

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

Decision:

Petitions

(i) Details of decision

That the response, attached as Appendix 1, is approved.

(ii) Reasons for decision

To respond to the petition.

(iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

None.

(iv) Details of any consultation and representations received not included in the published report

Mr. Martin Davies was present at the meeting.

Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted

(Any conflict of interest declared by any other Cabinet Member consulted in relation to the decision to be recorded and any dispensations granted by the Audit and Governance Committee)

None.

Decision taken by:

(i) Name: John Furey

(ii) Portfolio: Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

Date of Decision: 09 November 2016

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 9 November 2016

Date decision effective (this decision cannot be called in) : 9 November 2016

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

Decision:

PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF LAND AT FLINT HALL COTTAGE, FLOWER LANE,
GODSTONE

(i) Details of decision

It was agreed that an application be made to the Magistrates' Court for an order stopping up the land identified on the plan at Annex 1 as highway, in accordance with the provisions of Section 116 and 117 of the Highways Act 1980 and subject to the conditions of the County Council's approved policy on stopping up applications and the owner of Flint Hall Cottage purchasing the land within the cartilage of their property that is owned by UK Power Networks within one year.

(ii) Reasons for decision

The land in question is deemed surplus to highway requirements as the former access way has been functioning as a private driveway for some time. On completion of a successful application the County Council would be relinquished from any future maintenance liability for the land in question.

(iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

None.

(iv) Details of any consultation and representations received not included in the published report

The recommendation was revised following advice from Officers and the revised recommendation was agreed by the Cabinet Member

Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted

(Any conflict of interest declared by any other Cabinet Member consulted in relation to the decision to be recorded and any dispensations granted by the Audit and Governance Committee)

None.

Decision taken by:

- (i) Name:** John Furey
- (ii) Portfolio:** Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

Date of Decision: 09 November 2016

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 09 November 2016

Date decision effective (i.e. 5 working days after date of publication of record of decision unless subject to call-in by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board): 17 November 2016

CABINET MEMBER DECISION

Decision:

FLOOD PREVENTION PRODUCTS

(i) Details of decision

the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding agreed that:

1. Surrey County Council should write to inform affected homeowners who used their Repair and Renew Grant to fit self-closing airbricks to their property, where their property is within 250 metres of a current or historic landfill site them and ask that they consider replacing these products with an alternative flood protection product.
2. Surrey County Council offer a financial contribution to homeowners to assist with replacing the self-closing airbricks fitted with grant funding from the Repair and Renew Grant, where their property is within 250 metres of a current or historic landfill site. It is proposed that £65 per airbrick is provided to enable, at the residents' discretion, either direct replacement with a standard airbrick or an alternative flood prevention product.
3. Surrey County Council identifies a budget of £30,000 in order to cover the costs of any financial contribution to homeowners and that authority is delegated to the Community Partnerships Team Manager to authorise and manage expenditure against this budget.

(ii) Reasons for decision

Following advice from the Environment Agency received in June 2016 that products installed through the Repair and Renew Grant Scheme, administered by Surrey County Council on behalf of Defra, may not be suitable for properties within 250 metres of current or historic landfill, it is considered that a responsible public authority should provide a financial contribution to either return the property to its original condition or an alternative flood protection product.

(iii) Details of any alternative options considered and rejected

None.

(iv) Details of any consultation and representations received not included in the published report

The Cabinet Member stated that there was a small risk to residents who had installed airbricks following the flooding of 2013/14 and who live within 250 metres of a historical landfill site. The Council takes its responsibility to protect residents seriously, this is why the Cabinet Member approved the recommendations despite the current financial challenges facing the Council.

Conflicts of Interest and any Dispensations Granted

(Any conflict of interest declared by any other Cabinet Member consulted in relation to the decision to be recorded and any dispensations granted by the Audit and Governance Committee)

None.

Decision taken by:

- (i) **Name:** John Furey
- (ii) **Portfolio:** Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

Date of Decision: 09 November 2016

Date of Publication of Record of Decision: 09 November 2016

Date decision effective (i.e. 5 working days after date of publication of record of decision unless subject to call-in by the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board): 17 November 2016

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND FLOODING

Wednesday 9 November

RESPONSE TO PETITION CONCERNING BANNING CYCLING ON THE A24 BETWEEN LEATHERHEAD AND DORKING

The Petition

Please make it illegal for cyclists to use the A24 Dual Carriageway between Givons Grove roundabout, Leatherhead and Ashcombe Road, Dorking. It is very dangerous for all road users, especially the cyclists. There is a very good cycle lane off to both side of this road that many cyclists already use therefore it is clearly fit for purpose. I use this section of road many times each week, including the weekends, and have witnessed many close shaves and dangerous situations and feel it is only a matter of time before there are some serious accidents involving cyclists. One particularly dangerous section is when cyclists don't use the underpass and cross two lanes of 50mph traffic to turn right at the Burford Bridge roundabout to go up Box Hill. It will need 'No Cycling' signposts that will need to be actively enforced and a commitment to ensure the cycle lanes are kept in good repair and fit for purpose.

Submitted by: Martin Davies

Signatures: 338

Response

The A24 between Givons Grove roundabout and Ashcombe Road, is a single lane south bound, with a hatched out area adjacent to that lane, and becomes a two lane dual carriageway just south of the junction with the public footpath over Swanmouth Lane. The road is a two lane dual carriageway northbound between Ashcombe Road and Givons Grove roundabout. The speed limit is 50mph, between Givons Grove roundabout and the roundabout at Pixham Lane where it becomes 40mph. There is an off carriageway shared footway/cycleway on the west side of the A24 between Givons Grove roundabout and Ashcombe Road. There is a shared footway/cycleway on the east side from just south of B2209 Old London Road to Ashcombe Road. There is an advisory cycle lane southbound from Givons Grove Roundabout between the hatched carriageway marking and the eastern kerb line, that extends as far as the shared footway/cycleway. Use of these cycle facilities is not compulsory.

A review of the recorded personal injury collisions, involving cyclists, on this section of the A24, from 1/1/2011 to 30/6/2016 from (and including) Givons Grove RAB to Pixham Lane / Denbies RAB has been carried out and there are 23 recorded. There are a variety of reasons for the accidents, and 11 occurred at roundabouts, mostly Givons Grove roundabout. Changes have recently been made to the road markings at the Givons Grove roundabout to reduce the risk of accidents for cyclists.

The County Council does take concerns about road safety seriously and road collisions across the County are continually monitored. If there should be any significant change or increase in the pattern of collisions then the matter would be referred to the relevant Road Safety Working Group for action to be determined. This group consists of Road Safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways.

Surrey County Council have the powers to prohibit the use of a road by cyclists, but not a duty to do so. The Prohibition of Cyclists Traffic Orders are made under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, and this would require extensive consultation. This type of proposal would also require the support of the Police, as they would be responsible for enforcing any traffic order of this type.

There are many other sections of dual carriageway in Surrey, with a separate cycle facility, where cyclists can use the carriageway. This proposal would set an unjustified precedence, that would also create an additional budget pressure for the cost of consultation, advertising and potentially enacting a traffic order, signs and enforcement.

It is acknowledged that this section of the A24 formed part of the Olympic Cycle Route, in 2012, and the use of the road has brought cycling tourism to the area. Any proposal to ban cycling from the A24 would not support the Surrey County Council's Cycling Strategy, in particular that "We will support cycling as healthy, inclusive and affordable".

The petitioner has suggested that cyclists do not use the underpass at Burford Bridge to gain access to Box Hill. Cyclists have to dismount their bicycles and walk through the subway, as the clearance height, and approaches, are below current standards for a shared use subway due to the era in which the subway was constructed. This is only for a short distance and balances the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

The petitioner has suggested that there be a commitment to ensure the cycle lanes are kept in good repair and fit for purpose. Regular maintenance of the shared facility is carried out in collaboration with Mole Valley District Council. The recent carriageway resurfacing formed part of a larger resilience scheme on the A24 to reduce the risk of future flooding, and was funded through a Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) bid. The funding could only be used for the resilience works, and not any wider cycleway maintenance.

The western shared footway/cycleway is particularly well used. This cycleway forms part of National Cycle Network 22 linking Banstead to Brockenhurst, Hampshire. Unfortunately, a LEP bid for the cycle track maintenance that included comprehensive resurfacing and, in some parts, widening, of the whole length of the cycle track, and improvements for cyclists at the subway, was unsuccessful. There are more requests for maintenance and cycle facility improvements than there are resources available and these have to be prioritised, and balanced, with the requests from other road users.

For the reasons given above, there are no current plans to make a Traffic Regulation Order to prohibit the use of the A24 carriageway by cyclists.

Mr John Furey

Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding

9 November 2016