problem>.

Further details about this accident on 16th October are not known, although there have been no reports that this resulted in personal injury. There also does not appear to be a history of personal injury accidents on the road in the last three years.

Surrey County Council does take concerns about road safety seriously and road collisions across the County are continually monitored using information provided by Surrey Police. This includes information regarding the factors that have caused the collision. Unfortunately, there are many reasons that collisions occur including distraction in vehicles when drivers are using mobile phones or sat-navs, drivers not looking properly when exiting junctions, drivers making inappropriate turns or manoeuvres, lack of concentration, drivers exceeding the speed limit etc.

However, as there have been two damage only accidents at the same location, this matter is being referred to the relevant Road Safety Working Group for any action to be determined. This group consists of Road Safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways.

In the meantime, the road will continue to have highway safety inspections and any highway defects that meet the intervention level will be repaired.

Contact Officer: highways@surreycc.gov.uk

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 6 November 2020

SUBJECT: Member Question: Lingfield Pinch points

DIVISION: Lingfield



Question

The Lingfield pinch points are well known locally, in December 2014 the local committee received a petition with over 1000 signatures asking for them to be removed or another measure be installed to allow vehicles to exit Bay Trees. The pinch points have caused numerous accidents with damage to cars and countless near misses, which are often unreported.

I received vast number of emails and calls from local residents who are angry and frustrated by these pinch points and ask the county council take some action.

Please can Highways advise on the options available for this section of road?

Response:

A set of pinch points were installed in Lingfield during 2013 by a developer, (who obtained planning permission on appeal), in order to reduce vehicle speeds and enable safe access from a new development of 18 houses. The scheme was subject to a monitoring period, and after this closed in February 2015 the Local Committee identified several desired amendments to the scheme. Both SCC officers and the Police were supportive of the scheme on safety grounds. There was significant local opposition to the pinch points from the Parish Council and residents, with a petition coming to the Local Committee with over 1000 signatures in December 2014.

Planning permission was granted on appeal in January 2011 for the 18 new homes at land at The Bays (now known as Bay Trees), Godstone Road, Lingfield. A speed management scheme comprising of the relocation of the 30 mph speed limit to a point around 225m north west of the existing position and the provision of 2 kerb-build outs was a requirement of the planning permission granted.

The Local Committee agreed at the meeting on 9 December 2011, when the Traffic Regulation Order for the change in the speed limit was discussed, that the speed management scheme should be monitored for a year. The monitoring was to be on the basis of congestion, traffic diversion, traffic speeds and recorded personal injury accidents.

ITEM 7

The County Council entered into a Section 278 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980 on 18 September 2012 to enable the developer to undertake the works on the highway. The kerb build outs, and the moving of the speed limit were completed in December 2012.

A Stage 3 Road Safety Audit was conducted in February 2013 and amendments to the scheme to address the issues raised were undertaken by the developer at their expense in spring 2013. The access works were completed in September 2013 and the formal monitoring period began on this date.

The monitoring period ended on 5 September 2014 and, under the terms of the Section 278 Agreement, the County Council had 6 months to consider the outcome of the monitoring and to request amendments, should they be considered necessary.

A report was brought to the Local Committee in December 2014, to review the outcome of the monitoring. This report made the following recommendations:

The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to agree that:

- (i) The monitoring of the speed management scheme in Godstone Road, Lingfield has demonstrated that in terms of congestion, traffic diversion, traffic speeds and recorded personal injury accidents, there is no justification for the removal of the scheme.
- (ii) Should the Committee determine that the scheme should be removed and/or substantially amended, it would not be reasonable to undertake this at the expense of the applicant.

The committee received a petition from Mrs Pam Erskine, a resident who lives in the thatched cottage in between the pinch points, 1060 signatures from local residents requesting that the pinch points on Godstone Road in Lingfield are demolished.

The committee determined to defer the decision from the December meeting, in order to prepare a new report by March 2015 (proposing potential amendments to the scheme), continue the monitoring and to consult with the Lingfield and Dormansland Parish Councils prior to the report being submitted to the Committee.

In order to remain within the 6 month deadline for amendment, a special meeting of the local committee was scheduled for February 2015.

At the February 2015 meeting, the Local Committee received statements from Parish Council Chairman Chris D'Avray, and from Mrs Erskine.

The Local Committee agreed there was no justification to remove the scheme, and identified some amendments subject to funding:

- 'Keep Clear' markings in the carriageway at the pinch point closest to the village in order to prevent vehicles queuing to enter the village from stopping vehicles from exiting.
- Review and replace signage and explore more robust illuminated signage, in consultation with Surrey Police and Parish Councils.

- Provision of a VMS sign and 'keep clear' markings at the pinch point closest to the village.

There have since been several site visits to try to determine feasible and affordable alternative options for the junction of Bay Trees and Godstone Road.

Options that have been considered, but are not in broad terms feasible and/or affordable are:

- To buy land and gain consents to move a listed wall to give greater visibility for the exit from Bay Trees;
- A signalised junction (too close to the entrance to nearby businesses and properties, may require purchase of land to install signal posts);
- Install alternative traffic calming scheme through the village to support a reduction in speed limit (road is on bus route and road tables may not be effective and may be noisy. Priority give way had already been considered as the most effective option for reducing traffic speed. Issue of sight line for exiting Bay Trees would remain.)

It is suggested that the signs on the pinch points could be enhanced, and a review of road markings carried out. Any changes may require a road closure in order for the works to be carried out safely. The likely timeframe for the earliest that this proposal could be undertaken is at the start of the next financial year, subject to funding.

The Local Committee could consider adding this proposal to the Forward Programme for the next Financial Year.

References

[Agenda Papers December 2014 Local Committee](#)

[Supplementary papers - petitions for December 2014 meeting](#)

[Agenda Papers for February 2015 meeting of the Local Committee](#)

[Minutes from February 2015 meeting of the Local Committee](#)

Contact Officer: Zena Curry
highways@surreycc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank