

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
ELMBRIDGE LOCAL COMMITTEE (SPECIAL)
held at 5.00 pm on 27 September 2012
at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- Mr Mike Bennison (Chairman)
- * Mrs M A Hicks (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair)
- * John V C Butcher
- Nigel Cooper
- Mr Peter Hickman
- * Mr Ian R Lake
- Mr Ernest Mallett
- * Mr Tom Phelps-Penry
- Mr Tony Samuels

Borough / District Members:

- Borough Councillor Barry Fairbank
- * Borough Councillor Jan Fuller
- Borough Councillor Ramon Gray
- Borough Councillor Peter Harman
- * Borough Councillor Stuart Hawkins
- Borough Councillor Neil J Luxton
- * Borough Councillor Dorothy Mitchell
- Borough Councillor John O'Reilly
- Borough Councillor Karen Randolph

* In attendance

33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from County Councillors Mike Bennison, Peter Hickman, Nigel Cooper, Tony Samuels, Ernest Mallett, and Borough Councillors Barry Fairbank, Ramon Gray, Peter Harman and Neil Luxton.

Borough Councillor Chris Sadler substituted for Borough Councillor Peter Harman.

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 2]

No interests were declared.

35 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 3]

No announcements were made.

36 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION [Item 4]

No petitions or letters of representation were received.

37 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME [Item 5]

No public questions were received.

38 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 6]

No Member questions were received.

39 A307 TARTAR HILL PEDESTRIAN CROSSING PROPOSALS FOLLOWING THE REMOVAL OF TARTAR HILL FOOTBRIDGE [Item 7]

The Local Committee received a report from the North East Area Team Manager which set out alternative pedestrian crossing facilities along the A307, Portsmouth Road, following the removal of Tartar Hill Footbridge.

The North East Area Team Manager, Nick Healey, explained that Tartar Hill Footbridge had been removed after it had sustained significant damage in January 2012 and that new crossing facilities were now required. The matter had previously been considered by the Local Committee in July 2012 and Members had, at the time, supported the introduction of a controlled pedestrian crossing facility. However, following a full analysis of the situation, the County Council's highway engineers had proposed alternative crossing facilities that would help ensure the safety of both pedestrians and motorists.

The North East Area Team Manager outlined the proposed crossing, as detailed in section 3.18 of the report. It was explained that the benefits of the proposed scheme were that it not only provided a number of safe crossing points but also addressed the issues of speeding and risky overtaking, both common issues on the stretch of road in question. It was explained that in addition to the introduction of pedestrian refuges, the County Council was also proposing to install rumble strips and 'slow down' road markings.

The North East Area Team Manager stated that the original proposal to install a controlled pedestrian crossing was not recommended for the following reasons:

- It would only provide a crossing point in a single location whereas, in practice, individuals attempted to cross the road at various points and were unlikely to walk to a controlled pedestrian crossing to do so;
- A controlled pedestrian crossing was likely to see little use outside of peak hours. Given that research indicated that motorists were likely to disregard crossings that saw little use, it was felt the introduction of one in this location would provide a false sense of security for pedestrians;
- A pedestrian crossing would not allow the County Council to regulate speeds and overtaking on the road.

It was stressed that if the proposed scheme was implemented, officers would continue to monitor the situation and, should the need arise, could install additional crossing facilities.

Following questions from Members of the Local Committee, the Local Area Highways Manager clarified the following points:

- The cost of installing a fully controlled pedestrian crossing would be in the region of £100,000 to £150,000. Structurally speaking, it would take the same amount of time to install as the proposed scheme. However, the legal process for the installation of a controlled pedestrian crossing was more complex and would therefore the scheme as a whole would take more time to implement;
- The main concerns raised by members of the public in relation to the proposed scheme were the vulnerability of pedestrians, the ability of children to make use of the crossing facilities, a continued desire for a signalised crossing and worries about speeding vehicles. However, it was felt that the proposed scheme would in fact make pedestrians less vulnerable, particularly as the pedestrian refuges would be wider than normal, and that the scheme would have the side-effect of naturally reducing traffic speed. Irrespective of the crossing installed, the road would never be safe for young children and it was recommended that they be supervised by an adult at all times;
- Surrey County Council would continue to monitor the proposed crossing once implemented and the facilities would be subject to a stage three safety audit, that is, a review of the scheme post construction;
- Whilst rumble strips had the potential to be noisy, they had been placed in locations where they were unlikely to be heard by nearby residents;
- PV2, as referred to in the report, was a calculation widely used until about 15 years ago to determine the merits of installing pedestrian crossings. PV2 was a formula that took into account how easy it was to cross a road compared with the demand to cross it. The purpose of PV2 had been to ensure consistency across the County, but as communities had been given greater responsibility for determining local need, the system had slowly fallen into disuse;
- Having monitored traffic on the relevant stretch of the A307, officers were happy that there would be opportunities for pedestrians to cross both during peak and non-peak hours. The pedestrian refuges were also wider than the legal minimum, ensuring that users were well protected;

- It was not anticipated that the half-width bus stop located on the stretch of road in question would prove problematic. The nearby pedestrian refuge would encourage drivers to slow down and would also make it difficult for motorists to travel around a parked bus at any real speed. However, the situation would be monitored and any issues picked up in the aforementioned safety audit;
- The individual pedestrian refuges were all in close proximity to street lighting and were, as a result, easily visible. Each island was also individually illuminated and the stage three safety audit would include a night-time inspection to ensure good visibility.

Borough Councillor Dorothy Mitchell stated that whilst she had initially supported the introduction of a fully controlled pedestrian crossing, she was of the view that the proposed scheme was a better solution, particularly as it would help reduce traffic speeds. She stated that it was important that new crossing facilities be installed as soon as possible, provided that Surrey County Council would continue to monitor the situation and take further action if required.

A number of other Councillors expressed support for the proposed crossing facilities and thanked the North East Area Team Manager and his colleagues for putting together a comprehensive report.

Councillor John Butcher stated that whilst he was pleased a reasonable solution had been reached, he was concerned that residents of Cobham had been left without adequate crossing facilities for so long. He added that he still had some concerns with certain elements of the designs, particularly the half-width bus stop, but would expect these issues to be further explored as part of the stage three safety audit.

Summing up, the Vice-Chairman stated that the Committee was clearly in broad agreement with the proposed crossing facilities and thanked officers for their time. She stated that the main points to have come out of discussions were that Members would like to see a paper come back to Committee in a year for the purpose of review, that the bus lane be carefully monitored, and that officers look to see whether a Vehicle Activated Sign could be included as part of the scheme.

RESOLVED: That

- i. The report be noted;
- ii. The Local Committee's support for the scheme be noted;
- iii. The comments and views of the Local Committee be relayed back to the Projects and Contracts Group Manager, responsible for implementation of the scheme.

Meeting ended at: 6.15 pm

Chairman