

**DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Tandridge LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 10.15 am on 24 June 2016  
at South Godstone Sports and Community Association, Lagham Road, South  
Godstone, RH9 8HE.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mr Nick Skellett CBE (Chairman)
- \* Mr Michael Sydney (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr David Hodge
- \* Mrs Sally Ann B Marks
- \* Mr John Orrick
- \* Mrs Helena Windsor

\* In attendance

---

**57/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Due to county business, Mr David Hodge arrived during Item 4.

**58/16 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the previous meeting on 23 March 2016 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

**59/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**60/16 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Three petitions were received.

The petitions and their response are attached to the minutes.

**1 - Dormansland**

Mrs Sarah Jane Lloyd presented a petition containing 229 online signatures and a further 124 signatures on paper, asking for a zebra crossing, more road school signage and a lower speed limit in Dormansland High Street.

Mrs Lloyd highlighted the dangers when crossing the road, particularly with young children, given the speed of traffic and the number of parked cars affecting visibility. There is no safe place to cross. She requested a Traffic Engineer attends the site to look at the potential improvements that could be made. Mrs Lloyd said that the petition has local support, including school, preschool, and Parish Council.

Mrs Lloyd read a statement of support from the Headteacher of Dormansland Primary School, Mrs Stokes, who stated that the school site is difficult to access and there is no school crossing patrol. The school has successfully worked with the county council to start a 'stop and drop' scheme, but this does not help the families who would like to walk to school.

Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer, advised that a scheme to put in a crossing had been looked at in both 2002 and 2008/09, but had not progressed due to objections received from the Parish Council and residents. The Local Delivery Manager confirmed there had been a number of issues, including finding a safe location for the crossing. He advised that Highways were looking to adapt some funding with the Parish Council to put towards a crossing.

Mr Michael Sydney said that the objections received in the past were because the scheme proposed was not felt to be the right scheme, and therefore it was crucial to have the support of the shop, Parish Council, school and residents before proceeding.

Mr Nick Skellett confirmed the committee supports this petition, but needs to ensure the scheme is the right one, and to look at funding and timescales.

Highways agreed to report back to the next committee meeting on 23 September about funding and timescales.

## **2 – Pendell Road, Bletchingley**

Mr Adrian Floyd, Headmaster at the Hawthorns School, accompanied by pupils Connor Rook, Sabina Simpson and Chris Vassou, presented a petition containing 447 online signatures, and 2 offline signatures, submitted by Mrs Diane Brown. The petition called for the speed limit on Pendell Road to be reduced to 40mph with a 20mph limit outside the Hawthorns School.

The pupils said that the road is dangerous because visibility is poor and it is difficult to see oncoming cars because the road is uphill and narrow. They stated that the footpath is narrow. They quoted statistics that 348 children were killed or seriously injured on Surrey roads during 2014. The children also stated they would like to feel able to walk to school, and that the risk of flooding on this road also meant it was important to slow the cars down.

Mr Floyd stated that there should be a 40mph lead-in before the desired 20mph limit outside the school. The school wants to work in partnership with the county council to make this road safer. The school cuts back hedges and verges where it can, and will install a 'stop' sign at the exit, and repaint the lines at the exit. Mr Floyd said that parents have offered to join a community speedwatch scheme if the speed limit is approved.

The Senior Traffic Engineer referred the petitioners to the tabled response, and confirmed that speed surveys would be undertaken, during term time, and the existing signage will be reviewed.

Mrs Windsor thanked the pupils and Mr Floyd for bringing this petition with nearly 450 signatures. She appreciates there is lots of concern about this stretch of road, often used as a cut through, and gave the petition her total

support. Mrs Windsor requested that the speed surveys be conducted as soon as possible.

Mrs Marks queried the pupils' statistics about the number of children killed or seriously injured, and believed the number given was incorrect, and the real numbers much lower.

Mr Hopley, a local resident, spoke to confirm that for a family with young children, crossing the road on a daily basis feels extremely dangerous.

Mr Skellett confirmed that the committee has a genuine wish to make improvements. The committee agreed to progress the speed survey, and when the results are in place, to look at reducing the speed limit. Mrs Brown stated that they had spoken with Chris Cannon from Surrey Police and that he supported the proposed speed limit reduction.

Mr Michael Sydney encouraged the public to report accidents, as otherwise they do not appear on the council's accident statistics.

### **3 – Hurst Green Road**

Mrs Cidalia Santos and Mr Michael Walsh presented a petition containing 44 signatures, asking for improvements to road safety on Hurst Green road. Mrs Santos stated that the road is not designed for the heavy goods vehicles that use it, and which make Mrs Santos' house shake at unsociable hours. Mrs Santos said this affects all neighbours. Mrs Santos said the current situation is causing a lot of stress, and she feels that residents' concerns have been ignored. She invited Traffic Engineers to come to the site to experience it for themselves.

Mr Walsh stated that since submitting the petition, discussions with residents have shown concerns to be broader than speeding. Mr Walsh referred the committee to a document that residents had prepared, which he had sent to the council in advance of this meeting, outlining potential solutions that residents have suggested, and which they wish to work through with Traffic Engineers.

Mr Walsh stated that the road is now the main route out of Hurst Green, which now has a higher population than Oxted, and that there is not enough signage indicating the speed limit. Mr Walsh was clear that they wish to retain resident parking.

The Chairman thanked Mr Walsh and Mrs Santos for their petition and for the excellent additional paper provided. He has met with residents on the road, and has also met with David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager on site. He acknowledged the concerns of residents and the speed of the traffic and lack of passing places. He said that the condition of the road is an issue, and the road had been part of the Horizon programme, but been deferred due to funding cuts. Mr Skellett confirmed he had requested a technical appraisal.

The Local Delivery Manager confirmed that round speed limit signs are not permitted where there is street lighting, as drivers should be aware from the Highway Code that there is a 30mph speed limit in this instance. Painting '30mph' on the road is only permitted where the speed limit changes. He

stated it should be possible to obtain a 'slow' sign and a Vehicle-Activated Sign (VAS).

Mr Hodge confirmed he had raised the issue of people from out of the area speeding along local roads and abusing Highways Officers and workmen, in a meeting with the new Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey. He is advocating a countywide campaign against unnecessary speeding.

The Chairman gave his commitment to try and bring this road back onto the Horizon programme. Highways agreed to provide an update at the next committee meeting in September. The Chairman will seek some patching work in the meantime, if it does not affect the road being considered a priority for Horizon. It was agreed to pursue a VAS for the road, and Highways were asked to liaise with residents and Mr Skellett on the positioning of this.

## **61/16 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

6 public questions had been received.

### **1) Mr Lemanski – funding for roads maintenance**

The Chairman referred members to the response provided in the supplementary papers and confirmed the response had been sent to Mr Lemanski, who was unable to attend.

### **2) Mr Mousley – parking restrictions on Whyteleafe Road**

The Chairman referred Mr Mousley to the response provided. Mr Mousley asked a supplementary question concerning the specific detail of the restriction requested on Whyteleafe Road. The Chairman confirmed that the specific details of the scheme will be worked through by David Curl, Parking Implementation and Strategy Manager in consultation with the divisional member Mr John Orrick and Mr Mousley. The Chairman confirmed the final locations will be approved by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member.

### **3) District Councillor for Lingfield and Crowhurst Liz Lockwood – road safety in Lingfield**

The Chairman referred Mrs Lockwood to the response provided in the supplementary papers.

Mrs Lockwood spoke from a script and provided a copy of this, along with photos of the problems and proposals to the clerk. Mrs Lockwood stated that a key objective for the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan was to encourage the village's prosperity and promote safer pedestrian access to the local shops. Mrs Lockwood feels that reducing the speed limit through a major portion of the village will improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

Mrs Lockwood asked whether the committee would consider the request for a pedestrian refuge where the Godstone Road meets the roundabout, rather than immediately opposite the Post Office itself. Mrs Lockwood provided a photograph showing the desired location.

Mrs Lockwood also asked Highways to consider the position of the give-way markings for the traffic approaching the first pinch point when leaving the village and stated that the current positioning causes serious difficulties for cars exiting the driveway of the Thatched Cottage.

The Local Delivery Manager agreed to consider the options detailed by Mrs Lockwood and to come back to the committee with a response.

#### **4 ) Mrs Dianne Vassalo – speed limit on Rockshaw Road**

Mrs Vassalo did not attend the meeting. The Chairman confirmed that Mrs Vassalo had received the response to this question. Mrs Windsor asked a supplementary question on Mrs Vassalo's behalf. She stated that while the Tandridge end of the road is considered rural, there are a number of private dwellings, and as such the only part which is rural is the bridge over the motorway. The response suggests a speed limit reduction could be considered if speed survey results are in line with the speed limit policy, however given that the issue residents face is cars being driven well in excess of the 50mph limit, how could this be achieved within the policy.

Mrs Windsor stated she was concerned that going over the motorway bridge it would be unlikely that cars would stick to the speed limit; she asked what else can be done to protect residents in this area.

The Senior Traffic Engineer agreed to arrange a site visit with Mrs Windsor to look at the issues.

#### **5) Mr Salter – speed limit on A25, Kent boundary to Limpsfield**

The Chairman confirmed that Mr Salter had been sent the response as tabled in the supplementary papers.

Mr Salter submitted a supplementary question, which has been circulated to Highways and a response will be provided to Mr Salter after the meeting

#### **6) District Councillor Nick Childs – speed limits in South Godstone and Blindley Heath**

The Chairman referred Mr Childs to the response provided in the supplementary papers.

Mr Childs asked how soon the proposed speed surveys could be conducted and when the results would be available. He expressed concerns about the personal injury data in the response, and asked for clarification of the speed limit policy.

The Senior Traffic Engineer advised the speed survey would likely be undertaken in September.

Mr Hodge said that he could not support reducing the speed limit to 20mph on a major trunk road through the district. Mrs Windsor, the divisional member, concurred, stating that she supported a reduction to 30mph through Blindley Heath but not a reduction to 20mph through South Godstone.

The committee agreed to request that a speed camera van is located along the A22 at South Godstone on a regular basis over the next 3-4 months to act as a deterrent, with District Councillor Nick Childs and Divisional Member Mrs Helena Windsor asked to help identify the best location.

## **62/16 MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

### **1) Titsey Road - Councillor Nick Skellett**

The Chairman noted the response. Mr David Hodge thanked the Chairman for his work pursuing improvements to this road, as it partly falls into his division. Mr Hodge asked to be kept informed of progress.

### **2) A25 Westerham Road – Councillor Nick Skellett**

The Chairman noted the response.

### **3) M25 Junction 6 traffic lights – Councillor Nick Skellett**

The Chairman noted the response but said there still seems to be an issue with the sequencing.

### **4) Traffic lights on Woodhurst Lane by Morrisons – Councillor Nick Skellett**

The Chairman noted the response.

### **5) Recent flooding in Caterham, Whyteleafe and Chaldon – Councillor John Orrick**

Mr Orrick thanked officers for the response to the question. He stated that the impact of the flash flooding in his division has mainly fallen on residential properties– with over 50 properties suffering, largely from foul water inundations. Mr Orrick spoke about the distress this has caused for residents, including residents of a Sheltered Accommodation unit where the whole downstairs had been flooded. He said that residents are feeling angry and abandoned.

Mr Orrick thanked the County Council, District Council, Police and Fire and Rescue services for their immediate actions. He expressed his gratitude towards Ian Good, Head of Emergency Management, for arranging the recent surgeries with the National Flood Forum, and to the Leader of Surrey County Council, Councillor David Hodge, for confirming there will be a review of this incident.

Mr Orrick asked how the impact of flooding can be lessened, or prevented, in future.

Mrs Marks confirmed that there are still residents in her division living in hotel accommodation, who are unlikely to be able to return to their homes for some time. She expressed her concern that flooding had not been prevented in the 'hotspots' already known to the county council. Businesses around Caterham roundabout and Church Walk have been badly affected. Both Mrs Marks and

Mrs Windsor expressed their thanks to Steve Cunnah, Highway Maintenance Engineer, for his work.

Mrs Windsor and Mrs Marks said gully clearance had been inadequate. Mrs Marks asked why gullies on the A22 at Whyteleafe had not been emptied for 18 months, despite being raised on a number of occasions, and felt that contractors had not done their jobs properly.

Mrs Windsor was concerned that new housing developments had been put in without adequate drainage, and that this was exacerbating the problems.

Doug Hill, Strategic Network Resilience Manager, stated that a significant amount of rain had fallen in a short time. This event was therefore very different to the flooding of winter 2013. He said there are over 1000 known wetspots across the county, and these have to be prioritised in terms of risk to safety. A 'Section 19' investigation will be undertaken. This will identify which authorities had a function, and whether or not they carried out this function. He confirmed that the investigation will also look more widely at the issues. The Officer agreed to bring this report back to the committee to see what lessons can be learned.

The Officer confirmed that the National Flood Forum will continue to run drop-in sessions with advice and guidance over the coming weeks and the county council will help to publicise these.

John Lawlor, Local Delivery Manager confirmed that gully clearing had been completed in over 30 local roads, with repairs identified and scheduled. He asked members to tell them about any broken pipes in their divisions that they are aware of, so that they can be added to the list of repairs. He confirmed that the contract for gully maintenance had been reviewed, and dedicated officer resource put in to manage this contract going forwards.

Mr Orrick asked whether relief of council tax could be granted to those unable to return to their homes. Mr Hodge confirmed the county council's finance team were working with the district council on this, and that he will be raising the matter with the Secretary of State. He stated that as Leader of the county council, he sees flooding as a key risk for the county. He said the risks increase as more people tarmac over driveways and gardens, resulting in the water having nowhere to drain away naturally. He stated that the district council has a really important role in planning and needs to ensure soakaways are built into planning applications, and enforced. The Chairman referred the committee to the responses received to letters written by the committee to the Head of Planning at Tandridge District Council, and to Doug Hill, Strategic Network Resilience Manager.

District Councillor for Westway, Eithne Webster, thanked Mr Orrick for facilitating this item. She explained that residents had suffered terribly as a result of this flash flooding. She requested that the county council's contact centre are asked to ensure residents phoning up with flooding problems are invited to contact their county councillor. She said that some residents had their council tax already covered through their insurance company. She asked if a schedule for gully clearing could be published, and shared locally, so that residents could move parked cars. She confirmed that Tandridge District Council do enforce the provision of soakaways.

The Chairman stated that flooding incidents like this which affect people's homes need to be a priority. He requested that Mr Orrick and Mrs Marks identify those areas where gullies have not been cleared so that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman can seek to prioritise funds appropriately during Finance meetings with Highways.

**63/16 LOCAL COMMITTEE DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]**

The Chairman noted the report.

**64/16 MEMBERS ALLOCATIONS SUMMARY (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 8]**

**Members discussion – Key points:**

The Chairman confirmed they were looking at a September start date for the Singing for the Brain sessions.

The Chairman asked the Clerk to let the committee know the dates and venues once confirmed.

It was noted that the case study within the report should read 'Chaldon Parish Council', not 'Crowhurst Parish Council'.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed to note:

(i) The Members' Allocation applications received and amounts spent, where indicated, as set out in Annex 1 of this report.

**65/16 REPRESENTATION ON LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS FOR 2016-17 (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 9]**

**Members' discussion – key points:**

Members agreed to continue with the same representatives. This was proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Mr Hodge.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed:

- i. The terms of reference of the Youth Task Group, as set out in Annex 1.
- ii. The appointment of membership of the Youth task group and a representative on the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership for 2016/17 **as below:**  
**Youth Task Group: Mr Nick Skellett, Mrs Sally Marks, Mr John Orrick**  
**East Surrey Community Safety Partnership: Mr Michael Sydney**

**66/16 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FROM SERVICES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]**

The Chairman welcomed Paula Desai, Team Manager for Services for Young People, to the meeting. He stated that the work by the team is very good, and being undertaken on a reduced budget.

The Officer introduced the report and explained how the new staffing structure was arranged. The team is working hard to divert young people from entering the criminal justice system.

#### **Members Discussion – key points:**

Mrs Marks asked how homelessness was measured. The Officer explained that while there are no young people in the district identified as homeless, they were aware of young people 'sofa surfing', and 4/5 young people living in hostels. The team uses the family mediation service to try and keep young people at home where possible. Most young people do not want to be in hostel accommodation – there are none in Tandridge and therefore it means moving away from their friends, to Epsom or Ash Vale.

Councillor John Orrick left the meeting at this point.

#### **Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed:

- i. The terms of reference of the Youth Task Group, as set out in Annex 1.
- ii. The appointment of membership of the Youth task group and a representative on the East Surrey Community Safety Partnership for 2016/17 **as below:**

**Youth Task Group: Mr Nick Skellett, Mrs Sally Marks, Mr John Orrick  
East Surrey Community Safety Partnership: Mr Michael Sydney**

#### **67/16 PRESENTATION FROM GOVIA THAMESLINK RAILWAY (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]**

The Chairman stated this item had been deferred until September as nobody from GoVia Thameslink had been able to attend.

#### **68/16 PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 12]**

David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Manager introduced the report. He explained that the county council receives hundreds of requests for parking restrictions, and therefore for efficiency they are grouped together and looked at as part of the scheduled parking review. All proposals in the report have been discussed and agreed with the divisional member. The next stage is to start statutory consultation. The report allows for adjustments to be made to the proposals after the meeting.

The Officer explained that the changes to the regulations concerning School Keep Clear markings means that any proposals can be agreed with the divisional member straightaway, rather than waiting for the next parking review.

The Officer confirmed that implementation from last year's parking review was due to be completed within the next couple of weeks.

The Officer confirmed that recommendation vi had been amended to reflect that the monies had already been allocated.

**Members' discussion- key points:**

Councillor John Orrick confirmed his support for the restrictions on both sides of Whyteleafe Road and that this should be added to the proposals.

The Chairman requested that Brassey Road and Detillens Lane are included in the review.

The amends to the recommendations were proposed by the Chairman and seconded by Mr Sydney.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed:

- i. The proposed changes to parking and waiting restrictions as shown in Annexes 1 and 2, **as amended in Annex 3 and to further include the additions of Whyteleafe Road, Detillens Lane and Brassey Road.**
- ii. If necessary, adjustments can be made to the proposals agreed at the meeting by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member prior to statutory consultation.
- iii. The intention of the County Council to make Traffic Regulation Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Tandridge as shown in the Annexes (and as subsequently modified by ii) is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.
- iv. If there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor.
- v. If necessary the Parking Team Manager will report the objections back to the local committee for resolution.
- vi. Note the allocation £10,000 in the Revenue Maintenance Allocation 2016/17 as agreed at the 23 March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee meeting to implement the parking amendments.
- vii. Approve the new process for implementation of new school keep clear markings (SKCs), and to agree to revoke the traffic regulation orders for existing SKCs across Tandridge, in light of changes in government legislation.

Matthew Gallop, Asset Programme Manager introduced the report, which provides details of the needs-based schemes identified for years 2-5 of the Pavement Horizon programme. There are other preventative schemes not included within this report.

**Members Discussion – key points:**

Members were unhappy with the report and how this funding had been handled and requested a further meeting with a full list of schemes for members to be able to comment.

**Resolution:**

The committee acknowledged that they had received the report but declined to note the recommendations.

**70/16 HIGHWAYS UPDATE 2016-17 (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]**

**Members Discussion – key points:**

Mr Hodge asked when the Limpsfield Road to Warlingham Green scheme would be done. John Lawlor, Local Delivery Manager, agreed to find out and respond to Mr Hodge.

The Chairman asked for clarification about whether the Comforts Farm Road scheme was still going ahead. The Local Delivery Manager agreed to find out and respond to the Chairman.

The Chairman said Brassey Road still has a sign up saying it is going to be repaired even though it is no longer on the list of planned schemes. The Local Delivery Manager agreed to investigate and respond to the Chairman.

Mr Sydney asked when Officers had met with Burstow Parish Council regarding Redehall Road. The Local Delivery Manager responded this was at the end of the financial year.

Mr Hodge was disappointed the report did not contain an update on Project Horizon. The Local Delivery Manager agreed that this was a surprise and he would feed back to the committee about this.

**Resolution:**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) agreed to note the contents of the report.

Meeting ended at: 12:46pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016

**SUBJECT:** **PETITION - Introduce a zebra crossing, more road school signage, and a lowering of the speed limit to 20 miles per hour on Dormansland High Street**

**DIVISION:** LINGFIELD

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To consider a petition containing 229 signatures online, and a further 124 signatures on paper – by Mrs Sarah Jane Lloyd.

We, the undersigned, petition Surrey County Council to introduce a zebra crossing, more road school signage, and a lowering of the speed limit to 20 miles per hour on Dormansland High Street.

Dormansland High Street, which is the main road through the village, is becoming increasingly dangerous for both children and their parents to cross.

This is due to the excessive speed of traffic, plus poor visibility caused by copious on street parking. The combination of these factors means crossing is now extremely hazardous and the problem is exacerbated by the fact the High Street is the main route between Dormansland Primary School and the village shop, the recreation ground, the church, and the village preschool.

A number of parents and children have already been involved in near misses; as it stands the High Street is an accident waiting to happen. It is not acceptable to wait until someone is hurt or killed before taking action.

We therefore ask for a number of safety measures including a zebra crossing, more school signage and a lowering of the speed limit to 20 miles per hour.

**RESPONSE:**

Dormansland Primary School is located to the east of Dormansland High Street, accessed from both Clinton Hill (vehicles and pedestrians) and The Meades (pedestrians only). There are double yellow line waiting restrictions around the junction of High Street with Clinton Hill and in the High Street opposite Clinton Hill. There are also double yellow line waiting restrictions around the junction of High Street with The Meades. Vehicles can park along the rest of the length of the High Street. Buses serve the High Street, with bus stops located to the south of Clinton Hill. The High Street is street lit and subject to a 30mph speed limit. There are no pedestrian crossing facilities in the High Street.

There are school warning signs in the High Street on both approaches to the school, one north of The Meades and the other south of Clinton Hill. At the request of the

school, a direction sign to the school has been ordered. The double sided sign, which will read Dormansland Primary School, will be located in the High Street opposite Clinton Hill.

Reported personal injury collision data for the three year period 01/01/2013 to 31/12/2015, together with the data available for this year (up to 31/03/2016) is summarised below.

<b>High Street, Dormansland (Dormans Road to New Farthingdale)</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Slight</b>	<b>Serious</b>	<b>Fatality</b>	<b>Comments</b>
2013	1	-	-	Vehicle skidded in snow conditions
2014	1	-	-	Pedestrian (age 11) hit after alighting from bus
2015	2	-	-	1. Shunt into parked vehicle 2. Driver unlocking vehicle struck by passing car
2016	0	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

Surrey County Council does not hold any speed data for High Street, Dormansland.

A pedestrian survey was carried out in the High Street in September 2012 between 7am and 7pm, noting pedestrian crossing movements at 5 locations. The survey showed that the highest pedestrian crossing movements took place in the vicinity of the Post Office/Village Shop, with 266 movements recorded over the 12 hour period. The next busiest crossing location was to the south of Clinton Hill, near the bus stops, where 185 crossing movements were recorded over the 12 hour period.

Following the development of 72-74 High Street, s106 developer contributions were secured towards the implementation of traffic calming measures in the High Street. A scheme was developed which included two kerb build-outs incorporating an informal pedestrian crossings (dropped kerbs and tactile paving), one outside the Post Office/General Stores and the other south of Clinton Hill. The works started on site but was stopped and the scheme subsequently abandoned following objections from the Parish Council and local residents.

In consultation with the Parish Council and the divisional Member, approval is currently being sought from Tandridge District Council to reallocate this money to fund a traffic calming scheme at the junction of High Street/Dormans Road/Plough Road/Hollow Lane. The effect of this scheme, which would comprise a junction table and speed cushions, would be to reduce the speed of traffic approaching the village from the north.

Surrey County Council has an approved Speed Limit Policy which sets out the criteria under which a reduction in speed limit by signs alone would be considered. The policy requires that the length of road over which a speed limit change would be considered should be at least 600m in length. This is to ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist along a length of road.

Existing speeds are required to be measured using over a 7 day continuous period using automatic survey equipment. The measured existing mean speeds are then compared to a threshold set out in the policy and if the recorded mean speeds are below the threshold, then the council will consider reducing the speed limit. For a reduction from 30mph to 20mph, the threshold mean speed is set at 24mph.

There is no recent speed survey data available for High Street, Dormansland. In March 2016, Tandridge Local Committee allocated £2,500 of their revenue budget to fund speed limit surveys. Officers will arrange for a speed survey to be carried out in High Street, Dormansland to determine existing speeds, in accordance with the speed limit policy. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors such as adverse weather conditions or school holidays. The results of the speed survey will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, who is also the divisional Member.

A Road Safety Outside Schools policy was approved in July 2014. The policy sets out the process to be followed for investigating and responding to concerns about road safety outside schools. With the agreement of the Local Committee, an assessment is carried out that looks at the school's Travel Plan and road safety education programmed, and carries out a risk assessment following a site visit attended by the local highway engineer, road safety engineers and the Police. The findings of the speed limit review can be used to inform this process. A report will then be presented to the school and the divisional Member.

Any measures arising from the speed limit review and the Road Safety Outside Schools assessment, and supported by the divisional Member will be added to the list of Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS). Measures will be prioritised against other possible schemes on the list and used to develop future work programmes in Tandridge, subject to the allocation of funding by the Local Committee. It should be noted that the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities in High Street, Dormansland is already on the ITS list.

---

**Contact Officer:** Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE: 24 June 2016**



**SUBJECT: PETITION - Lower the speed limit on Pendell Road, Bletchingley from the national speed limit to 40 and to install a 20 mile an hour speed limit outside The Hawthorns School**

**DIVISION: GODSTONE**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To consider a petition containing 447 online signatures and 2 offline signatures – by Diane Brown.

We, the undersigned, petition Surrey County Council to lower the speed limit on Pendell Road, Bletchingley from the national speed limit to 40 and to install a 20 mile an hour speed limit outside The Hawthorns School.

Pendell Road in Bletchingley, from the junction with Sandy Lane to Merstham Road is currently an unrestricted speed limit. This road has a number of blind corners; the road narrows in a number of places; there are 90 degree bends; there are junctions and driveways where visibility is poor. All these factors have led to an unacceptable number of accidents.

The Hawthorns School has some 550 pupils aged between 2 and 13 and virtually all children travel to School by car as they and their parents do not feel safe on the limited pavements or crossing the road with cars traveling at speeds up to 60 miles an hour. Both residents and users of the road believe it is only a matter of time before a fatality occurs.

**RESPONSE:**

Pendell Road in Bletchingley is a rural road which forms one of a series of roads that link the A25 in Bletchingley with the A23 in Merstham. The speed limit on Pendell Road is unrestricted between a point just north of the junction with Sandy Lane and Bletchingley Road. The speed limit of Bletchingley Road is also unrestricted between Pendell Road and the point where the road leaves the Tandridge area at the district boundary west of the M23 overbridge. The Hawthorns school is located on land east of Pendell Road. The entrance to the school site is from Pendell Road and the exit is on the right angle bend where Pendell Road joins Bletchingley Road

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions on Pendell Road and Bletchingley Road between April 2013 and March 2016 (the latest date for which data is available) has been carried out and the results are given below.

Year	Slight	Serious	Fatal	Total
2013 (from April)	1	0	0	1
2014	3	0	0	3
2015	2	0	0	2
2016 (to end March)	0	0	0	0
Total	6	0	0	6

Of the 6 reported collisions, 5 were the result of loss of control, 3 of which involved only a single vehicle. As part of the reporting process, the Police log their views as to contributory factors leading to a collision. In Pendell Road and Bletchingley Road, 'Travelling too fast for conditions' was recorded as a contributory factor in 1 collision.

Surrey County Council does not hold any speed data for Pendell Road or Bletchingley Road. In March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee allocated £2,500 of their revenue budget to fund speed surveys, which are carried out using automatic traffic count equipment over a continuous 7 day period to comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy. Given the lengths of roads involved, more than one location will need to be surveyed in Bletchingley Road and Pendell Road. Bletchingley Road and Pendell Road will be added to the list of roads to be assessed in Tandridge and once locations for the survey sites have been identified and agreed, the surveys will be ordered. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors eg adverse weather conditions or during school holiday periods.

The results of the speed surveys will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member. If measured mean speeds comply with Surrey's Policy "Setting Local Speed Limits" for a speed limit reduction of, either 40mph over the entire length of Pendell Road and Bletchingley Road or a speed limit reduction of 40mph over the majority of the length with a reduction to 20mph outside The Hawthorns School, then Bletchingley Road and Pendell Road can be added to the list of schemes for consideration for future Local Committee funding.

**Contact Officer:** Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE: 24 June 2016**

**SUBJECT: PETITION – To reduce speeding on Hurst Green Road, Oxted**

**DIVISION: OXTED**

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To consider a petition containing 44 signatures – by Mrs Cidalia Santos and Mr Michael Walsh. The petition submitted contains additional information and maps of the affected area.

Hurst Green Road runs northwest from a mini-roundabout into Woodhurst Lane (it is the same road – there is no junction) and up north to the A25 and Oxted. The stretch from the mini roundabout to Oast Road is about 600 metres and both ends of this stretch are 'downhill'.

The road is relatively 'open' and this, combined with the hills, prompts many drivers to speed dangerously. There are no speed signs. There are street lights, so the speed limit must be 30mph. It is no exaggeration to say some offenders top 50mph. A further aspect is that parked cars (see photos) along the middle stretch mean drivers have to pull in to let opposing cars pass...but many drivers accelerate sharply to make it 'their road' and so avoid having to pull in.

Possible solutions could include:

- Installing 30mph speed limit signposts
- Setting up speed cameras (operational or decoy)
- Introducing traffic calming islands

We the undersigned urge Surrey County Council Highways Department to take action to avert further serious accidents.

**RESPONSE:**

Hurst Green Road is a single carriageway 2 lane road linking Holland Road and Woodhurst Lane. The section of road on which the petitioners are concerned about traffic speeds lies between Greenhurst Lane and Woodhurst Lane. This section of road has common lane on each side over part of its length, with residential properties set back behind the common land.

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions on Hurst Green Road over the 3 year period April 2013 to March 2016 (the latest date for which data is available) has been carried out and the results are given below.

Year	Slight	Serious	Fatal	Total
2013 (from April)	1	0	0	1
2014	1	0	0	1
2015	3	0	0	3
2016 (to end March)	1	0	0	1
Total	6	0	0	6

Of the 6 reported collisions, 3 involved turning movements at road junctions. As part of the reporting process, the Police log their views as to contributory factors leading to a collision. In none of the collisions detailed above did the Police record 'exceeding the speed limit' or 'travelling too fast for conditions' as contributory factors.

The speed limit on Hurst Green Road is 30mph and the Police are responsible for enforcing this limit. Hurst Green Road is classed as a restricted road under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The system of street lighting in the road indicates to drivers that the speed limit is 30mph. As Highway Authority Surrey County Council has to comply with national regulations covering the signing of speed limits. Under the regulations the 30mph speed limit can only be signed at its terminal points and it is not permitted to use 30mph repeater signs.

The petitioners have suggested that operational or decoy speed cameras are provided. The councils policy for permanent fixed speed cameras is that they are reserved for the very worst collision hotspots where there has been a history of collisions involving excessive speed. The reason for this is that new fixed cameras cost in the region of £50,000 to install, and then require ongoing maintenance by the council and ongoing processing of offences by the police. The recorded collisions do not support the installation of a permanent fixed speed camera in Hurst Green Road. Surrey County Council does not use decoy speed cameras, as experience in other areas has shown them to be ineffective.

The petitioners have suggested that traffic calming islands are introduced in Hurst Green Road to reduce traffic speeds. The County Council likes to follow an evidence led approach to such requests, and therefore it is proposed to carry out a speed survey to measure traffic speeds. The results of this survey will be reported to the Tandridge Local Committee Chairman, who is also the divisional member. Based on the results of the survey together with the collision record on Hurst Green Road, a decision will be made as to whether any scheme to introduce measures to reduce traffic speeds on Hurst Green Road be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes list for possible future funding.

If following the survey the measured mean traffic speeds are found to be above the 30mph speed limit consideration could also be given to the provision of a Vehicle Activated Sign, triggered when vehicles exceed the speed limit. The provision of such a sign would be subject to available funding.

**Contact Officer:** Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Public Question  
**DIVISION:** All Tandridge

**Dominik Lemanski asks :**

Out of the £100million road resurfacing fund quoted to me by Surrey County Council how much money has been spent in Tandridge with particular examples of work undertaken?

I am concerned with the state of roads across the borough but in particular the following: Hornchurch Hill, Whyteleafe (potholes), Whyteleafe Hill/Salmons Road West mini roundabout (potholes and resurfacing), West Hall Road, Warlingham (potholes on bend at top), Limpsfield Road, (resurfacing on sections close to Botley Hill Farmhouse) and the road approaching Tandridge leisure centre from Oxted High Street (resurfacing).

**Response:**

The total spend on schemes completed in the first 3 years of project Horizon in Tandridge is £15.75 million.

The Highways Update report, item 14 on this agenda, sets out the year 4 programme of works for Tandridge. It also invites Members to highlight priorities not on the original Operation Horizon list. The roads listed above could be considered for putting forward to the Asset team by the divisional Member for investigation, prioritisation and possible inclusion in the future programme.

All roads that are maintained by Surrey are the subject of regular inspection. Safety defects identified as part of the inspection process are repaired in accordance with Surrey's approved safety matrix, which sets out the depth of the defects and the timescales for repair. Defects reported by members of the public are inspected and repaired using the same matrix. Details of Surrey's Highway Inspection Policy are available to view on Surrey County Council's website.

---

**Contact Officer:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Public Question

**DIVISION:** Caterham on the Hill

**Mr Tim Mouldsley asks:**

This is a follow up to a previous question (which includes more background information) submitted on 18-4-16.

This question, and the previous one, relate to a proposal for extending double lines near the junction of Whyteleafe Road with High Street/ Waller Lane, as advertised in the Tandridge 2015 Parking Review (Location 16, Drawing 11, see page 14 in the Objections report).

The initial decision was to cancel the proposal, but following some action by John Orrick, I understand that a revised proposal has now been agreed, essentially to implement single yellow lines with no parking allowed 10-12 Monday to Friday. Currently some signs to this effect have been installed, but the yellow lines have not yet been painted.

I would therefore like to ask Surrey County Council when the corresponding single yellow lines will be implemented, and to confirm that they will be present on both sides of the road.

Furthermore, for consideration in the next parking review, I would like support the principle of extending a similar parking restriction further down Whyteleafe Road from the junction with High Street/Waller Lane, to ensure that long term parking is generally discouraged in this area. I understand that such a proposal may already be under consideration by Surrey County Council.

**Question in April**

I would like to ask Surrey County Council to implement the proposal for extending double lines near the junction of Whyteleafe Road with High Street/ Waller Lane, as advertised in the Tandridge 2015 Parking Review (Location 16, Drawing 11, see page 14 in the Objections report). The current decision is to cancel the proposal, but this is not in line with the comments received or the urgent need to improve the situation at this junction with respect to visibility, congestion and safety. The comments received during the consultation phase have been classified as 1 supporting, 1 objection and 2 "other comments". This seems inaccurate, and a more reasonable interpretation would be 3 supporting and only 1 objection.

The overall conclusion in the Objections and Decisions Report appears to recognise that something should be done, and reasonably concludes that there is even some support for increasing the length of the restricted area (from 2 of the 4 parties responding). However, it seems unjustified to conclude that there is broad support for limiting the time duration of restrictions since this suggestion only comes from the single objecting party. Therefore it is rather surprising and annoying to find that the proposal is cancelled. I can also confirm my understanding that those originally supporting the advertised proposal also share this opinion.

Note that all the properties adjacent to the proposed changes have hard off-road parking/garage space for at least 3 vehicles. This should be sufficient for any reasonable purposes, without needing to park on the street near the junction.

Replacing the advertised proposals with the proposed action to “Extend the double yellow lines on site to the edge of the driveway to number 1 Whyteleafe, to comply with the current traffic orders”, which might appear reasonable at first sight, is unfortunately not likely to have any useful effect. There is no long-term parking in those areas anyway (being so close to the junction). If, as is proposed according to the current decision, alternative schemes are considered at the next review this would have the effect of significantly delaying any improvement to the current situation: i.e. where inconsiderate parking leads to significant congestion particularly at peak times by effectively reducing the road width to one lane, vehicles manoeuvring on the verge area, poor visibility, safety issues and access problems for some properties.

A more appropriate response to the consultation in the 2015 Parking Review, and fully in line with the comments received, would be to implement the proposals as advertised, observe the effect, and consider possible extension or modification for the next review. I therefore request that the “cancellation” is reversed and the advertised proposal is implemented as soon as possible. Presumably this could be done without any further consultation being required

**Response:**

Thank you for your question about the parking situation in Whyteleafe Road. A new 10-12 noon, Monday to Friday restriction is being implemented with the signs having been put up and the single yellow to be marked in the next 2 weeks.

In response to your request for further restrictions in this area we will include a proposal to have a similar restriction (ie 10-12 noon, Monday to Friday) on both sides of Whyteleafe Road between the end of the existing proposals (outside St Mary's Rectory) and the junction with Essendene Road included in the 2016/17 parking review consultation.

---

**Contact Officer:** David Curl, Parking Team

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Public Question



**DIVISION:** Lingfield

**Liz Lockwood asks on behalf of Lingfield Parish Council:**

Would Surrey County Council consider the following suggestions to improve the road safety in Lingfield Village:

1. A reduction of the speed limit through the centre of the village - to 20 mph. This should be from Godstone Road pinch points through the High Street, as far as Church Road and as far as Paddock Close on Newchapel Road.
2. The installation of a pedestrian refuge in Godstone Road to allow people to cross from the public convenience to the new Post Office.
3. To move the road markings on the village side of the pinch points to a safer distance and to give a proper 'sweep' for vehicles exiting the driveway of the Thatched Cottage.

**Response:**

1. Speed Limit Reduction

Surrey County Council has an approved Speed Limit Policy which sets out the criteria under which a reduction in speed limit by signs alone would be considered. The policy requires that the length of road over which a speed limit change would be considered should be at least 600m in length. This is to ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist along a length of road. The suggestion being put forward by Lingfield Parish Council would meet this criterion.

The policy also requires existing speeds to be measured using over a 7 day continuous period using automatic survey equipment. The measured existing mean speeds are then compared to a threshold set out in the policy and if the recorded mean speeds are below the threshold, then the council will consider reducing the speed limit. For a reduction from 30mph to 20mph, the threshold mean speed is set at 24mph.

There is no recent speed survey data available for Lingfield village. In March 2016, Tandridge Local Committee allocated £2,500 of their revenue budget to fund speed limit surveys. Officers will arrange for a speed survey to be carried out at appropriate locations within the village to determine existing speeds, in accordance with the speed limit policy. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors such as adverse weather conditions or school holidays. The results of the speed survey will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, who is also the divisional Member.

## 2. Pedestrian Refuge

A pedestrian refuge could not be installed within the section of Godstone Road by the new Post Office and public conveniences due to the location of a bus stop lay-by at this point. An alternative location would be just to the north of the lay-by between Jenny Lane and Headland Way, noting that the turning movements into and out of these roads by delivery, emergency and refuge vehicles would need to be maintained. However, the carriageway at this point is only approximately 6.5 metres in width. To provide the 2 metre wide pedestrian island which is needed to safely accommodate a mobility scooter, and traffic lanes of 3.25 metres in each direction, a minimum road width of 8.5 metres would be required. There is insufficient width within the existing highway boundary to widen the carriageway to provide the additional width necessary. Therefore it is not feasible to install a pedestrian refuge in close proximity to the new Post Office.

## 3. Road Markings at Pinch Point

The location of the pinch points and associated road markings were the subject of detailed design and road safety audit. The give-way markings are sited where all vehicles proceeding through the pinch points are subject to the restriction. To move the give-way marking at the pinch point nearest to the village south ie. further towards the village, would result in vehicles turning right out of the driveway to the Thatched Cottage not being required to give-way at the pinch point. There is therefore a risk of head on collisions with on-coming traffic that has priority through the pinch point. The driveway to the Thatched cottage has to be subject to the give-way marking and unfortunately, as a result, there is no scope to move the road markings at this pinch point.

**Contact Officer:** Anita Guy, Principal Highway Maintenance Engineer, 03456 009 009

---

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE: 24 June 2016**

**SUBJECT: Public Question: Reducing the speed limit on Rockshaw Road, RH1 3DE**

**DIVISION: Godstone**



Dianne Vassalo, supported by Rockshaw Road Residents' Association, asks:

The section of Rockshaw Road between its junction with Warwick Wold Road and the motorway bridge currently carries a maximum speed limit of 50mph which drops to 30mph in the section of Rockshaw Road within Reigate & Banstead (after the bridge). The 50mph limit is frequently exceeded in both directions as motorists accelerate immediately when entering this section from either end, with vehicles being driven well in excess of the 50mph along the Tandridge section and continue without slowing down into the Reigate & Banstead end of Rockshaw Road. Chaldon Rise Care Home receives a large number of daily visitors and they along with residents of neighbouring properties have often been overtaken by speeding cars whilst attempting to turn right into our driveways. There have been several accidents in winter months when cars travelling at speed are unable to stop and end up crashing into the adjoining field or in the wall outside Rockshaw Lodge at the end of the road. Most recently a speeding vehicle careered into the railings over the Motorway Bridge which could have resulted in catastrophe had the vehicle dropped onto the motorway below. Also stray horses from Travellers Rest had to be rounded up by my son before a serious accident occurred as cars were not prepared to slow down to avoid them. On this occasion Police attended the scene. Used as a cut through, Rockshaw Road is extremely busy during the morning and afternoon commute and traffic is always fast. The residents believe our safety is paramount and consider it dangerous and confusing to have differing speed limits and that therefore the limit within the Tandridge section should be reduced to be in line with the rest of the road and be subject to a maximum speed limit of 30mph.

**Response:**

Rockshaw Road in Tandridge is a rural single carriageway 2 lane road between Warwick Wold Road and the Tandridge District boundary at the M23 over bridge. Rockshaw Road continues as a residential road to join the A23 in Reigate & Banstead at Merstham. The speed limit on the section of Rockshaw Road in Tandridge is 50mph and on the section of Rockshaw Road in Reigate & Banstead the speed limit is 30mph.

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions over the 3 year period April 2013 to March 2016 (the latest date for which data is available) has been carried out. There were 2 reported collisions involving slight personal injury in 2013, both of which occurred at the junction with Rockshaw Road and Warwick Wold Road. As part of the reporting process, the Police log their views as to the contributory factors leading to a collision. In neither of these collisions did the Police record 'exceeding the speed limit' or 'travelling too fast for conditions' as contributory factors.

Surrey County Council does not hold any speed data for Rockshaw Road. In March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee allocated £2,500 of their revenue budget to fund speed surveys, which are carried out using automatic traffic count equipment over a continuous 7 day period to comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy. Rockshaw Road will be added to the list of roads to be assessed in Tandridge and once the location for the survey site has been identified and agreed, the surveys will be ordered. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors eg adverse weather conditions.

The results of the speed surveys will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member. If measured mean speeds comply with Surrey's Policy "Setting Local Speed Limits" for a speed limit reduction to 30mph on Rockshaw, then Rockshaw Road can be added to the list of schemes for consideration for future Local Committee funding.

---

**Contact Officer:** Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE:** 24 June 2016

**SUBJECT:** Public Question: Reducing the speed limit on the A25 – Kent Boundary to Limpsfield.

**DIVISION:** Oxted



Mr Salter asks:

Following my petition on the 20th March 2015, held at Limpsfield where our petition of 39 signatures was put forward in order to lower the current speed limit of 60mph.

Referring to the response at that meeting it was agreed to reduce the speed limit from unrestricted to 50mph "The survey results show average speeds of 50.0mph in the westbound direction and 49.2mph in the westbound direction. These results comply with the requirements of Surrey's speed limit policy to support a reduction in the speed limit from derestricted to 50mph"

I would like to ask Surrey County Council why these findings have not been implemented and why after 39 signatures of local residents and local businesses relating to dangerous and unfitting speed limits along this stretch have not been prioritised?

**Response:**

Following the response to the petition it was agreed that the proposal to reduce the speed limit on the A25, from a point approximately 100m east of Ballards Lane to the Surrey/Kent boundary, should be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme list for consideration for future funding. This proposal has been added to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list however no funding is currently allocated to progress this proposal.

The Tandridge Forward Programme of schemes for design and construction is made up from schemes on the ITS list and this programme is presented to the Tandridge Local Committee each year for decision. The County Councillors who attend the Tandridge Local Committee are responsible for deciding which schemes to prioritise and where to allocate resources. County Councillors will take into account representations from the public, the advice from the engineers and the availability of funding.

Surrey County Council receive a large number of requests for speed limits to be reduced, the number of requests received outweighs the funding available, therefore funding for such measures is prioritised where their introduction would either achieve the greatest benefit in terms of helping to reduce the number of personal injury collisions or be of benefit to the largest number of people, e.g. the installation of a pedestrian crossing on a busy road next to shops or a school. Surrey County Council hold personal injury collision data for traffic collisions that have occurred over the most recent 3 year period, this information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there have been 6 collisions over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/04/13 to 31/03/16), 5 of these collisions resulted

in slight injury, 1 resulting in serious injury. However, vehicle speeds were not considered by the Police to be a contributory factor in any of these collisions.

The survey results also showed that average speeds are at or below 50mph despite the existing derestricted speed limit in place.

Therefore there is no funding allocated at the present time to progress the reduction in the existing speed limit from derestricted to 50mph on this section of the A25. However, the scheme will remain on the ITS list for consideration for future funding, to be prioritised alongside other schemes on that list.

Should funding be allocated in future to reduce the speed limit on the section of the A25 Westerham Road between Ballards Lane and the Surrey/Kent boundary, this would result in the speed limit of a short section of the A25 in Kent remaining derestricted between the boundary and the existing 30mph terminal signs east of Farley Lane, Westerham. Therefore as part of the scheme Officers would contact Kent County Council with a view to also reducing the speed limit on the derestricted section of the A25 in Kent.

---

**Contact Officer:** Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer, 03456 009 009

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 24 June 2016

SUBJECT: Public Question: Speed limits in South Godstone and Blindley Heath

DIVISION: GODSTONE



SURREY

**District Councillor Nick Childs asks:**

A number of residents have requested a reduction in the speed limit through South Godstone (30 to 20) & Blindley Heath (40 to 30). Please could you advise what action you could take to move this issue forward?

**Response:**

The A22 forms part of the primary road network and runs through Tandridge from Caterham in the north to Felbridge in the south. It is a single carriageway two lane road where it runs through South Godstone and Blindley Heath.

The speed limit in South Godstone is 30mph between a point just to the north of the telephone exchange on the northern edge of the residential area to a point immediately south of the railway over bridge. The speed limit in Blindley Heath is 40mph between a point just to the north of the junction with Tilburstow Hill Road and a point just to the south of the bridge over Ray Brook just south of Ray Lane. The Police are responsible for enforcing these speed limits.

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions on the A22 Eastbourne Road in South Godstone and Blindley Heath over the 3 year period April 2013 to March 2016 (the latest date for which data is available) has been carried out and the results are given below.

<b>South Godstone</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Slight</b>	<b>Serious</b>	<b>Fatal</b>	<b>Total</b>
2013 (from April)	0	0	0	0
2014	2	0	0	2
2015	1	0	0	1
2016 (to end March)	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Blindley Heath</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Slight</b>	<b>Serious</b>	<b>Fatal</b>	<b>Total</b>
2013 (from April)	2	0	0	2
2014	6	2	0	8
2015	5	0	0	5
2016 (to end March)	1	1	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>

As part of the reporting process, the Police log their views as to the contributory factors leading to a collision. In three of the collisions in Blindley Heath the Police recorded 'exceeding the speed limit' as a contributory factor leading to the collisions.

Surrey County Council does not hold any current speed data for these two sections of the A22. In March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee allocated £2,500 of their revenue budget to fund speed surveys, which are carried out using automatic traffic count equipment over a continuous 7 day period to comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy. The A22 Eastbourne Road in South Godstone and Blindley Heath will be added to the list of roads to be assessed. Given the lengths of road involved, more than one location will need to be surveyed and once the locations for the survey sites have been identified and agreed, the surveys will be ordered, subject to funding remaining from the £2,500 allocation. It should be noted that speed surveys should not be carried out if the results would be affected by other factors e.g. adverse weather conditions or during school holiday periods.

The results of the speed survey will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member. If measured mean speeds comply with Surrey's Speed Limit Policy for a signed only speed limit reduction to 20mph on the A22 Eastbourne Rod in South Godstone or for a signed only speed limit reduction to 30mph on the A22 Eastbourne Road in Blindley Heath, then these roads can be added to the list of schemes for consideration for future Local Committee funding. It should be noted that the A22 is a strategic economic route and Officers must be mindful of the County Council's aim to promote a vibrant economy for the benefit of all residents. Part of this aim involves ensuring that journey times are minimised where ever possible.

---

**Contact Officer:** Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**

**DATE:** 24 JUNE 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Member Question  
**DIVISION:** OXTED



Nick Skellett, County Councillor for Oxted division asks in relation to Titsey Road:

a) Although thankfully we now have a 40 mph limit along this road the many undulations and in places adverse camber continue to present a danger to safe driving. Instances have been reported of drivers swerving dangerously out of lane to avoid these defects and vehicles appearing to be thrown off balance when they hit a dip at speed.

I have already requested that this stretch of road between the bottom of Titsey Hill and the M25 bridge be checked technically to remove these defects. When will this be done and in the meantime can we consider double white lines along the centre of the road so that vehicles are more aware if they start to drift from their own lane.

b) When will rumble strips be installed on Titsey Road in the approach to the 30 mph limit at the beginning of Limpsfield village?

**Response:**

a) Following the fatality in Titsey Road in April 2014, one full width and one half width (southbound) patches were carried out in Titsey Road south of the electricity sub-station to remove the worst areas of subsidence.

The County's laboratory carried out coring to determine the construction of the road. No voids were identified as part of this work. The Asset team commissioned consultants to carry out an Embankment/Slope/Road Inspection of Titsey Road. The road was inspected in October/November 2014 and a report was submitted to the Asset team in November 2014. A copy of the report has been provided to the divisional Member.

The undulations do not register as a safety defect and cannot be progressed as a safety repair. Uneven road signs were erected some time ago and more recently 600 yards plates were added below each sign to better clarify the extent of the road condition to road users.

The road conditions on Titsey Road vary by time of year and are similar to those experienced on the A22 Godstone By-Pass. Based on the experience of the A22, it is likely that a remedial scheme comprising carriageway reconstruction would be required on Titsey Road. This work would exceed the budget available to the Local Highway office through the Tandridge Local Committee. As ground water and drainage along with highway embankment stability could well be factors that would need to be included as part of the scheme and this would significantly increase the cost.

Officers will raise the divisional Member's continued concerns about Titsey Road to the Asset team and will provide an update once a response has been received.

Double white line systems are used to prohibit overtaking where visibility is restricted, their introduction being subject to criteria set out by the Department for Transport. They do not require a traffic order but cannot be implemented without consultation with the Police as they are responsible for enforcement. Officers were of the view that a double white line system on Titsey Road would not meet the visibility criteria. The views of the Police were sought, who agreed with this view and advised that they would object to any proposal to introduce a double white line system at this location. Therefore there is no proposal to introduce double white lines on Titsey Road.

b) Work will commence in July on the feasibility and design measures to assist in reducing vehicle speeds on the approach to the 30mph section of Titsey Road. This will include consideration of rumble strips. The divisional Member will be kept updated of progress.

---

**Contact Officer:** Anita Guy, Principal Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 JUNE 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Member Question  
**DIVISION:** OXTED

Nick Skellett, County Councillor for Oxted division, asks in relation to A25 Westerham Road:

In order to reinforce the new 30 mph limit near Limpsfield School and change driver behaviour can we consider a gateway entrance to Limpsfield on the A25 where the 30 mph limit begins for traffic coming from Westerham? How much would that cost?

**Response:**

The Tandridge Integrated Transport Scheme Programme for 2016/17 was agreed by Tandridge Local Committee at the March 2016 meeting. Measures to support the new 30mph speed limit on the A25 Westerham Road outside Limpsfield Infants School, comprising the installation of gateways and Vehicle Activated Signs, are included in this programme. The provision of gateway signs at the location of the 30mph terminal signs east of the junction with Ballards Lane will cost in the region of £2,000.

---

**Contact Officer:** Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Member Question  
**DIVISION:** Godstone

**Nick Skellett, county councillor for Oxted asks:**

Have the traffic lights on the M25 slip road at Junction 6 been rectified yet?

**Response:**

The traffic lights on the M25 slip road at junction 6 are owned and operated by Highways England.

County Council officers have been in contact with Highways England for an update on progress to rectify the fault with the traffic signals at junction 6 of the M25. Highways England has notified County Council officers that there were problems with the existing detectors and the works to repair them was carried out on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

Highways England are unaware of any further issues regarding the operation of the traffic signals at junction 6 and Highways England officers travel through the junction twice a day. Highways England's Control Room has the capability of adjusting the signals to clear the slips if there is congestion back onto the carriageway, but this would normally be caused by congestion on the roundabout itself.

Highways England will look again at the operation of the signals but suspect that any problems experienced are due to weight of traffic.

---

Contact Officer: Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team, 03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Member Question – Nick Skellet  
**DIVISION:** Oxted

**Nick Skellett, County Councillor for Oxted asks:**

Would Highways check the traffic lights at the Morrison's junction in Oxted where undue tailbacks for westward traffic occur in the mornings and undue tailbacks for eastward traffic occur in the evenings. The programme for changing the lights does not seem to take into account the high number of queuing vehicles on the A25 in a given direction.

**Response:**

The Traffic Operations team are aware of a problem with the traffic signal junctions programming that is preventing the signals operating at optimum capacity.

Officers are working on an amendment to the configuration of the signals to improve the operation of the junction.

This will be completed and installed within the next four weeks.

---

**Contact Officer:** Anne-Marie Hannam, Senior Traffic Engineer, South East Area Team,  
03456 009 009

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)**



**DATE:** 24 June 2016  
**SUBJECT:** Member Question – John Orrick  
**DIVISION:** Caterham Hill

**County Councillor John Orrick asks:**

On June 7th residents and businesses in Caterham Hill, Caterham Valley, Whyteleafe and Chaldon were severely affected by flash floods during a torrential thunderstorm. What actions has SCC taken to assist those affected and what plans are being laid to ensure that this devastation is not repeated?

**Response:**

**Highway Maintenance and Repairs**

Following the flooding, Surrey Highways has worked to identify gullies that required clearing. Currently, 39 roads in the areas affected are having their drains and gullies cleared of silt and debris. Work will continue going forward to ensure that these remain clear.

Tandridge District Council (TDC) have arranged for a sweeper to clean the road surface of any remaining debris.

There is an ongoing assessment of the sink holes in the area. Seymour Avenue is being dealt with by the local highways area team. The damage to the road was caused by the soakaway surcharging which damaged the road surface. The local team have been onsite to assess the sink hole and have raised a works order to make the site safe. A permanent repair to the site is being planned.

The hole at the Banstead Road / Eldon Road junction has been inspected and a temporary tarmac fill has been put in place. Further investigation is being carried out regarding ownership of the TV cabling.

The Yorke Gate sink hole is being investigated by the local highways area team.

**Recovery:**

We arranged for the National Flood Forum to visit the area in order to give advice to residents on cleaning up their homes, claiming on insurance and other issues. We are looking to run further drop in sessions for residents over the coming weeks and are looking for a location for this to take place.

The social care issues raised by residents at the drop in session have been addressed by the local teams. Where needed, the care plans have been changed to meet the change in circumstances.

We have been working with Tandridge District Council to provide skips and to support a cleanup of the homes affected. Following this we would expect the insurers to then carry out any necessary restoration work.

Tandridge is reviewing what can be done regarding Council Tax for residents who have had flooding in their homes and are currently not able to live in their properties. This is thought to be around 14-20 houses.

**Investigation:**

Surrey County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, will be carrying out an investigation in to the flooding in line with Section 19 of the Floods and Water Management Act 2010. This investigation will:

- investigate the extent of the incident
- define the Risk Management Authorities involved
- identify the action that they have taken and are planning to take in response to the flood incident.

Potential longer term actions to reduce the risk of flooding in the area can then be explored in line with the conclusions of the investigation.

The Local Resilience Forum will also undertake a debrief of the partnership response for the flooding in Caterham.

---

**Contact Officer;** Doug Hill, Strategic Network Resilience Manager 03456 009 009

**ITEM 12, ANNEX 3– REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS****The Local Committee (Tandridge) is asked to:**

- i). Agree the proposed changes to parking and waiting restrictions as shown in Annexes 1 and 2 are agreed.
- ii). Agree, if necessary, adjustments can be made to the proposals agreed at the meeting by the Parking Team Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and local Member prior to statutory consultation.
- iii). Agree, the intention of the County Council to make Traffic Regulation Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Tandridge as shown in the Annexes (and as subsequently modified by ii) is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the Order is made.
- iv). Agree, if there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in consultation with the chairman/vice chairman of this committee and the appropriate county councillor.
- v). Agree, if necessary the Parking Team Manager will report the objections back to the local committee for resolution.
- vi). **Note the allocation £10,000 in the Revenue Maintenance Allocation 2016/17 as agreed at the 23 March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee meeting to implement the parking amendments.**
- vii). **Approve the new process for implementation of new school keep clear markings (SKCs), and to agree to revoke the traffic regulation orders for existing SKCs across Tandridge, in light of changes in government legislation.**

**Reasons for Recommendations:**

The Local Committee agreed the Revenue Maintenance Allocation 2016/17 at the 23 March 2016 Tandridge Local Committee meeting. This included a provision of £10,000 for parking amendments for the 2016/17 Parking review. The Committee is asked to note this recommendation.

**School Keep Clear Markings:** Following government changes to the regulations, it is no longer necessary for us to make a traffic regulation order (TRO) when we want to introduce a school keep clear (SKC) marking. It is also no longer necessary for us to have a TRO for existing SKC markings. As is already the case with bus stop clearways, all we need to do is put in place the appropriate road marking and signs, and the restriction will be enforceable.

As it is possible for people to receive a penalty charge notice (PCN) if they park on an SKC marking, we think it is important that the decision to install them still has member input. However, in order to simplify and speed up the process to introduce new markings, we would like to propose that this can be done by the parking team with the agreement of the chairman/vice chairman of the local committee and the relevant county councillor, rather than the whole committee, so we do not have to wait until the next committee meeting for a decision.

We would also carry out a consultation exercise with residents and businesses in the local area, in order to ensure that no new markings suddenly appear without prior notification.

As a consequence of the change to the regulations, we are also proposing to revoke the TROs for existing SKC markings because they are no longer needed. This will be done at the same time as the statutory consultation for this review.