

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Elmbridge LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 4.00 pm on 16 June 2014
at Council Chamber, Elmbridge Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, KT10 9SD.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mrs Margaret Hicks (Chairman)
- * Mrs Mary Lewis (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- * Mr Peter Hickman
- * Rachael I. Lake
- * Mr Christian Mahne
- Mr Ernest Mallett MBE
- Mr Tony Samuels
- * Mr Stuart Selleck

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Steve Bax
- * Cllr Nigel Cooper
- * Cllr Andrew Davis
- Cllr Jan Fuller
- * Cllr Peter Harman
- * Cllr Stuart Hawkins
- * Cllr Neil J Luxton
- * Cllr Dorothy Mitchell
- * Cllr John O'Reilly

* In attendance

17/14 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

The Local Committee noted that the Council had appointed Margaret Hicks as the Chairman and Mary Lewis as the Vice Chairman of the Elmbridge Local Committee for the municipal year 2014/15.

The Chairman asked the Committee to remember Tom Phelps-Penry, a former Member of the Elmbridge Local Committee, who had recently passed away, thanked Mike Bennison for his hard work and support as Vice Chairman and welcomed Mary Lewis as the new Vice Chairman and also Councillors Steve Bax and Andrew Davis as new Co-optees to the Local Committee.

18/14 APPOINTMENT OF ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL CO-OPTED MEMBERS [Item 2]

The Local Committee noted that Elmbridge Borough Council had nominated the following nine Borough Councillors to serve on the Elmbridge Local

Committee for the municipal year 2014/15: Councillors S Bax, N C Cooper, A Davis, Mrs J Fuller, P M Harman, S Hawkins, N Luxton, Mrs D Mitchell and J O'Reilly.

19/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 3]

Apologies for absence had been received from Ernest Mallett, Tony Samuels and Councillor Mrs Jan Fuller.

20/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 4]

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 24th February 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

21/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 5]

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting were received.

22/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS [Item 6]

The Chairman acknowledged various achievements in the borough of Elmbridge over the last year and talked about plans for the coming year. In addition she reminded Members of the Local Committee of the availability of SCC Community Improvements Fund.

23/14 PETITIONS [Item 7]

Three petitions had been received. The details of the petitions and the responses are attached in Annex A to these minutes.

Petition 1

A petition with 35 signatures was received from residents of The Fairway, Weybridge requesting the introduction of static non-parking bollards and double yellow lines on the right-hand side grass verge of Brooklands Road, by the southern entrance/exit of The Fairway to preclude cars causing an obstruction to residents exiting from The Fairway.

Ms Sandi Beaumont spoke for 3 minutes in support of the petition explaining how the parked cars/vans on the verge in Brooklands Road impeded the sightline for the cars exiting The Fairway from the southern exit creating a safety hazard. To highlight the dangers she quoted the stopping distances from the Highway Code, statistics from the Department of Transport on the higher risks of fatalities from side impact collisions and guidance on the calculation of sightlines and visibility splays from Manual for Streets.

To conclude, although the original petition was for bollards, the petitioners were now requesting i) the implementation of double yellow lines and ii) the extension of junction splay at the southern end to enhance road visibility.

Christian Mahne explained he had met with the Parking Team Manager and they had agreed that the installation of double yellow lines should help resolve the issue. Cllr Peter Harman expressed support for the petitioners too. The Parking Team officer, Steve Clavey responded as per the officer's response attached in Annex A.

Petition 2

A petition with 20 signatures was received from residents of Wynton Grove, Walton on Thames requesting that when the parking restriction times are reviewed in April 2014 consideration is given to increasing the 'residents only' parking times.

Ms Alison Moore spoke for 3 minutes, explaining that residents of Wynton Grove were becoming increasingly frustrated at not being able to park, because non residents quite legally park after 10am for the rest of the day. When these restrictions were introduced some 20 years ago it was to prevent commuters parking in the road, but times have changed, new businesses have arrived in Walton and some commuters have flexible working hours so can park for the full day for free after 10 am and not return until 5.30/6pm at the earliest. Some do not return until 10/11pm at night. The residents would like residents parking only from 8am to 6pm with a maximum stay of 2 hours for non residents after 10am. She thanked the Local Committee for accepting the petition and allowing her to speak in support of it.

Councillor Stuart Hawkins thanked the Local Committee for accepting the petition for the small cul de sac even though it didn't meet the normal minimum of 30 signatures. He appreciated that because Wynton Grove is so close to the station it is one of the first roads to be affected, but it is a problem elsewhere in Walton too and he would like officers to look at a wider area. The Parking Team officer, Steve Clavey responded as per the officer's response in Annex A.

Margaret Hicks summarised by saying any action in response to the petition would be deferred until a review of the whole CPZ could take place in Walton, which Councillor Hawkins said he was happy with as long as the delay was not too long.

Petition 3

A petition was received with 62 signatures requesting to promote the reconstruction of Palace Road East Molesey to the 2014/15 programme.

Nick Healey, the Area Highways Team Manager, explained that the Operation Horizon road maintenance programme had been reviewed with Members and Stuart Selleck had indicated that Palace Road was a priority. He also explained that the programme is now set and no other new roads can be moved up the schedule.

Stuart Selleck explained on looking around his division it was clear Palace Road was a priority and Councillor Nigel Cooper gave his full support to prioritising Palace Road. Councillor Steve Bax echoed the thoughts of Councillor Cooper and Stuart Selleck and also asked if Highways could look at the camber on the road during the resurfacing.

Two public questions were received. The questions and responses are attached in Annex B

Question 1 from Tony Nockles.

The meeting was adjourned at 16:30 as proposed by the Chairman, Margaret Hicks and seconded by the Vice Chairman, Mary Lewis. This was to allow both Members and the public to read and consider the Road Safety comments which had been produced at the request of the Local Committee on 24th February 2014, as the result of the response to a petition received by the Local Committee on November 18th 2013. The comments are attached in Annex C.

The meeting restarted at 16:40.

The Chairman asked Mr Nockles if he would like to ask a supplementary question. He responded that the Road Safety comments just reinforced the unsuitability of the location for the movement of construction vehicles. He added that if the drawings available are sufficient for the development to obtain planning approval then they must provide sufficient information for a safety audit.

Nick Healey, the Area Highways Team Manager, responded that with all due respect to the petitioners, all vehicle movement presents a risk, but SCC does not agree that this junction presents a significant risk. We can only ask the developer to pay for something where we consider there to be a risk. We are responsible for pedestrian safety, but we focus on places where we consider there is genuine risk.

Members' comments included surprise at the conclusion of the road safety report and a belief that now they need to await more concrete proposals from the developer, that they would like the re-alignment of the crossing as proposed at the end of the report, but were also keen for SCC to consider critically the developer's travel plans from a safety aspect.

In relation to question 1

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) to investigate a realignment of the existing uncontrolled crossing to improve visibility, and allocate the funding necessary for this.

Reason for decision: The safety audit team advised that this measure could improve the visibility at the existing uncontrolled crossing at Cigarette Island.

Question 2 from Mark Sugden

Mark Sugden asked a supplementary question, which was when the assessment would take place?

Jeremy Crouch, Contract Performance Officer, responded that it was already partly completed. The Health and Safety visit had taken place and as long as

the condition report does not reveal any major problems, the assessment should be ready in 2 to 3 weeks.

25/14 MEMBER QUESTION TIME [Item 9]

A Member's question had been received from the Chairman, Margaret Hicks. The question and response are attached in Annex D.

Frank Apicella, Senior Engineer, added that in the response he had attempted to explain how the layout of the area restricts the number of options of access to the industrial estate and that the main way the Highways service can alleviate the issue for residents is to make the roads as smooth as possible.

Members' comments included a suggestion that the Local Committee should investigate some of the 52 businesses who are on the industrial site and also Members asking whether there was any prospect of mitigating measures being taken to improve the issue in Molesey Rd., to which the officer said that the roads listed in the Maintenance Programme are highest priority and apart from some minor repairs at very specific sites, the only other option would be through funding from Local Committee budgets.

26/14 CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE: LOCAL RE-COMMISSIONING 2015-2020 [Item 10]

Jeremy Crouch, Contract Performance Officer, introduced the report and explained that the end of the first procurement cycle is approaching and at this relatively early stage he had come to ask the Local Committee Members whether they would agree to increased delegation to the Local Committee by adding the procurement of Centre Based Youth Work providers and resources. Currently there are too many different commissions making the process complicated so the aim is to simplify it into 3 areas.

At this stage the Chairman asked for nominations from the Co-opted Members of the Local Committee to sit on the Youth Task Group (to be agreed at Item 16). Councillor Jan Fuller, although not present, had before the meeting expressed an interest and Councillors Peter Harman and Steve Bax said they would like to be Members of the Task Group.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) to support increased delegation of decision-making to include the current Centre Based Youth Work so that it can be re-commissioned alongside the current Local Prevention Framework

(ii) that local priorities for the newly delegated commissions within Services for Young People will be decided by the Elmbridge Local Committee informed by the work of the constituted Youth Task Group.

Reason for decision: to build on the current successes of Services for Young People and increase the integration and working together for the commissioning of Local Prevention Framework, Centre Based Youth Work and potentially more integrated commissioning with partners.

27/14 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE [Item 11]

Jeremy Crouch, Contract Performance Officer, introduced the report. He explained that most of the information is contained within the Annex. He highlighted how the number of NEET young people had reduced from 4.5% in March 2013 to 1.5% in March 2014 and that no Looked after Children (LAC) in Elmbridge are NEET.

The Youth Support Service has had a lot of success this year. It works very closely with partners which is one of the keys to the success. The partners include Walton Charities, Catch 22, Surrey Youth Focus and local Police officers. In addition the Youth Centres are being more fully used. The Service expressed its thanks to the Local Committee for the Individual Prevention Grants which enable the Youth Support Service to help the changing needs of individual young people.

A Work Development Officer has been employed by the service which has proved successful and greater engagement with local businesses has led to work placements for young people.

Walton Youth Centre has managed to recruit a full time youth worker and plans are on-going to make the centre fully operational.

As regards the LPF contract, much of the profiled Eikon delivery concentrates on the summer months so by the end of August the figures should be back on target.

Members asked a number of questions regarding resources and missing data in some of the tables in the report. The missing data was due to the IT not being able to cope with the volume of work, but new equipment has now enabled better recording. Jeremy Crouch confirmed there would be a launch for Walton Youth Centre in the summer and invitations would be circulated.

The Local Committee resolved to agree to note:

(i) The Progress Services for Young People has made during 2013/14 to increase participation for young people in education, training or employment, as set out in the appendix to this report.

28/14 HIGHWAYS UPDATE [Item 12]

Nick Healey, the Area Highways Manager, introduced the report. In relation to A307 Portsmouth Rd bridge removal, he explained that all the work except for the flashing lights had been completed by December 2012. He pointed out the error in Annex A. On page 52 under **Pedestrian Survey** it should state 'survey was undertaken in April 2013'.

With reference to tables 1 and 2 in the main report Nick Healey added that the outturn figures were good. He also thanked Members for making quick decisions on schemes for the current year. For the next financial year 2015-

16 the Committee will be asked to decide the strategy at the September meeting and the schemes to be funded at the December Local Committee.

With reference to Annex A Mary Lewis asked about the timing of the 4 hour survey and requested that another survey took place which covered the busy times so the Local Committee could be confident that the islands are being properly used. Nick Healey said 2 x 2 hour surveys at rush hour/school times could be carried out. Mary Lewis proposed an additional recommendation to carry out 2 x 2 hour surveys on A307 Portsmouth Rd, which was seconded by Margaret Hicks.

Rachael I Lake said she wished to discuss with highways officers outside the meeting the outcome of the Rydens Road feasibility study as she doesn't want to fund a crossing where one is not required. Nick Healey explained the Terrace Road scheme was also being reviewed at a high level.

Councillor Peter Harman raised the issue of drainage investigation at Weybridge station. Nick Healey promised it would be fixed by the end of this financial year or he would supply an explanation as to why not.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) to authorise the Area Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

(ii) that SCC Highways Officers conduct a further survey of pedestrian movements across the new traffic islands at the peak usage times (two hours in the morning school rush hour and two hours in the afternoon school rush hour) in order to ascertain how well local children and parents are or are not using the pedestrian islands.

Reason for decision: to facilitate delivery of the 2014-15 Highways programmes funded by the Local Committee, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations and to confirm the success of the installation of the pedestrian refuge islands on A307 Portsmouth Road.

29/14 DRAINAGE UPDATE [Item 13]

Nick Healey introduced the report. He explained the Local Highways team has an influence over the use of the £1.6 million countywide drainage budget and can commission work and prioritise sites. There seems to be a perception that the drainage contract is not working well so to help find out the extent of the problems he requested that Members e-mail him directly with locations of persistent drainage problems. It was decided that the best way would be for the County Councillor to collect the details from Borough Councillors in their division and the County Councillor to send them all through to Nick Healey by end of June 2014.

The Local Committee resolved to agree to:

(i) Let the Area Team Manager know of locations where there are persistent drainage problems for their local communities.

30/14 INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FOR CIL (COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY) FUNDING [Item 14]

Nick Healey introduced the report, summarising Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and explaining how it is an opportunity to create a fund for strategic infrastructure improvements in the borough. Section 106 funding was restricted by strict criteria and there was not the option to build up a pot of money.

Approximately £1 million has been collected of which £0.75 million is available through the Elmbridge BC Strategic Spending Board (SSB). The Elmbridge BC officers and SCC officers have been working very closely in relation to CIL.

SCC Highways recommended that SCC submitted bids to the schemes listed in the report. He explained that the £50,000 for the Esher Transport study would be just for a feasibility study.

Melanie Harris, School Commissioning Officer, provided further details of the Education scheme recommended to be put forward for funding from the SSB.

Councillor John O'Reilly clarified that Elmbridge Borough Council was not the first, but one of the first boroughs in the country to be collecting CIL. However it is the first to have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with their County Council. He added that the Local Spending Boards have recently met or are due to do so imminently and spoke about how CIL provides an opportunity for borough and county councillors to work together to make a positive impact.

Members of the Committee agreed the order of priority as per the report and the recommendations.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) an order of priority for those schemes for which CIL funding will be sought

(ii) that final bids for 2014 be finalised on this basis and submitted to Elmbridge Borough Council

(iii) that the Chairman of Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Elmbridge represents the interests of the Local Committee at the Strategic Spending Board on 24 July.

Reason for decision: By agreeing priorities the County Council can submit funding bids as part of this first round of available CIL funding.

31/14 2014 PARKING REVIEW FOR THE BOROUGH OF ELMBRIDGE [Item 15]

Steve Clavey, Senior Engineer, introduced the report explaining that approximately 400 requests had been received for this review by the Parking team for changes to parking restrictions in the borough. He also pointed out

that two roads had been missed off the list of recommendations: The Furrows and Ambleside Avenue.

It was also requested that the proposals for Claremont Close be included in the recommendations.

Christian Mahne asked for Oakdale Road, Weybridge to be added in. Margaret Hicks said this road would be referred to the task group.

All the locations that were considered, but not recommended for progression as part of this review are listed in Annex 3. Margaret Hicks reminded the Committee that if residents wanted unsuccessful proposals submitted for this review to be reconsidered in a future review then they must be resubmitted.

In response to a question about curfew parking, the officer Adrian Harris, Assistant Engineer, explained this would be considered as part of the proposed future 5 year Parking Strategy for Elmbridge.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) the County Council's intention to introduce the proposals in Annex 1, **with the addition of Claremont Close**, is formally advertised, and subject to statutory consultation

(ii) if objections are received the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager is authorised to try and resolve them

(iii) if any objections cannot be resolved, the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, in consultation with the Chairman/Vice Chairman of this committee and the County Councillor for the division, decides whether or not they should be acceded to and therefore whether the order should be made, with or without modifications

(iv) to approve the introduction by Elmbridge Borough Council of new taxi ranks in High Street, Esher, in Queen's Road and High Street, Weybridge and in Mayfield Road, Hersham.

Reason for decision: to help solve parking difficulties in the borough, improve road safety, assist with access for larger vehicles, ease congestion and improve the environment for residents and improve access for visitors to local businesses.

32/14 REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES & TASK GROUPS & COMMUNITY SAFETY BUDGET [Item 16]

The nominations to the various task groups and outside bodies for the municipal year 2014/15 were discussed. In a change to the recommendation in the report, Rachael I Lake proposed that she represented the Local Committee on the Community Safety Partnership and this was seconded by Margaret Hicks.

Due to the timing of the appointment of the Co-opted Members to the Local Committee by Elmbridge Borough Council for the current municipal year it had not been possible to include nominations from Co-opted Members to the

Parking Task Group and the Youth Task Group in the published reports. The nominations were agreed at the meeting as Councillors John O'Reilly and Dorothy Mitchell to the Parking Task Group and Councillors Jan Fuller, Peter Harman and Steve Bax to the Youth Task Group.

The Local Committee resolved to agree:

(i) the appointment of Members to outside bodies and task groups as detailed in section 2.1 to 2.4, **with the following amendments: in 2.1 Rachael I Lake be appointed to the Community Safety Partnership, in 2.3 the nomination of Councillors John O'Reilly and Dorothy Mitchell to the Parking Task Group and in 2.4 the nomination of Councillors Jan Fuller, Peter Harman and Steve Bax to the Youth Task Group**

(ii) that the terms of reference of the Elmbridge Parking Task Group as set out in Annex A be approved

(iii) that the terms of reference of the Elmbridge Youth Taks Group as set out in Annex B be approved

(iv) that the community safety budget of £3,294, that has been delegated to the Local Committee, be transferred to the Elmbridge Community Safety Partnership and that the Community Partnership Manager authorise its expenditure in accordance with the Local Committee's decision as detailed in section 2.5.

Reason for decision: The appointment of Members of the Local Committee to outside bodies enables the representation of the Local Committee on these bodies, which affect the lives of the residents of Elmbridge. The task groups meet to review, advise and make informed recommendations to the Local Committee.

33/14 LOCAL COMMITTEE FUNDING 2014/15 [Item 17]

The Local Committee resolved to agree to note:

(i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

Minutes Annex A

Minutes Annex B

Minutes Annex C

Minutes Annex D

Meeting ended at: Time Not Specified

Chairman

S

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 16 June 2014

AGENDA ITEM 7i

PETITION 1

To receive a petition with 35 signatures from residents of The Fairway, Weybridge requesting the introduction of static non-parking bollards and double yellow lines on the right-hand side grass verge of Brooklands Road, by the southern entrance/exit of The Fairway to preclude cars causing an obstruction to residents exiting from The Fairway. The petition says that frequently cars and vans park on said grass verge and obstruct the vision of exiting cars from The Fairway onto Brooklands Road, Weybridge. Cars travelling on Brooklands Road do so at speeds of 30 – 45 mph and a significant number of residents have experienced near miss collisions when trying to exit. Surrey Police has been informed several times but the responsibility lies with SCC to consider remedial action to make this road safer for the residents.

Rikki Hill, Parking Project Team Leader provides the following response:

We carry out periodic reviews of parking in the borough of Elmbridge, where we consider requests for the introduction of new parking controls and changes to existing ones. The site visits and assessments for the 2014 review took place during March and April and the report on the outcome is included as item 15 of the agenda for today's meeting. This request was looked at as part of the review and a proposal has been put forward in the report to introduce double yellow lines along the whole of the length of the east side of Brooklands Road between the two entrances to The Fairway. We do not consider it necessary to install bollards as well as the yellow lines as the parking restriction applies to the whole of the highway, so covers vehicles parking on the verge as well as the carriageway. Subject to the successful completion of the necessary legal process for introducing yellow lines, they could be installed towards the end of the year.

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 16 June 2014**AGENDA ITEM 7ii****PETITION 2**

To receive a petition with 20 signatures from residents of Wynton Grove, Walton on Thames requesting that when the parking restriction times are reviewed in April 2014 that consideration is given to increasing the 'residents only' parking times. Since the parking restrictions were implemented in the 1990's to protect residents when parking charges were introduced for parking at the station car park no change has been made to restriction times to reflect the changes in day to day living and activities in the vicinity.

Rikki Hill, Parking Project Team Leader provides the following response:

We carry out periodic reviews of parking in the borough of Elmbridge, where we consider requests for the introduction of new parking controls and changes to existing ones. The site visits and assessments for the 2014 review took place during March and April and the report on the outcome is included as item 15 of the agenda for today's meeting. This request was looked at as part of the review, and we had also received other requests for changes to the times of operation or type of restriction of the Walton controlled parking zone (CPZ) on both sides of the railway.

The CPZ has been in place for many years without change while in that time there have been many changes in the times that people travel to work and in the business infrastructure near Walton station. It is quite likely that if the CPZ were being introduced for the first time now, it would be different in terms of when and how it would operate. Bearing this in mind, as mentioned in paragraph 2.5 of the report the parking task group discussed the requests but thought that it would be preferable to carry out a comprehensive review of the whole CPZ rather than tinker with small parts of it. This review, which we are anticipating starting later this year will consider the times of operation of the CPZ, as there have been suggestions that residents have problems parking when returning home in the afternoon, and the type of restriction, to see whether it would be appropriate to have longer periods when parking should be for residents only.

SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 16 June 2014**AGENDA ITEM 7iii****PETITION 3****To receive a petition with 62 signatures requesting to promote the reconstruction of Palace Road. East Molesey to the 2014/15 program.**

Repairs to Palace Road were originally agreed as part of the Horizon program for 2014/15 but the urgency of these repairs was downgraded in February to the 2015/18 schedule.

This road has not been significantly repaired for at least 25 years. Today much of the wear surface has eroded and in many places significant holes have appeared through the entire surface structure down into the foundation layer causing very dangerous conditions for road users. These potholes are particularly dangerous to cyclists and motor cyclists who have to swerve to avoid them. Palace Road is virtually a single carriageway due to commuter parking along both sides of the entire length. Vehicles are being subjected to serious damage and unnecessary wear due to the appalling condition of Palace Road in East Molesey. This is by far the most seriously damaged road surface in the area.

We petition Surrey County Council and the Elmbridge Highways Committee to fund the reconstruction of this road as a matter of considerable urgency on the grounds of safety and condition.

The Chairman will provide the following response:

The poor condition of Palace Rd has been fully recognised by Surrey Highways and Palace Rd is therefore planned for complete resurfacing this autumn, i.e. between September to December 2014. It had previously been allocated funding as part of Project Horizon in Year 3 (2015/16), however, following review with Councillor Selleck and additional damage caused by the recent severe weather, Surrey Highways agreed to accelerate the programme and bring forward by 12 months to year 2.

The scheme is currently in design and we are working with local partners and stakeholders to agree optimum delivery date, with the specific date for reconstruction expected to be published on SCC website from early August. In the meantime Surrey Highways will continue to keep the road safe by completing temporary repairs on any reported defects where the defect exceeds 40mm depth.

This page is intentionally left blank



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 16 June 2014

AGENDA ITEM 8

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Tony Nockles

Road Safety Audit – Cigarette Island Lane

I would like to know the status of the audit and whether, indeed, it will be conducted in accordance with SoRSA guidelines?

The Chairman will give the following response:

Surrey County Council's Safety Audit Team have reviewed the site and completed a report recording their views. The terms of reference of a Safety Audit are described in HD 19/04. This provides for the road safety implications of a proposed highway improvement scheme to be examined and reported. In this case no scheme has been proposed for the access road to Cigarette Island other than the hypothetical controlled crossing previously requested. Therefore it is not possible to conduct a Road Safety Audit according to the terms of HD 19/04. Nevertheless the Safety Audit Team has examined the existing site, considered the hypothetical controlled crossing and reported their findings.

The Safety Audit Team's findings concur with the views of the Area Team Manager, that there is no technical justification for a controlled crossing at this location. The Safety Audit Team go further and suggest that a controlled crossing would make the situation worse. It is suggested that visibility could be improved at the existing uncontrolled crossing. It would be the Local Committee's prerogative to take this suggestion forwards and allocate funding for feasibility, detailed design and construction. This would need to be coordinated with any other works in the near vicinity.

There remains no technical justification whatsoever for a controlled crossing in the access road to Cigarette Island. The Road Safety Auditor's report suggests that such a crossing could make the situation worse. In spite of this the Local Committee could instruct officers to undertake a feasibility study against officer advice to investigate the suggested controlled crossing further. However it is highly unlikely that any feasibility study would draw different technical conclusions from those already provided to Committee. Therefore it is strongly recommended that Committee choose between one of the two following options to conclude this matter:

- 1) Investigate a realignment of the existing uncontrolled crossing to improve visibility, and allocate the funding necessary for this;
- 2) Resolve to take no further action.

Committee should note that all its Highways funding for the current Financial Year 2014-15 is already committed, and that any reallocation of this Financial Year's Highways funding would result in a scheme or schemes elsewhere being deferred to the following Financial Year 2015-16. Committee could allocate funding for the following Financial Year 2015-16 from its Highways budgets freely as no commitments have yet been made against next Financial Year's Highways budgets.

Question 2: MARK SUGDEN

Can SCC provide an update on the status of the Youth Centre in Claygate and reassure residents that there will be continued local Youth provision in Claygate in the future?

The Chairman will give the following response:

Surrey County Council is currently working with the Management Committee and users of Claygate Youth Centre to secure the future of the centre and provision within. A full assessment of the condition of the building is being prepared so as to understand the extent of repairs necessary to bring the building in line with Surrey County Council property standards.

Within the Services for Young People Centre-Based Youth Work commission, provision at Claygate Youth Centre is classified as a satellite youth centre and as such carries a staffing allocation and budget for activities; this is set until 31 March 2015. Proposals for re-commissioning from 1 April 2015, outline plans that will give the Local Committee greater say over how resources, including youth work in centres, are allocated according to local need going forward. This is to help ensure that the services provided are tailored, taking into account the local context, to best meet the needs of young people within the borough. All commissions will be working towards outcomes in the newly agreed Services for Young People Outcomes Framework and will be aimed at local needs. The Local Committee will agree priorities and where resources should be targetted, and because of this, no decisions have as yet, been made regarding Services for Young People resources from 1 April 2015.



**A309 HAMPTON COURT WAY / CIGARETTE ISLAND
HAMPTON COURT**

ROAD SAFETY COMMENTS

MAY 2014

Introduction

Following a request for a Road Safety Audit on the pedestrian crossing location at Cigarette Island, Hampton Court Surrey, KT8 9AE, a site visit and subsequent road safety comments regarding the pedestrian crossing facilities to Cigarette Island are detailed below.

Background

A formal Road Safety Audit (RSA) report has not been issued as there are no formal scheme proposals nor scheme drawings, hence an RSA cannot be conducted in the usual manner.

It should be noted that the Department for Transport definition of a Road Safety Audit, as shown in the Design Manual for Road and Bridges (DMRB) HD19/04, states that a Road Safety Audit is "The evaluation of Highway Improvement Schemes during design and at the end of construction".

The Institution of Highways & Transportation document 'Road Safety Audit' published October 2008 (now the Chartered Institute of Highways & Transportation) defines Road Safety Audit as "a formal, systematic, independent assessment of the potential road safety problems associated with a new road scheme or road improvement scheme."

Road Safety Audits should be conducted on "Highway Improvement Schemes: All works that involve construction of new highway or permanent change to the existing highway layout or features" (HD19/04).

Therefore as there have been no scheme drawings produced to indicate the proposals of a pedestrian crossing, a Road Safety Audit cannot be conducted. Hence this report should be considered as Road Safety comments on a scheme proposal which have no drawings. The scheme 'proposals' are indicative and consist of an assumption of the type and location of a proposed crossing.

It should be noted that the comments included have been produced by SCC's Road Safety Audit team, who between them have over 26 years Road Safety Audit experience and have conducted over 3000 Road Safety Audits.

Indicative scheme proposals

Elmbridge Local Committee Report, dated 24 February 2014, stated that the petitioners requested the provision of "an 'unmanned' pedestrian crossing across Cigarette Island which officers have interpreted this to mean either a Zebra Crossing or a traffic signal controlled crossing".

Therefore it has been assumed that a zebra crossing or a traffic signal controlled crossing is proposed by the petitioners within Cigarette Island directly adjacent to the A309 Hampton Court Way. It has also been assumed that the proposed controlled crossing is to be on the same alignment as the existing uncontrolled crossing (currently comprising of dropped kerbs and tactile paving).

Casualty Data

A review of casualty data at the site indicates that there has been no pedestrian personal injury casualties recorded across the Cigarette Island access during the period 1/1/2000 – 31/3/2014. This shows that crossing Cigarette Island at this point has been comparatively safe for a number of years.

However, with proposed development traffic expected to access Cigarette Island, it is likely that an increase in traffic across this junction will increase the potential for conflict involving pedestrians. As a result of this, recommendations are included in this report to improve the current situation.

Previous Road Safety Audit

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was conducted in the vicinity of Hampton Court station during October 2007 using drawing number 6748/06. The proposals included the provision of controlled pedestrian crossings on Hampton Court Way and Creek Road and alterations to the forecourt area of Hampton Court train station, with enhanced access. The proposals also included a small change in the kerb line at Cigarette Island but did not show a controlled pedestrian crossing but appeared to retain the existing uncontrolled crossing. The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit did not recommend a controlled crossing across Cigarette Island. No Stage 2 Road Safety Audit has been conducted since 2007 as there has been no detailed design drawings submitted. No subsequent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been conducted on revised feasibility drawings either.

Site observations:

- The existing uncontrolled crossing within Cigarette Island is 2.4 metres wide.
- The existing uncontrolled crossing is indented within Cigarette Island by approximately 2.7 metres from the A309 carriageway.
- The uncontrolled crossing is not used by all pedestrians crossing Cigarette Island, but observations indicate pedestrians cross in-line with the footway passing over Hampton Court Bridge. Hence the uncontrolled crossing is not directly on the existing pedestrian desire line. The existing uncontrolled crossing does give access to pedestrians with a mobility impairment or those with pushchairs.
- Pedestrians crossing from north to south using the existing dropped kerbs at the uncontrolled crossing have restricted visibility of southbound A309 traffic due to the parapet walls of Hampton Court Bridge.

The provision of a proposed controlled crossing (either a zebra crossing or a traffic signal controlled crossing – such as a puffin crossing) is assumed to be located in the same position as the existing uncontrolled crossing.

Safety concerns of the provision of a traffic signal controlled crossing:

- The signal heads of a controlled crossing located within Cigarette Island would not be aligned to face southbound A309 traffic, but to traffic entering or exiting Cigarette Island. Hence traffic on the A309 wishing to enter Cigarette Island, especially those turning left, will have limited awareness of the status of the crossing due to restricted forward visibility.
- Drivers entering Cigarette Island required to stop by a red signal are likely to have to brake late due to the restricted forward visibility of the signal heads. This could result in shunt conflicts on the A309 carriageway, especially the southbound A309 approach.
- Vehicles queuing to enter Cigarette Island, especially southbound A309 traffic, are at risk of shunt conflicts involving following drivers, who are unlikely to expect vehicle queues to generate on the A309 carriageway resulting from traffic wishing to enter a cul-de-sac.
- Drivers entering Cigarette Island not viewing a red signal or not expecting to stop directly upon entry are at risk of violating a red signal, placing pedestrians at risk of conflict.

- Due to the observed number of pedestrians in the vicinity it is likely that pedestrians will cross the Cigarette Island regardless of the status of the controlled crossing (i.e. cross against a red man). Such activity may then also occur at adjacent signal controlled crossings, increasing the risk of conflict involving pedestrians. This is of particular concern due to the likely number of foreign pedestrians in the vicinity due to the proximity of Hampton Court Palace.
- There is insufficient space for a vehicle exiting the A309 to enter Cigarette Island and wait wholly within the Cigarette Island carriageway. Therefore the first vehicle at a proposed stop line is likely to overhang the A309 carriageway and be at risk of conflict involving southbound vehicles.
- It is unclear how or where zig zag markings will be aligned due to the short distance the crossing would be indented from the A309 carriageway.

Safety concerns of the provision of a zebra crossing:

- Vehicles queuing to enter Cigarette Island, especially southbound A309 traffic, are at risk of shunt conflicts involving following drivers, who are unlikely to expect vehicle queues to generate on the A309 carriageway resulting from traffic wishing to enter a cul-de-sac.
- Drivers entering Cigarette Island required to stop by pedestrians crossing a zebra crossing are likely to have to brake late due to the restricted forward visibility of the belisha beacons. This could result in shunt conflicts on the A309 carriageway, especially the southbound A309 approach.
- Drivers entering Cigarette Island not viewing a belisha beacon or not expecting to stop directly upon entry are at risk of conflicting with pedestrians crossing the Cigarette Island carriageway.
- There is insufficient space for a vehicle exiting the A309 to enter Cigarette Island and wait wholly within the Cigarette Island carriageway. Therefore the first vehicle at a proposed stop line is likely to overhang the A309 carriageway and be at risk of conflict involving southbound vehicles.
- It is unclear how or where zig zag markings will be aligned due to the short distance the crossing would be indented from the A309 carriageway.

Recommendations:

- Retain existing uncontrolled crossing.
- However, to improve visibility for and of pedestrians crossing from north to south across Cigarette Island, the indented uncontrolled crossing on the north side of the carriageway could be re-aligned closer to the existing pedestrian desire line, to provide an in-line uncontrolled crossing. This would assist due to the expected increase in traffic accessing Cigarette Island as part of the proposed development works. NB. This would also require the dropped kerbs and tactile paving on both sides of Cigarette Island to be re-aligned.

Photo A below showing existing sightline to the north at the existing crossing point and photo B where an improved sightline to the north could be achieved.

Photo A – from Cigarette Island looking north over Hampton Court Bridge from existing uncontrolled crossing.



Photo B – from Cigarette Island looking north over Hampton Court Bridge from location where most pedestrians cross the carriageway in-line, with improved visibility to the north.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'M. Smith'.

M Smith BSc(Hons), MCIHT, MSoRSA
Safety Engineering Team Leader



SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 16 June 2014

AGENDA ITEM 9

MEMBER QUESTION

Question 1: Margaret Hicks

Heavy goods vehicles are using the network to access the Weylands estate on Molesey Road by way of various roads in the local area. Does an appropriate route exist for these vehicles and what, if any, limitations/restrictions exist on times and access, that can mitigate this?

Highways officer will give the following response:

MOLESEY ROAD / RYDENS ROAD / HGV USAGE.

Surrey's road network has been developed over many years to suit the prevailing movement demands. The strategic road network is centered largely on London, with one orbital route, the M25, and several radial routes. The non-strategic road network is much denser in the larger urban areas than it is in rural areas.

The roads which form the highway network can be categorised in various ways: motorways, trunk roads (A Roads), principal roads (A Roads), other classified roads (B and C Roads), and, unclassified roads (D Roads).

Road Type	Category		Responsibility
Motorway	Motorway	Strategic Road Network	Highways Agency
A Trunk	Primary Route Network		
A Principal			
B	Distributor Road Network	Non-Strategic Road Network	County Roads
C			
Unclassified			

The Strategic Road Network:

- This includes motorways, A Trunk Roads and some A Principal Roads.
- Its function is to provide access to major centres of population and industrial areas (including ports and airports) and cater for longer-

distance movements that occur between those areas, including through traffic.

- Strategic roads have their own distinctive signs, which have blue backgrounds on motorways and green backgrounds on Primary Routes.

The Distributor Road Network:

- This network includes all A Roads not part of the Primary Road Network, and all B and C Roads.
- It caters for the distribution of traffic in and around local towns and settlements, and for the movement of traffic between these places and the Primary Route Network.
- The Council has adopted a hierarchy of distributor roads comprising Surrey County Distributors, Surrey District Distributors and Surrey Local Distributors
- All Distributor roads are the responsibility of the County Council.

As Surrey does have twice the national average of vehicles travelling on its roads, the burden placed on the network is very high, which ultimately leads to congestion during peak and busy periods.

The A244 Hersham Road and the C153 Molesey Road are the main classified routes through the area together with the D3830 Rydens Road, which is the main route running east to west, linking the A244 Hersham Road to the C153 Molesey Road.

The railway line runs to the south of Rydens Road and there are only two location where vehicular traffic can cross this railway line, one being under the railway bridge on the A244 Hersham Road and the other under the smaller arched railway bridge on C153 Molesey Road, adjacent to Hersham railway station.

Height restrictions are imposed on both bridges and whilst the higher at the A244 is 12'6" the lower on the Molesey Road is merely 10'6", and severely limits access from either side. Both bridges have been subject to bridge beam works by Railtrack as they are both prone to strikes by over height vehicles.

Due to the environmental conditions of the surrounding area, with the rivers Mole/Ember bounding the East, railway line to the South, and reservoirs to the North and East, together with height restrictions imposed upon the two bridges, it does mean that vehicular traffic is very limited in its ability to access the area without utilising these limited routes.

The Molesey industrial estate resides on the Molesey Road, to the north of the Hersham railway station and a signed HGV route has been in existence for many years, which directs vehicles to this estate from the A244, due to

these limitations explained above, via the B365 Ashley Road, C155 Station Avenue, and the D3830 Rydens Road.

The roads are all subject to a 30mph speed limit and are well lit by a continuous system of street lighting. The Molesey road does change to a 40mph as it proceeds north, but then returns to 30mph. Pedestrian footways are provided on both sides of all the roads.

Whilst many of the side roads to the north of Rydens Road, together with Walton Park to the south, have been traffic calmed over recent years, this has been carried out primarily to reduce personal injury accidents occurring. An important aim of the scheme was to remove vehicular rat running from those roads lower on the hierarchy, and return them to the primary route network.

Rydens Road was not treated in order that the existing rat running traffic travelling through the areas lower hierarchy roads, generating accidents at inappropriate speeds, were returned to the more appropriate primary route network.

It was for this reason that Rydens Road was not treated for traffic calming as it is the primary route through the area and directs vehicles to the Industrial estates. Any traffic calming would be very intrusive and intensely noisy due to the types of vehicles it carries. Additionally the personal injury accident record along Rydens Road did not justify any proposals.

Speeding is essentially a Police enforcement issue as driving in excess of the posted speed limit is a criminal offence, for which the Police as the sole highway enforcement agency, have powers to deal with offenders to unashamedly flout the law, quickly and effectively.

With the advent of highway electronic devices such as Vehicle Actuated Signs, it has been possible to effect driver behaviour in a more effective fashion. The Interactive sign targets the offending drivers, who drive in excess of the posted limit, and displays the speed limit to them, and on some units a message to 'SLOW DOWN'.

In 2008, two Vehicle Actuated Signs (VAS) were erected, one in each direction on existing lamp columns, at locations in consultation with Surrey Police, to best remind drivers of the obligations to the law and road safety.

As mentioned previously, the roads are subject to a 30mph speed limit, which is the appropriate limit for these types of road, and is the lowest limit than can be applied in Surrey, without traffic calming measures.

Some years ago a 7.5T weight restriction was introduced in Walton Park, as HGV vehicles were using this residential road as a rat run to the Molesey Industrial Estate. A short distance of restriction was introduced in Walton Park near to the Molesey Road, in agreement with Surrey Police, to enable them to enforce the restriction. Advisory advanced warning signs were erected on all approaches to the restriction.

It is not possible to introduce heavy goods vehicle restrictions on the A244 Hersham Road, C153 Molesey Road or the D3830 as these roads are the only primary routes on the highway hierarchy able of accommodating such vehicles, due to the environmental characteristics of the location. Any restrictions would merely be flouted or would migrate vehicles into more residential and less appropriate routes.

Roads are the arteries of the Country for goods and commerce and care must be taken not to adversely affect this, as when these are strangled, the economy suffers and jobs are undoubtedly lost.

Furthermore the Police would not support such a move, as the enforcement of such a ban would be impossible. Some of the side roads have already been traffic calmed over recent years, primarily to reduce personal injury accidents occurring.

Part of the site at Weylands has a lawful use certificate, issued about twenty years ago, which allows the import of inert waste material. Such documents are not subject to planning conditions and therefore the County has no formal control over working hours. The Environment Agency has a remit given the waste use and the waste team has asked to be advised of any measures they are able to apply at Weylands site.

From a Planning perspective, the problem is that there is no direct control over the timing or passage of HGV's on the public highway. There is a degree of indirect control in that access to other sites in Surrey, which have planning permission, will be restricted by planning condition. However this does not prevent vehicles travelling to sites in Surrey and beyond and, to a degree, waiting at some point for a site to open.

There is one over night weight restriction in the Elmbridge area and this was introduced some 15 years ago, in The Woodlands, Esher, between 22.00 & 6.00, to protect residential streets, from overnight HGV movement. This is easier to carry out in locations such as The Woodlands, as this is an unclassified road, and not a primary route, which would divert vehicles onto other less appropriate roads. Furthermore it gained the support of the Police who as the sole highway enforcement authority would be charge with any contravention.

From a highways perspective there are environmental restrictions that predetermine access to the Molesey Industrial Estate. This severely limits what can be introduced in terms of weight restrictions, or other mitigation measures as explained above.

What can achieved as a mitigation is to inspect the carriageway for condition, together with the status of any manholes and gullies, with the aim of repairing defects, resurfacing poor areas, raising and/or resetting Manhole chamber access covers and gullies gratings. This would at least make the ride surface smoother for all vehicles, and minimize any ground-borne vibrations and noise.