

Agenda

Tandridge
Local Committee

Welcome to Tandridge Local Committee

Your Councillors, Your Community
and the Issues that Matter to You

Discussion

Further review of the operation of the development funded speed management measure in Godstone Road, Lingfield and potential amendments to the scheme.



Venue

Location: Tandridge District

*Council Offices, Station
Road East, Oxted,
Surrey, RH8 0BT*

Date: Friday, 13 February 2015

Time: 10.15 am

You can get involved in the following ways

Get involved

Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Thank you for coming to the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help. If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern please contact them through the channels below.

Email: sarah.woodworth@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01737 737422



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Michael Sydney, Lingfield (Chairman)
Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Oxted (Vice-Chairman)
Mr David Hodge, Warlingham
Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Caterham Valley
Mr John Orrick, Caterham Hill
Mrs Helena Windsor, Godstone

Chief Executive
David McNulty

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please either call Sarah Woodworth, Community Partnership and Committee Officer on 01737 737422 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Tandridge District Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0BT or sarah.woodworth@surreycc.gov.uk

This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.

GUIDANCE ON USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) AND SOCIAL MEDIA AND ON THE RECORDING OF MEETINGS

Those wishing to report the proceedings at the meeting will be afforded reasonable facilities for doing so; however, there is no legal requirement to enable audio or video recordings or use of IT and social media during the meeting. The final decision on whether a member of the public or press may undertake these activities is a matter for the Chairman's discretion.

All mobile devices (mobile phones, BlackBerries, etc) should be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with any Public Address (PA) or Induction Loop systems. Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. This is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference with any PA or Induction Loop systems being caused. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Any requests to record all or part of the meeting must be made in writing, setting out the parts of the meeting, purpose and proposed use of the recording, to the Chairman prior to the start of the meeting. In considering requests to record the meeting, the Chairman will take into consideration the impact on other members of the public in attendance. The Chairman may inform the committee and any public present at the start of the meeting about a proposed recording, the reasons and purpose for it and ask if there are any objections. The Chairman will consider any objections along with any other relevant factors before making a decision. The Chairman's decision will be final, but s/he may ask for recordings to be ceased in the event that they become a distraction to the conduct of the meeting and may request a copy and transcript of any recording made.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies.

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the 12 December 2014 Local Committee meeting will be received for approval at the next ordinary meeting on the 20 March 2015.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 FURTHER REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT FUNDED SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES IN GODSTONE ROAD, LINGFIELD AND POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHEME

(Pages 1 - 6)

Following the Local Committee (Tandridge) meeting on 12 December 2014, the decision was deferred until the next meeting in order to prepare a report proposing amendments to the scheme, to continue the monitoring and to consult with the Lingfield and Dormansland parish councils prior to the report being submitted to the Committee. This further report summarises the outcome of the monitoring and identifies a number of amendments to the scheme.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 13 FEBRUARY 2015



**LEAD OFFICER: CAROLINE SMITH
TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLANNING TEAM MANAGER
EAST**

**SUBJECT: FURTHER REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE DEVELOPER
FUNDED SPEED MANAGEMENT MEASURES IN GODSTONE
ROAD, LINGFIELD AND POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE
SCHEME**

DIVISION: LINGFIELD

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

Following the granting of planning permission at The Bays, Godstone Road, Lingfield by a Planning Inspector in January 2011, requiring the implementation of a developer-funded speed management scheme on Godstone Road, the Local Committee at the meeting on 9 December 2011 determined that this scheme should be introduced for a period of one year in the first instance in order to monitor the impact and to make amendments if necessary. The Local Committee determined that the monitoring would be on the basis of congestion, traffic diversion, traffic speeds and recorded personal injury accidents. This was legally recognised in the Section 278 Agreement between the County Council and the developer. This was completed on 18 September 2012 and the highway works in their entirety were completed on 5 September 2013, although the kerb-build outs were completed in December 2012. The matter was reported to the Local Committee meeting on 12 December 2014 and the decision was deferred until the next meeting in order to prepare a report proposing amendments to the scheme, to continue the monitoring and to consult with the Lingfield and Dormansland parish councils prior to the report being submitted to the Committee. This further report summarises the outcome of the monitoring and identifies a number of amendments to the scheme.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to:

- (i) Agree that the monitoring of the speed management scheme in Godstone Road, Lingfield continues to demonstrate that in terms of congestion, traffic diversion, traffic speeds and recorded personal injury accidents, there is no justification for the removal of the scheme.
- (ii) Consider possible amendments to the scheme that could be introduced to improve its operation subject to Local Committee funding.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The outcome of the monitoring shows that traffic speeds on Godstone Road have reduced, albeit with an increase in journey times, and the monitoring indicates that there is no justification on the basis of the agreed criteria to require the developer to

ITEM 4

amend or remove the build-outs.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The matter was reported to the Local Committee meeting on 12 December 2014 and the decision was deferred until the next meeting in order to prepare a report proposing amendments to the scheme, to continue the monitoring and to consult with the Lingfield and Dormansland parish councils prior to the report being submitted to the Committee. This further report summarises the outcome of the monitoring and identifies a number of amendments to the scheme.

2. ANALYSIS:

Monitoring:

- 2.1 **Congestion** – Unfortunately the sat nav data for the period September 2013 to August 2014 is not available to report to this Committee. I understand that it has not yet been received from the Department for Transport even though I was initially informed that it would be available in December 2014. Whilst this is frustrating, the previous data, including the period when there were road works causing additional delays in the area, illustrated that the impact on journey time during the peaks did not exceed an additional 23 seconds and it is still the view of officers that the measures themselves have not caused significant congestion in the area.
- 2.2 As referred to in the previous Committee Report, congestion was initially monitored by the Parish Council. A methodology was agreed between the County Council and the Parish Council but they decided not to continue with further monitoring of the scheme in March 2014 as they believed the evidence they were collecting did not explain the main issue that concerned them with the pinch points.
- 2.3 **Traffic Diversion** – There is still no discernible trend that would demonstrate that traffic is diverting from Godstone Road to Station Road and/or Saxby's Lane. The additional two months traffic count data plus October for comparison is as follows:

	Station Road	Godstone Road	Saxby's Lane
October 2014		10023	2369
November 2014	2101	9865	2455
December 2014	1709	8559	2203

- 2.4 **Traffic Speeds** The data from November and December 2014 reinforces the reduction in the 85thile speed to 35 mph and the mean speed to 29/30 mph N.W bound and the 85thile speed to 34 mph and the mean speed to 27/28 S.E bound.

	North West	North West	South East	South East
	85 th ile	Mean	85 th ile	Mean
October 2014	35	30.09	34	27.73
November 14	35	29.8	34	27.2
December 14	35	30.1	34	27.9

- 2.5 **Recorded Personal Injury Accidents** –The County Council now has records of personal injury accidents to the end of October 2014. According to these records, there continue to be no recorded personal injury accidents related to the build-outs. There have also been no additional personal injury accidents in the whole study area (Godstone Road from Lingfield Common Road to Mountpleasant Road) between August 2014 and October 2014.
- 2.6 Additionally, the Parish Council have not informed the County Council of any incidents since the meeting in December 2014. The Parish Council submission refers to 30+ reported accidents at the Pinch Points but the County Council has only been made aware of 15 incidents, as reported to the December 2014 meeting.

Amendments to the scheme

- 2.7 At the request of Members at the previous Local Committee meeting, officers have devised a number of measures that could improve the operation of the scheme, subject to available Local Committee funding.

These are as follows:

- ‘Keep Clear’ markings on the carriageway at the pinch point closest to the village in order to prevent vehicles queuing to enter the village from stopping vehicles from exiting;
- A vehicle activated sign (VAS) for vehicles approaching Lingfield from the Blindley Heath direction to warn of the build-out ahead;
- Lighting of the build-out furthest from the village;
- Review and replacement of signage that does not comply with the Traffic Signs Manual;

- 2.8 It has been suggested informally that a mini-roundabout could be constructed at the junction of Godstone Road and Bay Trees. This has been discounted for two reasons. Firstly, that there is insufficient highway land available and secondly, that the flows would need to be reasonable balanced on all three arms for the roundabout to operate safely and efficiently, which is not the case here. Godstone Road carries between 4 and 5 thousand vehicles per day in each direction, Bay Trees serves 18 dwellings, which is a huge imbalance.
- 2.9 If Members decide that the build-out closest to the village should be removed, the only practical option is to replace it with a speed table. This will reduce speeds although it will not assist visibility for vehicles exiting Bay Trees. Tables will have a different impact on local residents and will also have a knock-on effect on the operation of the build-out furthest from the village which is likely to result in more vehicles queuing.
- 2.10 There is currently no illumination at either build out as residents that appeared at the Public Inquiry made clear that they did not want any lighting and therefore the Inspector attached a condition to the planning permission stipulating that there should be no lighting. The Parish Council have indicated that they do not support the introduction of lighting as it would be

ITEM 4

inappropriate in the green belt and lead to further urbanisation. There is an existing street light on the opposite side of Godstone Road adjacent to the sports ground, which itself has floodlighting, so its introduction here would not be wholly out of place. If Members decide that lighting should indeed be installed at one or both of the pinch-points, it would be unreasonable to ask the developer to fund this as they would be in breach of their planning permission. As highway authority, however, Surrey County Council has the power to introduce lighting if it is deemed necessary.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee needs to decide, on the basis of the criteria previously agreed and legally binding within the Section 278 Agreement, whether any amendment to the scheme is necessary and, if so, what amendments should be required and which of these, if any, can justifiably be funded by the developer.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 A draft of this report has been circulated to Lingfield and Dormansland Parish Councils and Surrey Police for their comment. Due to the timescales involved, there is insufficient time to include their responses in this report and an update/addendum sheet will be produced in advance of the meeting to address their comments.
- 4.2 Lingfield and Dormansland Parish Council have formally requested that the pinch-point closest to the village be removed and traffic signals be installed at the junction of Godstone Road and Bay Trees. The traffic signals would only be activated when a vehicle wished to exit Bay Trees - they would be on green for Godstone Road at all other times. This would potentially overcome the sight line issue for Bay Trees but would lead to a number of others. Bay Trees is a development of only 18 dwellings, the traffic signals will not be regularly activated and traffic will only be stopped on Godstone Road infrequently. This will not keep the traffic speeds down as there is nothing to constrain them for most of the day, indeed it is likely to increase speeds to around the levels they were before the traffic calming was introduced. Also, in safety terms, the traffic signals will be green so often that drivers will not expect them to be anything other than green, leading to accidents. Both Surrey Police and the County Council Safety Engineering Team have been approached for their views on this suggestion. Neither would be in favour of such a scheme. Additionally, a cost of £80,000 has been suggested for the cost of traffic signals, although this is not on the basis of a costed scheme.
- 4.3 When previously asked, Surrey Police stated that they cannot support the removal of the installations as it would return the average speeds to an unacceptable level with the potential for an increase in collisions and injuries. They have further stated that they accept that the current arrangement causes congestion problems at peak times but that it has addressed the collision and average speed issues. Based on these considerations, they would therefore prefer the existing arrangement to remain.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The developer has made provision for £25,000, included within the S278 Agreement, for amendments to the scheme should they be necessary, pending the outcome of the monitoring and the decision of this Committee.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 None.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The speed reduction scheme was introduced to facilitate the development of 18 affordable dwellings to meet an identified need in Lingfield itself.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The speed management scheme has reduced traffic speeds but led to a slight increase in journey times. There is no evidence that this has led to traffic diverting to other routes. There have been no personal injury accidents reported to the Police associated with the scheme. In the circumstances, it would not be reasonable to require the developer to significantly amend the scheme, although some minor amendments to address some of the concerns raised in the community could be appropriate.
- 9.2 Officers recommend that, whilst no substantive works are required, some minor amendments as identified in this report may be in order to improve the current arrangement.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The developer will be asked to address any construction shortcomings with the scheme (broken kerbing, uneven road surface, problems with highway drainage etc) that have become apparent since the scheme was constructed or have been caused by construction traffic associated with the scheme. If Members consider that any wider amendments are necessary that it is reasonable to request the developer to fund, these will need to be requested at the same time.

ITEM 4

Contact Officer:

Caroline Smith 020 8541 9975

Consulted:

Lingfield Parish Council

Dormansland Parish Council

Surrey Police

Surrey Highways

County Councillor Michael Sydney

Annexes:**Sources/background papers:**

- Tandridge Local Committee Report and minutes of 9 December 2011
 - Tandridge Local Committee Report and minutes of 12 December 2014
-