

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: Response – Petition to: Introduce two box junctions in Dorking

Venue

Location: Virtual

Date: Wednesday, 24 February
2021

Time: 2.00 pm

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

4a PUBLIC QUESTIONS (Pages 1 - 8)

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

4b MEMBER QUESTIONS (Pages 9 - 16)

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

5a PETITION TO: INTRODUCE TWO BOX JUNCTIONS IN DORKING (Pages 17 - 18)

The full wording of this petition and officer response are provided within

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2021****LEAD OFFICER: JESS LEE, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER****SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC****DIVISION: ALL****1. Question submitted by Cllr Roger Adams**

Surrey Wildlife Trust (SWT) has managed and supported the activities of the Norbury Park Sawmill since 2002 when it was included as part of the overall Agreement with Surrey County Council to manage the land and properties which formed their countryside estate. In 2020, SWT reached a new amended Agreement with SCC in which SWT agreed to temporarily continue to manage the business of the Sawmill for SCC whilst they assessed options for the Sawmill. However, the business is considered to be unsustainable and is slated for closure on 31st March 2021 or shortly thereafter.

I understand that this is the last remaining working wood mill and workshop left in the country, taking English native trees to produce hand built unique outdoor furniture; amongst its dedicated customers are the Royal Parks and Wildlife Trusts. Furthermore, it provides employment for highly skilled craftsmen. It is considered by the wider community to be an important Surrey asset.

What options have SCC assessed to enable the sawmill to continue its operations and what steps are SCC taking to ensure its continuation?

Response:

The detailed analysis and outcomes for each of the options considered is commercial in confidence and were included in part 2 of the officer decision. Evidence was gathered by officers and verified and developed by external independent experts.

Option 4 was the proposed option, providing greatest value for money and future opportunities for the site including rural crafts and industries. A version of Option 2 can be considered as part of Option 4 and could include a CIC being established by another organisation.

Factors taken into consideration when evaluating were current contract arrangements, investment needed, planning conditions, environmental considerations, economic and social potential plus added value and fit with SCC corporate objectives.

O1.	Do Nothing - SWT continue to manage the operations
-----	--

O2.	Sell the Sawmill business to another operator and provide a lease over the whole site
O3.	Close the Sawmill and take no further action
O4.	Close the sawmill and develop the site for visitor services and courses, local wood processing for rural crafts and woodland management, in keeping with Norbury Park.
O5.	To transfer the sawmill into SCC ownership either within the service or as a wholly owned subsidiary

2. Question submitted by Julia Dickinson

According to our LEP (Coast to Capital), Gatwick Airport is “one of the most important parts of our regional economy”, so it has recently submitted the ‘Gatwick Freeport’ bid. Gatwick Airport’s footprint includes land in Mole Valley, and the jobs of many residents are dependent on its recovery. Could the relevant officers who are responsible for Economic Development and Planning please explain on how this Freeport will help Mole Valley’s economy, and how are the economic development and planning teams at Surrey CC and Mole Valley working together to maximise the benefits.

Response:

Free ports are areas designated by government with little or no tax with the aim of encouraging economic activity. While located geographically within a country, they essentially exist outside its borders for tax purposes. Companies operating within free ports can benefit from deferring the payment of taxes until their products are moved elsewhere, or can avoid them altogether if they bring in goods to store or manufacture on site before exporting them again.

The three main objectives of the government’s Freeport policy, as stated in the [bidding prospectus](#), are:

- ‘Establish Freeports as national hubs for global trade and investment across the UK’
- ‘Promote regeneration and job creation’
- ‘Create hotbeds for innovation’

The proposed Gatwick Freeport boundary does not include Mole Valley but the view of Coast to Capital is that a successful Freeport would have ‘significant spill-over

effects' across the wider regional economy. As stated in Coast to Capital's [press release](#), the LEP expects Freeport status to help safeguard and create new jobs and unlock infrastructure upgrades that would benefit the wider region.

Mole Valley District Council has asked Coast to Capital to provide information on the potential implications for Mole Valley if the Gatwick Freeport bid were to be successful. This information on the benefits for the wider region, including Mole Valley, is likely to be available towards the end of February.

Whilst Mole Valley and Surrey County Council (along with the other Surrey Districts and Boroughs), are reviewing and refocusing their inward investment activity, it is not yet clear whether or not it will be possible to take advantage of any Freeport status at Gatwick.

3. Question submitted by Peter Seaward

Can the Local Committee provide reassurance that new housing developments in Mole Valley and neighbouring boroughs are being taken into account when future school places are being considered? And also confirm that there will be a clearer picture of this for residents later this year, on completion of various studies?

Response:

The Surrey County Council Education Place Planning (EPP) team is working closely with colleagues at Mole Valley District Council in relation to the Mole Valley Draft Local Plan.

The EPP team receive housing permissions and trajectories from the District and Borough councils in April each year (with updates requested every October), which are then combined with birth and pupil movement trends in specialist demographic forecasting software called 'Edge-ucate'. This creates pupil projections, in a variety of different formats.

The pupil yield from the Draft Local Plan is not yet included in the return from Mole Valley. Colleagues at Mole Valley have been in contact again this month as part of a review of the proposed sites to be taken forward to the submission stage of the Local Plan. There will be further discussion on any potential impact to the education infrastructure across the area.

However, until there is more detail on confirmed sites and phasing of developments the forecasts cannot reflect any potential pupil yield from housing.

Consideration must also be given to further housing proposed in the neighbouring borough of Guildford, in particular at Effingham and Wisley, and how this might impact on pupil movement trends.

It is worth noting that the birth rate has decreased by 14% in Mole Valley since 2012 creating capacity in our primary schools. Peaks and troughs are expected as the higher cohorts from the primary sector transition to secondary provision with a general decline expected in the long term.

All of the above will be closely monitored over the next six months and it is hoped that more information will be available in the Autumn.

4. Question submitted by Cllr Caroline Salmon

Surrey has removed trees that are purported to have Ash Dieback along the A24. Ash Dieback is notoriously difficult to diagnose without seeing spots on the leaves or loss of canopy, but no trees were marked for felling in my ward.

Many of these trees acted as screens against, light and particle pollution and as a bit of a barrier against noise.

However, a number of houses which previously benefitted from such screening are now exposed.

Considering we are being told we need more trees; can Surrey Highways confirm:

Why the trees are being felled on mass, as resistance is being found in larger trees but they are all being felled without any apparent individual arboreal selection.

How much more tree felling is proposed and where?

What Hedge or Tree screening might be planted to provide appropriate replacement barriers against noise, light and particulate pollution?

When might such replacement be done?

Response:

At the time of publishing, it wasn't possible to provide a comprehensive response to this question. Work will continue on the response and be provided in writing to the questioner outside the meeting.

5. Question submitted by Cllr Elizabeth Daly

How many Bookham secondary students currently attend (a) Howard of Effingham school and (b) all other schools, and how is it estimated these numbers will change if:

- (i) the size of the school increases to 2000;
- (ii) an additional 295 homes are built in Effingham;
- (iii) an additional 405 homes are built in Effingham?

Response:

In response to points A and B please see the table below:

School name	Number of Bookham residents on roll (October 2020 census)
Howard of Effingham School	527
Cobham Free School	Under 5
Three Rivers Academy	Under 5
Therfield School	29
The Ashcombe School	7
St Peter's Catholic School	Under 5
Rosebery School	Under 5
Royal Alexandra and Albert School	Under 5

In line with the Data Protection Act 1998, the term “under 5 pupils” has been used to protect any possible identification.

In response to point (i) the proposed increase of the Howard of Effingham School has not been included in the forecasts and would not be included until the change to the Published Admissions Number had been consulted upon. Generally, any change to the admissions of a school can alter the pattern of provision within the local area; but the extent of this is difficult to determine as it will inevitably alter the current pupil movement trends. For example, given the Howard of Effingham’s reputation as an outstanding oversubscribed school, it is likely that any expansion would also attract applications from students who may not currently be in the maintained school system and who would otherwise attend an independent provision.

In response to points (ii) and (iii), any new housing could have an impact on the local school provision as new homes can encourage families to move either into or within the area. The potential pupil yield from any development will depend on two factors: the number of homes being built and the number of bedrooms those new homes will have. The housing trajectories provided to SCC from Guildford Borough Council in April 2020 included the 295 homes proposed at the Howard of Effingham site as well as other proposed developments in the area. The pupil yield from these developments is factored into our place planning forecasts and shows a slight increase in the numbers of children expecting to attend secondary school in the area. Should any additional proposed housing come forward, these will be consulted upon with us by Guildford Borough Council and will be factored into the forecasts for 2021 onwards.

6. Question submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy

It is good news that Surrey County Council are planning to consult in Spring 2021, having taken over most of the management of Norbury Park at the end of March 2020.

ITEM 4a

During the last year, what consultation has taken place with local residents, MVDC councillors and community groups including the Norbury Park consultative group,, especially over performance issues and decisions already made such as the closure of the sawmill?

Response:

No formal consultation has taken place with stakeholders since Surrey County Council have taken on the site in August 2020 (contract completion). This is due to new staff needing to be recruited and mobilised, on site, handover meetings with SWT and COVID restrictions.

Initial informal discussions were held with tenants, residents and parish councillors in the summer of 2020. Feedback indicated the liaison group for Norbury Park had become too large (with a focus beyond Norbury Park including other sites on the estate) and should be more focused on the Park.

An Engagement Officer was recruited within the team to manage engagement with stakeholders across the whole estate and to propose a new structure for regular liaison. The post holder began in November and was redeployed to support the vaccine programme in January. She is due back in post in May and will be prioritising the resurrection of local liaison methods. In the meantime, the Operational team are working with the Corporate Communications Team to provide initial communications to local users and stakeholders.

7. Question submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy

This puddle on the footpath between Mole Road and Cannon Way in Fetcham has been an almost permanent feature for many years. Surrey Highways have informed me that it does not meet the intervention criteria in their Highways Safety Matrix.

Will Surrey Highways permit any other agencies or residential groups to fix this, and if so what would be the estimated cost?

Response:

The puddle referred to is localised ponding of water. As noted, there is no defect on this section of the path that would meet the intervention criteria set out Surrey's Highways Safety Matrix.

Our records show that there was flooding on the path in the past but this was due to a blocked Thames carrier, an issue that has now been resolved. There are no previous reports of flooding in the vicinity of the current puddle or that the path is inaccessible due to water ponding. Therefore, Surrey has no plans to carry out resurfacing of this path at the current time as it does not prioritise for funding.

Any work on the public highway has to be carried out by a contractor that has the necessary public liability insurance

Anyone wishing to work on the public highway must have the following:

- the appropriate road opening license from Surrey. It is a criminal offence to carry out works on the public highway without a valid license.

- suitable valid accreditation under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) for the type of work they are carrying out and be on the Street Works Qualifications Register
- £2 million public liability insurance
- a permit for road space from Surrey's Street Works Team
- a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order if the highway is to be closed for the duration of the works

Due to the above requirements, an application from a Parish or District Council to carry out works on the path may be considered. Under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015, the Parish or District Council would take on the duties of the client, which includes the appointment of a competent contractor. The cost of the works would be quoted by the contractor and depend on the extent of the works being carried out and their schedule of rates.

More information can be found on Surrey's website - www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/permits-and-licences/road-opening

Alternatively, if others wish to fund works to the path where water currently ponds, a price from Surrey's term contractor could be provided and the funding transferred to Surrey before works commence.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2021****LEAD OFFICER: JESS LEE, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER****SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS****DIVISION: ALL****1. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson:**

In response to the petition for a pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane near to Triangle Stores presented to the Local Committee at its December 2020 Meeting it was stated:

Existing safety regulations do not permit the installation of a push button pedestrian crossing where the existing pedestrian island is located. Existing safety regulations state that crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions (the uncontrolled junction in this instance being Station Road). This will give drivers an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a crossing and to brake safely, in order not to hit a pedestrian using the crossing. A minimum distance of 20m is suggested for a control pedestrian crossing.

Can an explanation as to how the controlled pedestrian crossings in South Street outside Waitrose, in Flint Hill close to Ridgeway Road, and in Horsham Road close to South Street and St Paul's Road West were authorised and installed given that this requirement was not met in relation to these controlled crossings. Furthermore, if these crossings could be installed within 20m of road junctions, why is it considered a problem for the proposed crossing on Chalkpit Lane as surely the same mitigating factors will apply?

Response:

The controlled pedestrian crossings in South Street and Junction Road outside Waitrose do not need to be located away from the junction because the crossing on Junction Road only shows a "green man" and allows pedestrians to cross when the pedestrian crossing on South Street outside Waitrose is on a red signal and has stopped traffic. This prevents drivers from turning into Junction Road from South Street colliding with pedestrians using the crossing on Junction Road. The controlled pedestrian crossing on South Street doesn't need to be located away from the junction because South Street is a one-way road, with good forward visibility of the pedestrian crossing. Also because of the one-way road, traffic can only turn right out of Junction Road and therefore drivers turning out of Junction Road do not drive across the pedestrian crossing on South Street.

The minimum distance of 20m set out within existing safety regulations is measured from the position of the driver waiting at the give-way line. Therefore, those drivers turning right out of Ridgeway Road and St. Paul's Road West are a sufficient distance away for drivers to have an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of these crossings and brake safely. In comparison any driver turning left out of Station Road, would not

ITEM 4b

have adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a pedestrian crossing where pedestrians currently cross Chalkpit Lane at the pedestrian island, to brake safely. Drivers turning left out of Station Road would also be concentrating on traffic approaching from their right, rather than looking left to see if the pedestrian crossing is on a red signal before turning left.

It is appreciated that parents, residents, business owners and community partners of Dorking Safe Streets and many others want a safe, controlled pedestrian crossing to be installed on Chalkpit Lane. However, any such crossing will need to follow existing safety regulations to ensure that any crossing can be used safely and does not increase the risk of accidents.

2. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson

When Boxhill School made a request for a 20mph speed limit outside the school a speed survey was carried out to see if traffic speeds outside the school met the criteria for a 20mph speed limit. The result of the speed survey showed that the criteria for a 20mph speed limit were met at this point and the potential speed limit reduction was added to the ITS List.

County Highways has now stated: *“The road is approximately 1.9km long, with a section through Mickleham village and also a long section that is far more open and rural in nature. The speed survey on Old London Road was located in the Village centre and, although that complied with the “Setting Local Speed Limits” Policy for that short section, the survey data could not be extrapolated to support a change in speed limit on the more rural section of the road. Further speed surveys and a feasibility study are required to determine if it is possible and affordable to reduce the speed limit on the whole of the road, and also what additional engineering measures could be needed.”*

Can an explanation be given as to why the required number of speed surveys to reduce the speed limit through Mickleham were not carried out when the initial speed survey outside Boxhill School was carried out and can an explanation be given as to why it was not a waste of money to carry out a single speed survey when it should have been clearly known that the requested reduced speed limit could not be implemented as a result of the single speed survey that was carried out?

Response:

The B2209 Old London Road, Mickleham is a B-Class road travelling north to south through Mickleham village, connecting to the A24 at Mickleham in the north with the A24 at Westhumble in the south. The northern section of the B2209 Old London Road runs through the built up area of Mickleham village, with a high density of development and on street parking which help to narrow the road for an approximate distance of 400m. The southern section of the road becomes more rural in nature as there are fewer properties. An existing 30mph speed limit is in place on the B2209 London Road, Mickleham from its most northern point, at its junction with the A24, to its junction with Headley Lane. To the south of Headley Lane a 40mph speed limit is in place, to its junction with the A24 at Burford Bridge.

In May 2016 the Headmaster of Boxhill School wrote to the Chief Executive of Surrey County Council expressing concern about the safety of the students crossing the B2209 Old London Road outside Boxhill School due to the School being a split

site, and requested the introduction of a 20mph speed limit and traffic calming. At this time funding was available to carry out speed surveys, therefore a speed survey was carried out outside the school where the pupils cross the B2209 Old London Road in order to travel between the school and their boarding houses, to measure average mean speeds. The results of the survey recorded the following average mean speeds;

Northbound – 19.6mph
Southbound – 18.7mph

The results of the survey showed very good compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit. A review of the recorded personal injury collisions on Old London Road, Mickleham was also carried out, which showed that over the most recent 3 year period for which data was available at that time (1st April 2013 to 31st March 2016) there were no reported collisions involving personal injury in the 30mph speed limit section of the B2209 Old London Road.

The information from the speed survey that was carried out provided evidence that the majority of drivers travelling past the school, where pupils cross in order to reach their boarding houses, were travelling well within the 30mph speed limit and often below 20mph, in comparison to other sites within Mole Valley. This information coupled with the assessment of the personal injury collisions, provided evidence that additional measures (not necessarily a reduced speed limit and traffic calming) in order to address the concerns regarding children crossing the B2209 London Road outside the school, could not be prioritised above other schemes on the ITS list.

3. Question submitted by Cllr Rosemary Dickson

Would it be possible to move the white stop line outside the History Museum in Leatherhead back a bit? It is alarming to wait there while very large vehicles turn left to continue down Gimcrack Hill/Dorking Road.

Response:

The History Museum in Leatherhead is on the B2033 Church Street at the signal-controlled junction with the B2122 The Crescent and the D2885 Church Street in Leatherhead.

The white stop line on the B2033 Church Street at this signal-controlled junction, would have been installed as part of the works to install the traffic lights. Whenever any new infrastructure is installed on the public highway, such as new crossings, traffic calming or traffic lights, extensive design work is carried out. These designs go through a two-stage safety audit process prior to work starting, and one safety audit once work is complete. The installation of the traffic lights and therefore the white stop line would have gone through this rigorous design and safety audit process to ensure that there was enough room for vehicles of all sizes to turn safely at this junction.

It is appreciated that it can feel daunting when waiting at any stop line when larger vehicles turn, and sometimes drivers may choose to hang back from stop lines for this reason. The work involved to move a stop line back would include more than moving the existing white stop line. It would also require the loop cables under the surface of the road, which detect that a vehicle is waiting at the stop line, to be

ITEM 4b

relocated and the traffic light being moved further away from the junction and on to a much narrower section of footway. This would also have to go through careful design and safety audits.

An assessment of the personal injury collisions that have occurred at this junction over the most recent 5 year period has been carried out, this information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there has been no personal injury collisions at this set of traffic signals over the most recent 5 year period for which data is available (from 01/10/17 to 30/09/2020).

For the above reasons, this proposal is not currently prioritised for further investigation, and there are no plans to relocate the existing white lines at the traffic signals on Church Street, Leatherhead.

4. Question submitted by Mr Stephen Cooksey

Over the last year an increasing number of cars have used the grass verge in front of Wicks on Vincent Lane as a regular parking space. This has two consequences – the once grassed verge is now a sea of mud and there is a road safety problem resulting from cars parked on the verge but unable to access the road because of cars parked on the road driving along the pavement and accessing the road at a 90 degree angle when a space to do so is available. Local residents have complained about both of these problems and asked me to investigate what can be done to prevent verge parking at this location in the future.

Response:

The A25 Vincent Lane, Dorking is part of the one-way system around Dorking town centre. On street parking is present and heavily used alongside the existing wide highway verge outside of the Wickes store. However, the bell mouth of the road entrance to Wickes, and the gap in the on-street parking bays in Vincent Lane opposite the junction with Norfolk Road, provides an opportunity for drivers to enter and exit the grass verge in order to park. The bell mouth of the road is required to enable larger vehicles such as fire engines to turn out of Norfolk Road on to Vincent Lane.

An assessment of the personal injury collisions that have occurred along this section of the A24 Vincent Lane over the most recent 3-year period has been carried out. This information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there has been one personal injury collision, resulting in a slight injury, along this section of Vincent Lane over the most recent 3-year period for which data is available (from 01/10/17 to 30/09/2020). However, this collision was not caused by drivers manoeuvring for parking on the grass verge.

However, it is appreciated that residents are concerned about the safety of drivers pulling on and away from the grass verge. Further investigations are needed to determine what measures could be feasibly introduced to deter parking on the grass verge. Part of this assessment would include investigating the location of existing underground utility plant, that could be affected by some suggested measures such as bollards. The views expressed about the parking on Vincent Lane on the verge will be taken into consideration.

Once these investigations are completed, this will be discussed with the local County Councillor to see if this is locally prioritised.

5. Question submitted by Hazel Watson

At the Informal Local Committee held on 10 February 2021 the Members of the Local Committee were asked to make a very significant spending recommendation relating to potential highways schemes that are to be progressed over the next three years. In being asked to make this significant spending recommendation the project scoring model which ranked the projects that were under consideration was not provided to Members and Members were asked to take the accuracy of the model and the scoring within the model on trust.

After the Local Committee Meeting the scoring model which ranked the projects was provided to Members for their review so that they could verify the accuracy of the model, the scoring of the potential projects, and thus the accuracy of the ranking of the projects that Members had considered for progression.

In relation to the potential controlled crossing at Chalkpit Lane, the model shows the following scores which were used to rank the project.

Support Travel Plan	Score 0
Parking Management	Score 0
Encourage Walking	Score 1
Encourage Cycling	Score 0
Support Safe Routes to School	Score 0

On the basis that this scoring was presented to Members of the Local Committee as accurate, can this scoring please be justified to the Local Committee taking into account the knowledge held by Highways Officers following the 2016 site visit to assess this potential project attended by Anne-Marie Hannam which was held at the time children walk to school, the petition that the Chair of Governors of St Martins School presented to the Local Committee, and the recent petition and presentation that was presented by Dorking Safer Streets to the Local Committee?

In particular, can the justification cover why the "Support Travel Plan" was scored as "0" when this project supports the travel plan of St Martins' School, why "Parking Management" was scored as "0" when fewer cars at the school at drop off and pick up times would significantly improve parking management around the school, why "Encourage Walking" was scored as "1" when the scheme will significantly add to the number of children who will walk to school, why "Encourage Cycling" was scored as "0" when this potential project is strongly supported by Dorking Cycling groups as a key link needed on the cross town routes, and why "Support Safe Routes to Schools" was scored as "0" given that this potential project has the strong support of both St Martins and Ashcombe Schools to secure a safe walking route to these schools.

If the scoring cannot be justified based on the knowledge that exists within County Highways, as explained in this Question, will all projects that were considered for funding be reassessed and rescored to ensure the accuracy of the data upon which the significant spending decision was made and will the re-scored project prioritisation schedule be brought back to the next Informal Committee for reconsideration as the recommendation that was approved on 10 February 2021 will have been shown to have been made based on erroneous data presented to Members?

Response:

We appreciate that a petition was submitted by the Chair of Governors at St. Martin's School and that Dorking Safe Streets presented an excellent petition to the Mole Valley Local Committee requesting a new pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane. This request is on the ITS list and I appreciate that it is disappointing to you that this scheme is not currently suggested for the local committee forward programme.

We suggest prioritisation on the forward programme based on the CASEE scoring matrix. The prioritisation score in 2020 for this scheme was 75. We have since had some consideration on the possible location of the requested crossing and consider that it could have an effect on the access to the local shops. As a result of this the prioritisation score was changed to 55, due to the impact that this could have on the access to the shops and resultant impact on passing trade.

The schemes that are suggested on the forward programme have a CASEE scoring over 190 and are those schemes that would make the biggest difference in improving road safety.

We appreciate that you have specific concerns about the scoring for the Chalkpit scheme and please see below how these scores could affect the overall priority:

Support Travel Plan Score 0 This supports the Travel Plan to St Martins School – please also explain why the school travel plan has been discounted.

There is already a pedestrian crossing facility in the form of a pedestrian island to assist pedestrians to cross Chalkpit Lane. A formal push button crossing, although an improvement for pedestrians if it is feasible to install it in a safe location, would support those already walking to the schools. If this score was increased to 1 to reflect this, as it is a subjective score, then the overall score for Chalkpit Lane would increase to 70.

Parking Management Score 0 Explain why a zero score given the parking management issues around the school (many less cars at school drop off and pick up time)

Any pedestrian facility in the form of a push button crossing would restrict parking on Chalkpit Lane in the near vicinity of the shops, it would also be likely to impact on the access to the parking facilities in front of the shops. There is no evidence to suggest that the installation of a push button crossing at this location would have a significant direct impact on parking outside the school.

Encourage Walking Score 1 Explain score, noting the number of existing and additional school children who would walk to school using the Chalkpit Lane crossing

There is already a pedestrian crossing facility in the form of a pedestrian island to assist pedestrians to cross Chalkpit Lane at this location. Other pedestrians choose to cross Chalkpit Lane away from this existing pedestrian crossing facility at the junction with Parkway, where there are no pedestrian crossing facilities. There is no evidence to suggest that these pedestrians would change their existing walking route to use a new pedestrian crossing facility.

Encourage Cycling Score 0 Explain given the Dorking Cycling Groups support this scheme as a key cycling link across town assisting cyclists across major roads

There is currently no cycle route in the vicinity of the proposed push button pedestrian crossing that would benefit from it. This pedestrian crossing would therefore not be a toucan crossing to facilitate use by cyclists.

Support Safe Routes to School Score 0 Explain given that the main purpose is to secure a safe walking route to both St Martins and Ashcombe Schools

There are 2 locations where pedestrians cross Chalkpit Lane on their route to schools. One of the locations is where the pedestrian island is located and other pedestrians cross where there is no facility. Any new push button crossing would not support a safe route to school for those children crossing at the junction with Parkway. The existing pedestrian island works well, with drivers frequently stopping to enable pedestrians to cross.

The scoring matrix is intended as a guidance for members to help prioritise the forward programme for the capital ITS funding, that is delegated to the local committee. We appreciate that you are disappointed that the proposed Chalkpit Lane scheme has not currently prioritised above the other schemes put forward for the local committee to approve.

Although we appreciate that you are disappointed in the subjective CASEE scoring, we have increased the score to take account of your suggestion about supporting the School Travel Plan. However, this increases the score to 70 which is still below the level for prioritisation for funding from the forward programme.

Until this project could be prioritised by the local committee alternative ways forward could be sought, as we have discussed.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2021****SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR A YELLOW BOX MARKING AT THE VINCENT LANE/WESTCOTT ROAD JUNCTION AND ON SOUTH STREET AT THE ENTRANCE TO DORKING SERVICE CENTRE****DIVISION: DORKING SOUTH & THE HOLMWOODS/DORKING HILLS****SURREY****PETITION DETAILS:****Mole Valley Local Committee Petition (24 February) Summary:**

Stop traffic congestion in Dorking
Aren't you fed up with the traffic congestion in Dorking?

We want to introduce two junction boxes which will help reduce the congestion in town. One on Westcott Road where traffic feeds in from Vincent Lane. Introducing a yellow box at this junction will prevent cars from sitting in the middle of the road when the lights change (to red) from Vincent Lane and keep the traffic flowing from the Westcott road. The other on South Street outside Dorking Service Centre to enable them to access to their business.

These junction boxes will allow for a greater flow of cars moving throughout the town. No more stagnant traffic

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.

It is appreciated that many people feel that a yellow box installed at this junction would help to assist traffic to exit Vincent Lane and turn right, because sometimes traffic travelling eastbound on the A25 Westcott Lane queues across the junction, and there is concern that this stops traffic being able to turn right out of Vincent Lane on a green light on to the A25.

This very same request, for a yellow box to be installed on the A25 Westcott Road/Vincent Lane, has been assessed on a number of occasions and has also been raised as a question and as petitions to the Mole Valley Local Committee, the last time being the Mole Valley Local Committee on 22 January 2020.

Yellow boxes are useful to install to enable a gap to be created to enable vehicles to turn right out of junctions where vehicles are queuing across the junction from the left. However, installing a half-yellow 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 Vincent Lane will not be able to enter the box as the exit outside the yellow box will be obstructed due to queuing vehicles. As a result, drivers turning right out of Vincent Lane will have to wait on a green signal until the queuing vehicles on the A25 have cleared, which will

increase congestion on Vincent Lane. 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. They will also have to wait until the exit outside the yellow box is clear of queuing vehicles, even on a green signal, leading to longer queues on the A25 Westcott Road. Therefore, there are no plans to install a yellow-box junction at the A25 Westcott Road/Vincent Lane junction.

It is appreciated that there are times when congestion occurs in Dorking town centre, which can lead to many accesses being temporarily blocked. There are a number of roads, both public and private, and also private accesses onto South Street none of which have KEEP CLEAR markings provided. Installing a KEEP CLEAR marking outside the private access to Dorking Service Centre would set a precedent for the installation of such markings on all of the public and private roads and accesses on to South Street. Creating a considerable number of KEEP CLEAR areas on South Street would reduce the length of carriageway available for vehicles to queue leading to further congestion, and increase the maintenance required. Therefore, there are no plans to install KEEP CLEAR markings on South Street.

RECOMMENDATION

The Local Committee is asked to note:

1. That the installation of a yellow box at this junction will not be effective at reducing congestion on Vincent Lane or the A25 Westcott Road and will likely lead to further congestion.
2. There are no plans to install KEEP CLEAR markings on South Street, which could lead additional queuing/congestion on South Street.

Contact Officer:

Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer
