

Supplementary Agenda

Leader Decisions



Date and Time

Tuesday, 27
February 2024
10.00 am

Place

Council Chamber
Woodhatch Place, 11
Cockshot Hill,
Woodhatch, Reigate,
RH2 8EF

Contact

Joss Butler
joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk

Web:

[Council and
democracy
Surreycc.gov.uk](#)

Twitter:

@SCCdemocracy



SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

2a MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

(Pages
1 - 2)

One Member question has been received. The question and response is published within this supplementary agenda.

2b PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(Pages
3 - 6)

Seven public questions have been received. The questions and responses are published within this supplementary agenda.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive

Published: 26 February 2024

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Members of the public and the press may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode during meetings. Public Wi-Fi is available; please ask the committee manager for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at Council meetings. Please liaise with the committee manager prior to the start of the meeting so that the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

The use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to any Council equipment or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Thank you for your co-operation.

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL DECISIONS
27 February 2024

PROCEDURAL MATTERS – MEMBER QUESTIONS

1. Question submitted by George Potter

Paragraph 16 of the report notes many of the stakeholders whose views were sought as part of the engagement exercise. Additional stakeholders who responded to the engagement, but are not mentioned, include The Clockhouse retirement home, amongst others. It is my understanding is that the vast majority of these stakeholders expressed support for the scheme, including the borough council, Stagecoach buses, and every school along the route of the scheme. Additionally, George Abbot school reported that a survey of their students resulted in hundreds of responses from students who said they would wish to cycle to school if it was safer to do so. Why have the views of all of these stakeholders, whether for or against the scheme, not been mentioned in this report, and what were those views? How have the views of these stakeholders been taken into account in the production of the recommendations in this report?

Separately, the design for section 1 clearly represents a dramatic improvement in safety and accessibility for pedestrians compared to the current situation along London Road. Can you clarify what the further design review for section 1 will entail, and please can you confirm that the design review will not result in the loss of Active Travel England funding required for the implementation of section 1?

Reply:

The engagement involved both quantitative and qualitative inputs which were submitted during the process and were reflected in the engagement report. The two face to face engagement sessions with George Abbot pupils have been referenced within the report as well as the letter of support received from the headteacher. In addition, we held a face to face session with the residents of Clockhouse, which has also been referenced in the report.

As both the decision and engagement reports outline, the themes from all the quantitative and qualitative inputs show a balance of views which have been considered when making the recommendations. The comments of residents and the groups, where we held face to face engagements, are reflected in the themed responses as part of the engagement report rather than being individually attributable.

The George Abbot survey was carried out prior to the engagement period and was not submitted as part of the formal engagement process, therefore, it was not specifically included in the report.

The design review will be focused on considering the comments made concerning road widths and shared use paths, and will include independent analysis of the proposal in relation to these elements. Active travel England remain supportive of the scheme and there is no identified risk to funding caused by the design review.

Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
27 February 2024

This page is intentionally left blank

LEADER OF THE COUNCIL DECISIONS
27 February 2024

PROCEDURAL MATTERS – PUBLIC QUESTIONS

2b

1. Question submitted by Howard Smith

Surrey County Council conducted a consultation with the residents of Burpham on the proposed London Road Active Travel Scheme. An excellent scheme that would encourage more walking and cycling, leading to a reduction in traffic especially in peak hours. The scheme would almost certainly improve air quality and wider public health. Do the results of the consultation lead the council to believe that with a very clear majority of people in favour, and with so much work already completed, that the scheme should proceed and achieve its aims and benefits?

Reply:

The engagement report sets out the results of the comprehensive engagement undertaken, with a variety of views shared about elements of the scheme. The quantitative and qualitative results, as outlined in the engagement report, show support for section 1 and 2 and less support for section 3, the result of which has been reflected in the report recommendations to proceed or otherwise.

2. Question submitted by Doug Clare

With regard to each Section of the London Road Active Travel Scheme we implore you to go ahead with Section 1 which aligns with all your policies and also ties in with Guildford's proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor for their Local Plan allocated Gosden Hill Farm site. Your concerns with regard to the shared use cycle paths will be allayed with the correct signage telling cyclists to 'Share with Care'.

It is a terrible shame that you are not going ahead with Section 3 but I understand the conflict outside the High School.

My question is in two parts :

1. Will Surrey CC please not shelve Section 3 but strive to find a long term solution along London Road for this very important entrance to the Town Centre?
2. Will Surrey approach the owners of the London Square offices opposite the High School to compulsory purchase/acquire enough land for a proper footpath and segregated cycleway to replace their wall which is currently falling down?

Reply:

1. Following the comprehensive engagement, it was apparent from both the quantitative and qualitative feedback that there was less support for section 3. A significant number of concerns were raised about the proposals outside Guildford High School and the proposed changes to the York Road junction which were considered when making the recommendation. Whilst we are not able to provide a long term solution specifically along London Road at this point, there is an alternative safe route already available through Stoke Park.

- 2b
2. There are no proposals to engage with the owners of London Square as currently there is both an alternative route through Stoke Park for walking and cycling as well as a permissive path through the grounds of London Square for pedestrians.

3. Question submitted by Mark Percival

The officers report discusses the feedback and how this was reviewed to make the decision. One factor in the decision to not proceed with sections 1 & 3, was the concerns residents raised regarding shared use paths (sections 1 and 3 of the scheme). A recent Fol (FOI 005748/23) showed in all of Surrey there were only 3 recorded injuries to Pedestrians from Bicycles in 2022, this is in comparison to 3,630 injuries to pedestrians from cars.

Can the officers state the evidence of the actual risks with shared use paths and supply data on any injury or crash rates on the existing shared use paths on London Road or wider within Surrey?

Reply:

The collision report for the period July 2018 to June 2023 shows that there were a total of 22 collisions involving either pedal cyclists or pedestrians along A3100 London Rd between Clay Lane Roundabout and High Street. The breakdown of the 22 collisions is as follows:

- Car/Pedal Cycles: 14
- Motorcycle/Pedestrian: 1
- Car/Pedestrian: 4
- Pedal Cycle/Pedal Cycle: 1
- Pedal Cycle: 2

There was no collision between a pedal cyclist and a pedestrian on a shared use path during the period under review.

Whilst the evidence of pedestrian / cyclist collision is one factor to consider, the feedback from the engagement is also important in the decision making.

The proposed design review on section 1 will consider the comments received through the engagement to ensure all users' needs are provided for within the design guidance. This will include specifically a focus on the perceived risks and comments from those who raised concerns around shared use paths.

4. Question submitted by Calum Shaw

Recommendation 3 to the leader is to "Defer a decision on Section 1 subject to further design review informed by comments received..."

Can you please confirm a) what considerations this additional design review will involve that were not part of the original design, b) what criteria will be used to make the decision on whether the design is acceptable and c) when the final decision will be made.

Reply:

- a) The design review will be focused on the comments made concerning road widths and shared use paths, which will include an independent analysis in relation to these aspects.

- b) The criteria used will be highway design standards as well as LTN 1/20 to confirm compliance and highlight opportunities to improve the design.
- c) It is anticipated that the design review is completed around summer 2024 with further consideration to be given by the Leader at a future date.

5. Question submitted by James Masterman

Two percent of the traffic on the London Road is bikes. Thirty percent of reported injuries are to cyclists. Every 3 to 6 months a cyclist is injured on the London Road, some of these being children, a pattern that goes back more than 10 years. Anyone who understands the concept of the accident triangle will realise that sooner or later, maybe tomorrow, maybe in twenty years' time, one of these many reported incidents will result in a cyclist's fatality.

How does the Head of Surrey County Council expect to prevent this happening without the installation of properly segregated traffic and bike lanes?

As a secondary question, given this has been a proposal since 2015, how much longer is SCC going to deliberate before acting, all the while running the dreadful risk outlined above?

Reply:

As has been set out in the recommendations, the proposal is to proceed with the construction of section 2 which will create infrastructure to allow segregation for pedestrians and cyclists along this route. Further provision of infrastructure along section 1 also remains under consideration.

With reference to the recommendation for section 3, it is worth noting that there is an existing alternative route through Stoke Park to enable pedestrians and cyclists a choice to avoid London Road.

In terms of the secondary question, the report recommendations set out the actions we are taking by progressing with elements of the proposal for London Road which are supported by the community.

6. Question submitted by Cameron Allan

In regards to section 3 of the scheme from Boxgrove Roundabout to York Road, Guildford High School has consistently voiced their support. Why is it that this section of the scheme is therefore likely to be cancelled? Whilst I recognize the issues with regards to this section of the scheme in that it has high pedestrian traffic from the school, we must consider that in 2022 Surrey Police recorded 3,630 road traffic collisions and just 3 were between pedestrian and cyclists for the whole of Surrey. Meanwhile 139 cyclists were killed in the county in 2022. There is a clear need to do more to protect cyclists on our roads and claiming that conflict between pedestrians and cyclists is too high in this section feels like a coup out considering that shared use has been used for decades without any issues. Section 3 is also the most vital as it creates a continuous route from Guildford Town centre to Burpham. Without this section the overall routes usefulness is reduced.

Section 3 is vital for cycling, but it is equally important for pedestrian safety and your own officer report states that pedestrian use is very high in this section. As part of the planned improvements numerous new zebra and signalized pedestrian crossings were proposed as well as speed humps along the road. Vastly improving the safety of this road for ALL users whether by active or motorized transport.

I therefore ask the council that Section 3 should not be cancelled and if it is, what plans do Surrey County Council have for London Road's needed improvement to protect the life and limb of its users?

What needs to happen for this dangerous road to be improved?

Reply:

Whilst some support for section 3 was evident during the engagement process, the results of the quantitative and qualitative engagement demonstrate that overall, there was less support for this section, and numerous concerns were received in relation to the proposals outside Guildford High School and York Rd junction. It is on this basis therefore that the recommendation not to proceed with section 3 has been determined.

It is worth noting that there is an alternative route through Stoke Park that pedestrians and cyclists may choose to use to avoid London Road.

Just correct the casualty numbers, there were 2 cyclist fatalities in Surrey in 2022 and 137 seriously injured.

7. Question submitted by Julia Dickinson

In presentations such as this one <https://activetravelcafe.org.uk/node/106>, Brian Deegan (Director of Inspections at Active Travel England) stresses that Active Travel England's primary role "is to support and empower Local Authorities to get the outcomes they want by helping them to spot the issues with schemes, then identify the resolutions and provide evidence to back up the recommended designs". Has Surrey CC shared the design issues that the consultation identified for "Section 3" with Active Travel England yet, and if so, what were ATE's proposed resolutions for them and what supporting evidence did ATE supply?

Reply:

The design team has worked closely with Active travel England (ATE) on the proposed designs for all three sections including section 3 prior to engagement.

Engagement comments on section 3 have yet to be shared with ATE, however, we will continue to work closely with ATE on schemes that they fund.

Tim Oliver
Leader of the Council
27 February 2024