

## **DRAFT**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Tandridge LOCAL COMMITTEE**  
held at 10.15 am on 21 September 2018  
at Tandridge District Council offices, Station Road East, Oxted, RH8 0BT.

### **Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Mrs Rose Thorn (Chairman)
- \* Mr Cameron McIntosh (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Chris Botten
- \* Mr David Hodge CBE
- \* Mr David Lee
- \* Mrs Lesley Steeds

### **Borough / District Members:**

- \* District Councillor Pat Cannon
- \* District Councillor Nick Childs
- \* District Councillor Michael Cooper
- \* District Councillor Martin Fisher
- \* District Councillor Simon Morrow
- \* District Councillor Sir Nicholas White

\* In attendance

---

#### **26/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

None received.

#### **27/18 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes from the previous meeting on the 22 June 2018 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

#### **28/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

#### **29/18 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

Three petitions had been received. Responses to the petitions were provided in the supplementary papers.

##### **Petition 1 A25 Godstone Road, Bletchingley**

Discussion for this petition was taken with ITEM 8.

The lead petition Mrs Janine Marks presented the petition. She advised that the petition had been signed by residents in both Godstone and Bletchingley

villages who had concerns regarding both the speeds of vehicles and safety on the A25.

Concerns raised included:

- The sight lines when exiting Sunnybank.
- Difficulty for residents crossing the road and asked if a refuge point could be installed.
- The cost of increasing the speed limit on the A25, was not a good use of public money.
- Possibility of the cemetery being extended and a new housing development not being taken into consideration.
- Request for a strategic and holistic view of the whole of the A25 from Godstone to Bletchingley.

Mr Woods, who had submitted a question on the same topic, asked to speak at this point and raised his key points which included:

- That full consideration had not being given to the correspondence sent to the Local Committee or addressed within the report for item 8.
- Concerns regarding speed, and pedestrians crossing the road to get to the bus stop, and the residents do not feel safe.

Ward Members for Bletchingley and Nutfield Ward, District Councillors Tony Elias and Gill Black asked to speak to the Committee.

Key points raised included:

- Widespread support for this petition.
- Concerns regarding inaccuracies within the Officer report, and steps under Surrey's Policy -Setting Local Speed Limits not being followed correctly.
- The letters of the support received from Bletchingley Parish Council, Opheus Centre, Godstone Village Association and Divers Cove had not been taken into consideration in the report.
- Requesting a strategic and holistic view to the A25 between Godstone and Bletchingley rather than looking a small part.
- The engineering methods, to reduce speeds that were agreed in 2011 have not been implemented such as the gateway.
- Concern that there was not much evidence of any speed enforcement by Surrey Police in any local area.

The Committee agreed to discuss the petition with the item 8 report.

### **Petition 2- Sandy Lane/Pendell Road/Big Common Lane/ Little Common Lane**

Lead petitioner, Diane Brown presented her petition requesting a review of the junction of Sandy Lane/ Big Common Lane/ Little Common Lane/ Pendell Road. She thanked the Committee for reducing the speed in 2017. However, stated that the junction was still dangerous due to the restricted visibility,

signage and some SatNavs advising drivers that this is a through road rather than a junction.

The Area Highways Manager, thanked the lead petitioner for their attendance. She advised that this junction is currently on the agenda to be discussed at the next Road Safety Working group in November so a variety of options will be considered. Officers will work with the petitioner to contact the Satnav companies to ask that this be marked as a junction not a through road.

#### Members Discussion – Key points

The following points were raised:

- It was asked if the landowner could cut his hedges to improve the sightlines. The land owner was present at the meeting, and advised would be willing to work with Surrey CC. The Area Highways Manager thanked the landowner for his offer and Surrey CC would be in contact, should it be required following consideration of the options at the Road Safety Working Group.
- Members requested that an update be provided at the next meeting following the Road Safety Working group meeting in November.

#### **Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) did not agree to the recommendations, wishing to wait on the outcome of the Road Safety Working Group meeting.

#### **Petition 3 – Lingfield Common Road**

Lead petitioner, Beverly Mann presented the petition, informing the Committee that this route was a rat run for people to avoid the congestion in Lingfield. Crossing the road to the bus stop was dangerous due to the speeding traffic and asked the Committee to consider reducing the speed limit to be the same as the surrounding residential roads.

District Councillor for the Lingfield, Mark Ridge, advised he was supportive of the residents' petition. Drivers who are trying to avoid the pinch points use Lingfield Common Road to avoid the traffic.

The Area Highways Manager, thanked the lead petitioner for their petition, and highlighted that a speed reduction of the existing 50mph will be reduced to 40mph on Haxted Road and part of Lingfield Common Road. This was approved by the Local Committee and would be completed by the end of March 2019. A speed survey carried out on Lingfield Common Road in the current 40mph section, show good compliance with the existing speed limit of 40mph, and would not meet Surrey County Council's speed limit policy for a reduction to 30mph with signs alone.

#### Members Key Discussion Points

- Divisional Member, Lesley Steeds was supportive of the petition and thanked the lead petitioner for her work on the petition to date.
- Requested that the Local Committee Chairman writes to the Police and Crime Commissioner and ask that the police regularly enforce the new speed limit.
- The Local Committee requested that the Chairman also writes to the MP to thank him for his letter and if a 30mph speed limit is implemented in the future that the Government provides funds for supporting engineering measures.
- It was agreed that Lingfield Common Road would be included on the Integrated Transport Schemes list for future funding.

### **Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) NOTED the contents of the response.

### **30/18 FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

One public question had been received. Mr Edward Woods, made a statement during the petition item.

### **31/18 MEMBERS QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

No formal Members questions received.

### **32/18 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 7]**

This item was moved to after item 10 on the agenda.

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Sarah Woodworth, Partnership Committee Officer

**Petition, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Officer introduced the item explaining that this document monitors progress against decisions that the Local Committee has made.

### **Member Discussion – Key Points**

The following points were raised:

- The Square Caterham, Cllr Cooper asked for an update on the roundabout.
- Request for a pedestrian crossing on the Godstone Road, Caterham. Cllr Cooper asked if it could remain open as the Parish Council were awaiting further detail on costings. The Officer advised that the request was for a broad figure to base a discussion for joint funding which has been provided. A detailed and full cost could not be produced without a full feasibility study which would need to be funded. The Officer will discuss with the Parish.

- Mr Chris Botten, stressed the urgency of implementing Banstead Road crossing as the S106 money is time limited and may not be available. This would have implications for not only residents in Banstead Road but also Rook Lane who may also be able to benefit from this funding.

It was requested that should Members have questions relating to the decision tracker that Officers are advised in advance, in order to be in a position to answer Members questions fully at the meeting.

The Committee agreed that the items marked as closed would be removed from the tracker as now complete.

### **Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) Noted the contents of the report
- (ii) Agreed to remove the closed items from the tracker.

### **33/18 A25 GODSTONE ROAD, BLECHINGLEY SPEED LIMIT REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]**

Taken after item 6 on the agenda.

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

**Petition, Public Questions, Statements:** Petition, public question and statements raised under Item 4. The chairman permitted district councillor Mr Tony Elias to make a further statement.

The Officer advised of a correction to the date in the papers. The report had previously been deferred at the meeting held on the 23 September 2016 not the 9 December 2016.

The Area Highways Manager presented the report, thanking all for their comments and information received about this issue and they, have been taken into consideration. The depth of local feeling is understood. The report is brought to the committee in line with the council's approved policy that aims to set successful local speed limits that are appropriate for the main users of the road (Setting local speed limits policy). This report has been brought before the committee as the speed limit on the section of road is not in accordance with the Surrey Policy- Setting Local Speed Limits. This references national policy issued by central government and nation policy issued by Association of Chief Police Officers. The previous speed limit reduction on this road, from 50mph to 30mph, with supporting engineering measures has been shown to be ineffective.

As this is a decision on a Surrey Policy, there are two options in the recommendations for the committee to decide on. The report asks for the committee to agree to increase the speed limit from 30mph to 40mph on the

400m section on the A25, Bletchingley or referred to the Cabinet Member responsible for Road Safety. The Police have advised that they would support a 40mph speed limit, and would be willing to enforce speeds if it was in accordance with the speed policy. There could be a community speed watch set up, if the speed limit is in line with the Surrey policy. If approved, new yellow-backed, 40mph signs could be installed. The Area Highways Manager advised that average speed cameras can be considered on single carriage roads, where an appropriate speed limit is in place, on this section of road this would be 40mph.

### **Public statement**

Mr Elias' statement included the following points:

- There were errors and omissions in this report, and previous reports to the committee, to such an extent that they invalidate any decisions to be taken by the committee.
- Referred members to the report brought to the committee in 2011 and the reasons given as to why the speed limit was considered appropriate at 30mph, and how it would secure support from Surrey Police.
- The originally agreed supporting engineering measure of the village gateway sign has not been implemented. Therefore it is not appropriate to consult Surrey Police at this point, and not possible to evaluate the success of the scheme. Concern that Surrey Highways were therefore not following the steps in the agreed Setting Local Speed Limits Policy.
- New houses, and changes to the area, meant that the road needed to be considered holistically along with Bletchingley and Godstone, and the parish councils consulted. The item was deferred in 2016 for this work.
- Views of parish councils and local people do not seem to have been taken into account.
- Question why the committee are not being asked to consider further engineering measures. For example, installing a new speed camera, a pedestrian refuge, or moving the existing VAS sign.
- Further concerns around the council's adherence to the Setting Local Speed Limits policy, such as the length of road.

The Area Highway Manager made the following points in response:

- The Area Highway Manager apologised that it was not reported to the local committee at this time that there had been consideration of a village gateway, but that insufficient road width meant it was not put in. However other supporting measures were put in – including red surfacing, 'dragons' teeth' marking and signage. This is why Surrey Police have asked for the speed limit to be reviewed through the speed assessment.
- As the road is part of the strategic highway network, road tables or road cushions are not appropriate – the road is used by HGVs.
- Officers have asked whether it would be possible to have average speed cameras on this road. Surrey Police indicate they would support this if the speed limit is appropriate. Surrey Police consider the current speed limit to be inappropriate.
- It is not possible to move the VAS sign.

- The speed limit would remain at 30mph at the entrance to the cemetery.

Mr Elias made some further points in response, outlining ongoing concern about the application of the policy, lack of police enforcement, and how speed limits are ignored on many roads.

### **Members Discussion- Key points**

- The Chairman acknowledged the depth of feeling expressed both at the meeting, and beforehand.
- Concern that the report does not give members all the evidence they need to lower the speed limit, and feel that need to take a holistic view about the whole stretch from Bletchingley to Godstone. Need to take into concern new housing developments.
- Need to listen to residents. Report does not give weight to local opinion.
- Concern that while the policy is sound, it has not been properly applied in this instance. Others disagreed with the policy.
- It cannot be appropriate for a service road to be 40mph.
- Increasing amount of traffic coming from the East with drivers avoiding the roadworks on the M23. This should be taken into consideration.

Cllr Cannon proposed an alternative recommendation. He proposed that the 'decision on this item should be deferred until such time as the officers have implemented the supporting engineering measures decided in 2011 and any other such engineering measures that are considered necessary such as moving the VAS sign, a speed camera and pedestrian refuge, and until such time as they are ready to bring to the Local Committee a holistic and strategic response to the whole section of the A25 from Chevington Villas to Bletchingley to the boundary of Godstone where the 30mph sign is currently located to take account of the new information received from the petitioners, Parish Council, local District Councillors, Orpheus Centre, Godstone Village Association and Divers Cove'. This was seconded by Cllr Martin Fisher. Members agreed to remove the reference to 'pedestrian refuge' from the proposal, as achieving this is something that would take a long time.

- Could the speed camera be moved.
- Did Surrey Highways provide a view on the Knights' Development?
- Whether a more consistent speed limit across a longer stretch of road could be appropriate for average speed cameras.

### **Resolution**

The committee moved to take a decision. Members requested a report back to the committee within 3 months, to consider the full stretch of road holistically.

At this point, the proposed recommendation put forward by councillor Cannon during the discussion was read to the committee, with the removal of the reference to the pedestrian refuge. Members verbally indicated they supported this proposal.

Mr Hodge declared that the proposal was not correct. The recommendation should be that members have listened to the public. The public are clear that we want a review of the speed limits coming out of Godstone, to the Tandridge boundary. What is the right speed that officers should recommend to councillors. Then members can take a decision. If the route was 30mph, the committee could look at whether it is possible to have average speed cameras along this stretch. Members verbally indicated agreement with this.

The chairman confirmed that the committee was agreeing to defer the item, for officers to return with a new report.

**34/18 FARLEIGH ROAD WARLINGHAM PERMISSION FOR REMOVAL OF SPEED CUSHIONS (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 9]**

Mr David Lee, left the meeting.

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

**Petition, Public Questions, Statements:** None

The Officer introduced the report, advising that the consultation is for removal of the speed cushions, the speed tables would remain.

**Members Discussion- Key points**

- Members were pleased that Farleigh Road would be resurfaced.
- Concerns were raised that the speed cushions can cause damage to owners' vehicles.
- Parked cars on some parts of the road slow the traffic down however this is not on all parts of the road.
- Additional recommendation added, requesting that the results of the consultation be published.
- Cllr Simon Morrow proposed, that the residents of Farleigh Road should be consulted and the results from the residents should decide the outcome. The proposal was seconded by Mr Chris Botten and voted on by the Committee. The proposed new recommendation was not carried.
- Cllr Simon Morrow proposed that the results of the consultation be published. This was seconded by Mr Chris Botten and carried by the Committee.

**Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge)

- (i) APPROVED the removal of the existing speed cushion traffic calming in Farleigh Road between the junctions of B269 Limpsfield Road and Sunnybank, to be carried out when resurfacing works are undertaken in this road as part of the Severe Weather Resurfacing Works, subject to the outcome of consultation results;

- (ii) AUTHORISED delegated authority be given to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and divisional Member, together with the Area Team Manager, to consider the results of the consultation and make a final decision as to whether to proceed with the removal of the speed cushions;
- (iii) **AGREED that the results of the consultation are published.**
- (iv) NOTED that if speeds and/or road casualties increase following the removal of the existing speed cushions, there is currently no funding available in the foreseeable future to design and reinstate any traffic calming measures in order to reduce vehicle speeds.

**35/18 HIGHWAYS SCHEMES UPDATE (INFORMATION - SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officer attending:** Zena Curry, Area Highways Manager

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** None

**Members Discussion: Key Points**

- With reference to the Member Local Highways Fund, Cllr Simon Morrow asked if we could move forward with installing new parking bays in Warlingham as the Parish has contributed funding to the scheme.
- It was advised that should Members wish to use over the £2500 on one scheme from the Local Members fund, approval must be sought from the Cabinet Member. However, joint funding for schemes from Parishes would aid the request.

**Resolution**

The Local Committee (Tandridge) NOTED the contents of the report.

**36/18 LOCAL COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]**

The forward plan was noted.

Meeting ended at: 1.20 pm

---

**Chairman**