

## Supplementary Agenda

# Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Decisions



### Date and Time

Tuesday, 24  
September 2024  
12.00 pm

### Place

Woodhatch Place, 11  
Cockshot Hill,  
Reigate

### Contact

Joss Butler  
Joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk

### Web:

[Council and  
democracy  
Surreycc.gov.uk](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy)

### Twitter:

@SCCdemocracy



## Supplementary Agenda

### 2b PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(Pages  
5 - 6)

One public question was received. The question and response are included within this supplementary agenda.

### 3 PETITION: ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OF SANDCROSS SCHOOL

(Pages  
7 - 8)

One petition has been received requesting Surrey County Council to implement measures to calm both moving traffic and parking in the vicinity of Sandcross School and improve facilities for walking and wheeling to the school. The aim is to encourage active travel to the school and substantially reduce the ongoing daily concerns about the safety of Sandcross School pupils and their families on the school run

139 people signed this petition.

The full details and the petition response are included within this supplementary agenda.

**4 PETITION: MIXNAMS LANE KT16**

(Pages  
9 - 10)

One petition has been received requesting Surrey County Council to apply The Highways Act X1 1980 to the owners of Mixnams Lane KT16 to make permanent repairs to the road bringing the road to highways standard and include adequate drainage to cope with the regular flooding which causes the road to break up annually to a dangerous state of repair, Causing much damage to vehicles to vehicles due to pot holes under water.

204 people signed this petition.

The full details and the petition response are included within this supplementary agenda.

**5 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT SCHEMES  
PRIORITISATION PROCESS AND 25/26 DELIVERY PROGRAMME**

(Pages  
11 - 12)

Annex B of the report is included within this supplementary agenda.

**Terence Herbert**  
**Chief Executive**  
Published: 23 September 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.

## **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

Cabinet and most committees will consider questions by elected Surrey County Council Members and questions and petitions from members of the public who are electors in the Surrey County Council area.

### **Please note the following regarding questions from the public:**

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to a meeting by the deadline stated in the agenda. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and cannot relate to “confidential” or “exempt” matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual); for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of an agenda.
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman’s discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Decisions**  
24 September 2024

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS – PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**1. Question submitted by Brian Edmonds**

Surrey CC engages in systemic acts of discrimination against the elderly highway users and pedestrians in Farnham by making their health and safety subservient to Developers' cost and convenience. This has long been the case for East Street, where pavements have been closed by officers without public consultation and the resulting pollution levels actively ignored. I have personally experienced the hostility of onsite teams when complaining of unsafe blockage of pavements that forced pedestrians to enter unsafe roads on highway bends. How does Surrey CC Highways expect the vulnerable elderly or poor without access to information to IT to sign up to "your Highways Update"? The recent closure of Farnham's East Street and its bus stop forced the elderly to walk from Farnham East Street in extreme heat to Farnham Railway station to catch their bus a detour of 0.6 miles including a significant incline.

Why does Surrey CC Highways ignore the safety of other highway users when closing Farnham's roads to pedestrians and public transport without suitable and sufficient consultation and warning. Please advise where the risk assessment and Hospitality Register for this East Street closure be found?

An extreme example of closing footpaths to aid developers was the closure of the direct footpath from Farnham Town to Farnham hospital. Delegated authority was used for this pedestrian hostile decision in favour of the developer. An additional question requests that it be confirmed that the footpath closure was within statutory authority, considering the length of closure. The developer was also irrationally allowed to use the closed public footpath as an advertising space.

**Reply:**

The East Street S278 works were completed between 17 May 2024 and 4 August 2024, with a full road closure only required for a period of 1 week commencing 29 July 2024. Advanced notification of the roadworks was published on the 10<sup>th</sup> May, and included a notification letter sent to local businesses and residents. The traffic management for the works were assessed and approved by the County Council in accordance the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, ensuring that safe pedestrian access was maintained throughout the project duration. The traffic management included a temporary bus stop to allow buses to access East Street throughout the duration of the works, other than during the 1-week full road closure. During this time, all bus services travelling westbound (towards Farnham town centre) along East Street were diverted as follows:

- Stagecoach 16/17/18/19 – Not be able to serve westbound bus stops on Hale Road, East Street, Dogflud Way or South Street. Passengers instead advised to use the bus stop at Farnham Railway Station (Stop N).
- Stagecoach 65 – Not be able to serve westbound bus stops on Guildford Road, East Street, Dogflud Way or Union Road. Passengers instead advised to use the 'Downing Street' (Stop C) bus stop on West Street.
- Stagecoach 4/5 – Service 4 departures from Farnham not be able to serve the 'South Street' (Stop K) or 'Union Road' (Stop L) bus stops.

With regarding to the additional question, the footway closure adjacent to 80-84 East Street was approved by the County Council to maintain public safety during demolition and

construction activities on the site. During this time, the footway on the south side of East Street provided a safe route for pedestrians walking past the site.

**Matt Furniss**  
**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic**  
**24 September 2024**

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Decisions**

24 September 2024

**TITLE: ROAD SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OF SANDCROSS SCHOOL****Statement:**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to implement measures to calm both moving traffic and parking in the vicinity of Sandcross School and improve facilities for walking and wheeling to the school. The aim is to encourage active travel to the school and substantially reduce the ongoing daily concerns about the safety of Sandcross School pupils and their families on the school run.

**Justification:**

Many pupils at Sandcross School walk or wheel to school. We have started this petition to ask the Council to review and improve the safety of the current road and parking arrangements in the area around Sandcross School.

Submitted by: Louise Cleland  
139 Signatures

**RESPONSE:**

Many thanks for raising your concerns over road safety and the need for improved facilities to support walking and cycling to Sandcross School. Officers are sympathetic to these concerns. Fear over busy traffic and road safety can deter more walking and cycling, leading to more car use, and more congestion and air pollution on school journeys.

Officers from the County Council's Road Safety and Sustainable Travel Team have previously visited this site, have met with the Headteacher and so are aware of the concerns and extent and nature of the problems being experienced. The team also manage the School Crossing Patrol and so visit and observe the site at least annually, and receive feedback from the School Crossing Patrol too.

Officers are aware of a planning application (reference 23/01122) for new housing on land adjacent to the school to the southwest of Sandcross Lane that is designated for new housing within the Reigate & Banstead Local Development Management Plan. The County Council's Transport Development Planning team have set out a range of highway improvements that would be required to be implemented by the developer as a condition of planning consent, should their planning application be approved. These include cycle tracks along Prices Lane, traffic calming and bus stop improvements on Prices Lane and Sandcross Lane, and a zebra crossing on a raised table at the location where the School Crossing Patrol currently operates outside the school. The developers transport assessment containing these proposals as part of their planning application can be viewed via the following link to the Reigate & Banstead Borough Council Planning Portal.

<https://dmdocs.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/w2webparts/Resource/Civica/Handler.ashx/Doc/pagestream?cd=inline&pdf=true&docno=5213892>

Therefore should the planning application be approved by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, the County Council would welcome the highway improvements proposed as a condition of planning consent that would be funded and implemented by the developer. It

would not be financially prudent for the County Council to invest in the implementation of such measures through its own taxpayer funded budgets (and which would take typically two years to design, consult upon and implement), when there is a reasonable possibility of such measures being funded and implemented by a developer within a similar timescale.

None-the-less suggestions for changes to the parking controls outside the school will be included within the Reigate & Banstead annual parking review. [Reigate and Banstead parking reviews - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/reigate-and-banstead-parking-reviews)

**Matt Furniss**

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth**

**24 September 2024**



## **Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth Decisions**

24 September 2024

### **TITLE: MIXNAMMS LANE PETITION**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Apply The Highways Act X1 1980 to the owners of Mixnams Lane KT16 to make permanent repairs to the road bringing the road to highways standard and include adequate drainage to cope with the regular flooding which causes the road to break up annually to a dangerous state of repair, Causing much damage to vehicles to vehicles due to pot holes under water.

#### **Justification:**

Mixnams Lane is the only route on and off the Island and access to 500+ Ratepaying homes it also supports a bus service which has at least 36 bus movements per day + delivery vehicles, care workers and many other essential services. This road has suffered these problems for many years and it gets worse each autumn / winter. The above highways act gives SCC the power to enforce repairs, we call on the council to carry out its duty of care to its residents.

Submitted by: Alan Baldwin  
204 Signatures

### **RESPONSE:**

#### **Making Up and Adoption of Private Streets**

Part XI of the Highways Act 1980 gives the street works authority powers to execute works in private streets and adopt them as highways maintainable at public expense. The cost of the works is apportioned between the premises fronting the street according to frontage measurement and degree of benefit. Costs may also be apportioned between premises that do not front the street but have access to it and would benefit from the works being carried out. There are provisions for the owners of premises to which costs have been apportioned to object to the apportionment, and for the magistrates' court to determine any unresolved objections.

In the case of Mixnams Lane there are three premises with direct frontages: Penton Hook Marina (who also own the road), land forming part of the Thorpe Park estate to the south, and Penton Park mobile home site, at the eastern end. There are also over 100 properties in Laleham Reach to which access is gained via Mixnams Lane.

Surrey County Council has not initiated any private street works procedures since 1989, when it was decided that the resource implications of doing so were prohibitive. The policy of the County Council since that time has been to only adopt roads where they have been made up to an adoptable standard by those offering them for adoption, who need to meet the Council's costs of inspecting the works and legal expenses. Commuted sums to offset future maintenance costs would also normally be required.

#### **Urgent Repairs to private Streets**

Section 230 of the Highways Act 1980, which is in Part XI, gives the street works authority the power to serve notice on the owners of premises fronting a private street requiring them to carry out repairs that are necessary to obviate danger to traffic. A person aggrieved by a requirement under this section has the right of appeal to the magistrates' court.

When notices have been served under this section, the majority in number or rateable value of owners of premises in the street may serve notice on the street works authority requiring them to proceed with the making up and adoption of the road under the private street works code.

If the frontagers on whom notices have been served fail to carry out the necessary repairs within the specified time, the street works authority may carry out the repairs and recover the costs from the frontagers in default.

These powers are only exercised in exceptional circumstances, where there is a clear danger to users of the road, and not when a road is just in poor condition.

## **Conclusions**

The ownership of a private street is not relevant to the provisions of Part XI of the Highways Act 1980, which states that costs are to be apportioned between the owners of the premises fronting the street and those deriving benefit from it being made up and adopted. Surrey County Council are therefore unable comply with the request contained in the petition to require the owners of the road to bring it up to highways standard.

If the interested parties can reach agreement amongst themselves on sharing the cost of making the road up to highways standard, including the installation of adequate drainage and street lighting, the County Council would consider adopting it as a highway maintainable at public expense. Any request for the road to be adopted would need to come from the Marina, as owners of the road.

When the state of repair of Mixnams Lane has been raised in the past, inspections have not found it to be in a condition that would warrant action under section 230 of the Highways Act 1980. If the road does fall into a state of disrepair that poses a danger to traffic using it, the County Council would take action to ensure the necessary repairs are carried out.

The Marina have been asked for their comments on the issues regarding the maintenance of Mixnams Lane. If they are forthcoming they will be provided at the meeting.

**Matt Furniss**

**Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth**

**24 September 2024**

## Annex B

## Draft Prioritised Countywide ITS programme

Integrated Transport Scheme	County Councillor	Location	Budget Estimate* (£000)	Prioritisation score
<b>1. A23 London Rd South/New Battlebridge Lane, Subrosa, Redhill</b> Signalised pedestrian crossing – likely delivery in following summer school holidays 2026	Jonathan Essex	Reigate & Banstead	350	65
<b>2.A244 Upper Halliford Rd to Nursery Road, Shepperton</b> Pedestrian and cycle infrastructure improvements.	Buddi Weerasinghe	Spelthorne	100	64
<b>3.C142 Triggs Lane, Triggs roundabout, Woking</b> Pedestrian crossing and accessibility improvements - likely delivery in following 2026/27 FY	Lance Spencer	Woking	280	64
<b>4. B3376 Thorpe Lea Road, Egham</b> Toucan crossing. likely delivery in following 2026/27 FY	Robert King	Runneymede	250	62
<b>5. A307 Portsmouth Road, Cobham</b> Pedestrian crossing – likely delivery in following summer school holidays 2026	David Lewis	Elmbridge	250	58
<b>6. A3046 Station Road, Chobham (Chobham to Woking Trackway Extension)</b> Cycle infrastructure improvements Phase 2	Richard Tear	Surrey Heath	300	56
<b>7.A246 Epsom Road, Guildford</b> Pedestrian crossing improvements – likely delivery in following summer school holidays 2026.	Fiona Davidson	Guildford	250	55
<b>8. Dorking North Town Centre, 20mph, Dorking</b> Speed limit reduction and Healthy Streets for Surrey – timing links with any emerging programme from the Dorking masterplan.	Hazel Watson	Mole Valley	200	54
<b>9. D2311 Northey Avenue, Ewell</b> Pedestrian crossing improvements – likely delivery in following summer school holidays 2026.	John Beckett	Epsom & Ewell	150	53
<b>10. B2028 Plaistow Street, Lingfield</b> Pedestrian crossing - likely delivery in following summer school holidays 2026.	Lesley Steeds	Tandridge	300	49
<b>11. D5508 Critchmere Hill, Haslemere</b> Pedestrian improvements, footway widening.	John Robini	Waverley	200	48

Integrated Transport Scheme	County Councillor	Location	Budget Estimate* (£000)	Prioritisation score
<b>12. B2030 Church Road/Whyteleafe Rd/D1429 Waller La/Queens Park Rd, Caterham</b> Pedestrian safety improvements at junction on approach to Caterham Dene Hospital. Parish Council area.	Jeremy Webster	Tandridge	175	47
<b>Countywide safety audits, signs, lines, road markings, TRO amendments, speed surveys to complete previous years capital schemes and that may come up throughout the year</b>		Countywide	195	
<b>Total projected budget for 25/26</b>			3,000	

\* Budget Estimate is an expected cost envelope for the expected scope of the proposed scheme. It is intended to be used for budget allocation purposes and is not an indication of the actual cost of projects.

Schemes highlighted in green will be progressed in the 2025/26 Financial year. Some schemes may be delivered in the following financial year, for a variety of operational reasons including coordinating with utility works/school holidays etc.

Proposed schemes that are not on this list can either be resubmitted, or an alternative scheme nominated instead, to be considered for prioritisation for 2026/27, subject to budget availability.