

## Notice of Meeting

# Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Prosperity Decisions

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 12  
September 2017 at  
2.30 pm

**Place**

Committee Room C,  
County Hall, Kingston  
upon Thames, Surrey  
KT1 2DN

**Contact**

Andrew Baird & Joss Butler  
Room 122, County Hall  
Tel 0208 541 7609 or 0208  
541 9702

**Chief Executive**

David McNulty

[andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk) or  
[joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk)

**If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email [andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.baird@surreycc.gov.uk) or [joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:joss.butler@surreycc.gov.uk).**

**This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Andrew Baird & Joss Butler on 0208 541 7609 or 0208 541 9702.**

**Elected Members**  
Mr John Furey

## **AGENDA**

### **1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- i. Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- ii. Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting

#### **NOTES:**

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner)
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

### **2 PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

#### **a Members' Questions**

The deadline for Members' questions is 12pm four working days before the meeting (06/09/2017).

#### **b Public Questions**

The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (05/09/2017).

#### **c Petitions**

The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

### **3 VICTORIA WAY, WOKING, SPEED LIMIT DECISION REVIEW**

(Pages 1  
- 44)

On 28 June 2017, Woking Joint Committee approved a speed limit reduction from 40mph to 30mph for Victoria Way. As this decision was taken contrary to the views of the Area Highways Manager, this report is presented to enable review of this decision.

**David McNulty**  
**Chief Executive**  
Published: 01 September 2017

## **MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****DEPUTY LEADER AND CABINET MEMBER FOR  
ECONOMICAL PROSPERITY DECISIONS****DATE: 12 SEPTEMBER****LEAD OFFICER: TREVOR PUGH, STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE****SUBJECT: VICTORIA WAY, WOKING, SPEED LIMIT DECISION REVIEW****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

On 28 June 2017, Woking Joint Committee approved a speed limit reduction from 40mph to 30mph for Victoria Way. As this decision was taken contrary to the views of the Area Highways Manager, this report is presented to enable review of this decision.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

1. The existing speed limit of 40mph is retained.
2. A review of the speed limit is undertaken on completion of the town centre development works, so that the review is based on contemporary and complete speed data that reflects driver behaviour following the street scene modifications forming part of the town centre development
3. A report is then presented to the Woking Joint Committee recommending any speed limit revision that may then be required.

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

These recommendations will ensure that any Joint Committee decision to modify the speed limit is based on complete and sound evidence, and that the existing County policy on setting speed limits is followed in a manner consistent with other speed limit reviews.

**DETAILS:****First Heading/Business Case**

1. The full report as prepared by Lousia Calam of Town Centre Development (TCD) and presented to the Joint Committee on 28 June 2017 is appended.
2. Victoria Way, Woking, is an A class road and presently subject to a 40mph speed limit. It is part of Surrey's strategic road network and a key link between the M25 and Guildford. For this reason it is essential that any decision to vary the speed limit is based on sound information.

3. The speed data on which the Joint Committee decision was based on was out of date and incomplete. It did not include data for the section of Victoria Way likely to attract the highest vehicles speeds, and suggested average speeds that are likely to be lower than reality.
4. Although the report suggested that reducing the existing speed limit would result in a number of benefits to the public, a reduction in the posted speed limit is unlikely to result in any reduction in vehicle speeds, and none of the benefits cited were substantiated by factual evidence.
5. The accident history along Victoria Way is predominantly associated with turning movements at junctions, and excessive speed has not been cited as a contributory factor. A reduction in speed limit is unlikely to reduce accidents, and based on experience at other locations, introducing a 30mph speed limit could result in vehicle speeds increasing, as the existing repeater signs would have to be removed, and the streetscene does not suggest to road users that a 30mph speed limit is appropriate.
6. The existing speed limit policy is scheduled for review as there circumstances, such as is the case with Victoria Way, where average speeds may be suppressed due to congestion, and suggest that a lower speed limit may be appropriate than is actually the case for the character of the road, and how road users will behave under free flow conditions.
7. The Area Highway Manager, having considered the contents of the presented report, could not support the recommended speed limit reduction for the reasons outlined above, and recommended that a review of the speed limit should be undertaken on completion of the town centre development, so that the decision taken by the Joint Committee is based on complete and current data that reflects actual driver behaviour following modifications to the street scene forming part of the development works.

#### **CONSULTATION:**

8. Consultation has been carried out as part of the original report to the Joint Committee, and no additional consultation has been undertaken prior to referral to the Cabinet Member for review of the Joint Committee decision.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:**

9. Introducing a 30mph speed limit along Victoria Way may result in reduced public safety due to vehicle speeds increasing, as the existing repeater signs would be removed, and the street scene is not presently in keeping with a 30mph speed limit.
10. The cost of amending the speed limit is minimal and would be met by Woking Borough Council as part of their town centre development budget. However, this expenditure would be unlikely to yield any public benefit.

#### **Financial and Value for Money Implications**

##### **Section 151 Officer Commentary**

11. As there are no budgetary implications for Surrey County Council, the Section 151 officer approves this recommendation.

**Legal Implications – Monitoring Officer**

12. There are no legal implications associated with this report.

**Equalities and Diversity**

13. The proposals contained in this report, and the one presented to the Woking Joint Committee do not have any equalities and diversity implications, as no material change affecting members of the public would result.

**Other Implications:**

14. The potential implications for the following council priorities and policy areas have been considered. Where the impact is potentially significant a summary of the issues is set out in detail below.

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Area assessed:               | Direct Implications:                                 |
| Environmental sustainability | No significant implications arising from this report |

**Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children implications**

15. N/A

**Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults implications**

16. N/A

**Environmental sustainability implications**

17. N/A

**Public Health implications**

18. N/A

**WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

- Subject to the Cabinet Members decision, the speed limit reduction will either be actioned, or the existing speed limit retained with a commitment to undertake a full and thorough review following completion of the town centre development works.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Andrew Milne, Area Highways Manager 01483 519580

**Consulted:**

N/A

**Annexes:**

**REPORT SUBMITTED TO WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE ON 28 JUNE 2017 -  
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS FOR THE  
WOKING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE PACKAGE INCLUDING  
APPENDICES**

**Sources/background papers:**

- All background papers used in the writing of the report should be listed, as required by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.
-





**WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** 28 June 2017  
**LEAD OFFICER:** LOUISA CALAM, PROJECT MANAGER TOWN CENTRE DEVELOPMENT  
**SUBJECT:** PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS FOR THE WOKING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE PACKAGE  
**AREA:** Woking Town Centre

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

This report will update the Joint Committee on the progress from the last committee report (March 2017) which detailed the various Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) which need to be amended/revoked/made to facilitate the delivery of the Woking Integrated Transport Package.

The amendments to the TRO's are sought to enable improved transport facilities and access to the town centre as well as the provision of a high quality urban environment as part of the major public realm improvements to Woking Town Centre.

Joint Committee approval is requested for the advertising of a change of speed limit on Victoria Way (A320), Woking from 40mph to 30mph.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Woking Joint Committee is asked to:**

- (i) Note the results of the advertising of the TRO's and the update from the previous March 2017 report.
- (ii) Authorise the advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order for the creation of a 30mph speed limit along Victoria Way between the junction with Church Street West (the start of the existing southbound 30mph speed limit) to Chertsey Road, to include revoking of the existing speed limit of 40mph;
- (iii) Authorise the Surrey County Council Area Highways Manager, in consultation with the Woking Town Centre Project Manager and the

Chairman and Vice Chairman, to advertise the appropriate legal notices in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to implement the proposed changes and revoke any existing traffic orders, as necessary;

- (iv) Agree that the Surrey County Council Area Highways Manager, in consultation with the Woking Town Centre Project Manager and the Chairman and Vice Chairman, resolve any objections received in connection with the proposals, and implement subject to no irresolvable objections.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The amendments to the TRO are sought as part of the package of improved transport and access facilities to the town centre as well as the provision of a high quality urban environment as part of the major public realm improvements to Woking Town Centre.

Analysis of the existing vehicle speeds has been considered, as well as the guidance within Surrey County Council's Speed Limit Policy. Discussions with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team and Surrey's Road Safety Team have been held which have been positive to the proposals. These comments are appended to this report.

The Surrey Area Highways Team is not supportive of the speed reduction. These comments are summarised in the appendix to this report and whilst these comments have been carefully considered, notwithstanding this, and in consultation with Woking Borough Council Chief Executive, recommendations for the speed limit reduction on Victoria Way from 40mph to 30mph are being pursued in the interests of supporting growth, economic vibrancy and improvements to the environment in the town centre.

The speed reduction forms part of the aspirations to deliver improved transport infrastructure through the Woking Integrated Transport Package, being funded by the Victoria Square development and Enterprise M3. This government grant provided to Woking to kick start infrastructure and other projects will drive economic growth in the area and help create housing and jobs for local people. The reduction of the speed limit on Victoria Way forms part of these aspirations to deliver improved transport infrastructure to the town centre.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

1.1 A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is the legal instrument by which transportation authorities implement most traffic management controls on their roads under the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984.

1.2 A list of amendments to TRO's in Woking town centre were brought to the March 2017 Woking Joint Committee, which were for the Joint Committee to note, as delegated authority to advertise and make the TRO's rested with SCC and WBC Members and officers. Many of these TRO's have been advertised, which are detailed later in this report. The Joint Committee is asked to note these TRO's which will be implemented.

1.3 A summary list of the TRO's which were brought to the March 2017 Joint Committee along with the progress update is provided in the table below.

| Item no. | Summary of item  | Progress Update  |
|----------|--|--|
| 1        | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for the creation of a 20mph zone within the town centre.  | Advertised.<br><br>Refer to representations summary.                                       |
| 2        | An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order will be implemented along High Street from its junction with The Broadway to its new junction with Victoria Way for a one way direction route westbound for use by "buses", "cycles" and "authorised vehicles" with a time period shown (7am – 9pm) with Contra-flow pedal cycles.              | Not yet advertised/implemented. Broadway works need to be completed first.                 |
| 3        | The use of the new enforcement camera device which is proposed to be installed at the junction of The Broadway with High Street to enforce the restricted access TRO mentioned above.  | For noting only.   |
| 4        | An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order will be implemented along The Broadway, between its junction with Duke Street and High Street for one way movement of all vehicles westbound, and a contraflow cycle lane eastbound.  | Not yet advertised/implemented. Broadway and High Street works need to be completed first. |
| 5        | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for High Street from its junction with The Broadway to its new junction with Victoria Way in close proximity to Victoria Arch for revoking existing parking bays, taxi bays, disabled badge parking bay and a bus stop and implementing loading bay and disabled badge parking bay. | Advertised.<br><br>Refer to representations summary.                                       |
| 6        | Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for The Broadway from its junction of Duke Street to High Street for revoking existing parking bays, and implementing taxi bays, loading bays, disabled badge parking bay   | Advertised.<br><br>Refer to representations summary.                                       |
| 7        | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for a restricted parking  | Advertised.  |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | zone along The Broadway from its junction with Duke Street extending along High Street to its junction with Victoria Way. This restricted parking zone will also apply to Chapel Street since this is a road adjoining High Street and accessed directly from High Street with no other point of entry. | Refer to representations summary.   |
| 8  | An Experimental Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued to restrict general traffic on Chapel Street between its junction with High Street and Commercial Way.   | Not yet advertised/implemented. Broadway and High Street works need to be completed first.                      |
| 9  | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for the reverse of the one-way section of road on Duke Street between its junction with Locke Way and Chertsey Road, and along Chertsey Road from its junction with Duke Street to Stanley Road.   | Advertised.<br>Refer to representations summary.  |
| 10 | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued to revoke the Bus Lane on Victoria Way between its junction with Goldsworth Road and its junction with Church Street West.   | Advertised.<br>Refer to representations summary.  |
| 11 | A new bus stop on Victoria Way on the northbound carriageway between Goldsworth Road and Church Street West will be provided.   | Bus Stop Clearways do not need advertising. The Signs Regulations allow for them to be installed without a TRO. |
| 12 | A new bus stop on the eastbound carriageway of Church Street West between its junction with Goldsworth Road and Forge End will be provided.   | No advertising is required.   |
| 13 | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for no left turn for all vehicles except for "Buses" and "Cycles" from Victoria Way into Church Street West.   | Advertised.<br>Refer to representations summary.  |
| 14 | To note the new enforcement camera device which is proposed to be installed at the junction of Victoria Way with Church Street West to enforce the restricted access TRO mentioned above.   | For noting only.  |
| 15 | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued for a Bus Lane on Victoria Way between its junction with   | Advertised.   |

|    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
|    | Lockfield Drive and the pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Bedser Bridge crossing.   | Refer to representations summary.   |
| 16 | A new bus stop on Victoria Way eastbound section on the approach to the pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Bedser Bridge will be provided.   | This does not require advertising.  |
| 17 | A Permanent Traffic Regulation Order will be pursued to change the position of the pedestrian crossing on Victoria Way adjacent to Bedser Bridge. The proposal is to keep a staggered crossing setup. | This is not being advertised or implemented following further study work carried out. |

1.1 Victoria Way (A320) is currently a 40mph speed limit between Church Street West and the Brook House roundabout. The A320 has been assessed as a strategic route within Surrey’s highway network. This part of the A320 passes through Woking town centre, and whilst it provides a good road connection with other areas of the Borough and beyond, it suffers from heavy traffic, particularly at peak times, forming a severance for pedestrians and cyclists between the town centre and the residential areas to the north and the Lightbox and WWF. It is therefore inconvenient for sustainable road users, which is damaging to the quality of the environment in the area.

1.2 40mph limit is considered inappropriate for a town centre where we want the support the economic vibrancy of the shops and businesses by making it a pleasant place to be. Reducing the speed limit to 30mph would bring this section of road in line with neighbouring towns in Surrey and elsewhere (such as Kingston) with dual carriageways of 30mph speed limit whilst in an urban environment.

1.3 Reducing the speed limit to 30 mph will slow speeds and regulate acceleration and deceleration between junctions and reduce queuing, therefore reducing pollution and emissions, so helping to improve air quality. It will also reduce noise.

1.4 The Woking Integrated Transport Package, delivering extensive public realm and transport improvements to the town centre, is an ideal opportunity to address these particular aspects of the town centre and bring enhancements for all those living, working and visiting Woking.

1.5 Joint Committee is asked to agree to advertise the speed reduction TRO on Victoria Way from 40mph to 30mph. The proposal to reduce the speed limit on Victoria Way did not form part of the original planning application, and for this reason there is no delegated authority to approve advertising, which is the reason for the need to seek approval from Joint Committee.

**2. ANALYSIS:**

2.1 Woking Town Centre is going through a period of major transformation. The Borough Council has made a substantial investment in improvements to public realm. The Woking Integrated Transport Package is to deliver further improvements to the

transport infrastructure and public realm for the town centre, which seek to secure the long term vitality of the local economy.

2.2 A summary of the representations received as a result of advertising some of the TRO's brought to the March 2017 Joint Committee is attached in the appendix. These have been considered by the Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Colin Kemp, as having delegated authority to make the TRO following consideration of representations. Their view reached is that these representations can be overcome. The Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Colin Kemp, therefore considers that the TRO can be made.

2.3 A summary of the Members comments from the March 2017 Committee and a response is provided in the appendix.

2.4 The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities like Surrey County Council to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a need for a speed limit which is different from the national speed limit. For example while higher speed limits are appropriate for strategic roads between main towns, lower speed limits will usually apply within towns and villages.

2.5 Speed data was examined from 2012 for the section of Victoria Way between the pedestrian crossing adjacent to the Woking Borough Council offices and the rail over bridge at Guildford Road. Further data from 2016 was available over the final approach to the rail bridge. However, this data differed little from that recorded in the earlier 2012 surveys. Refer to plans in the appendix VD15278-03-0100 Rev B.

| A320 Victoria Way                                | Average 85%ile speed (mph) | Average mean speed (mph) |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Goldsworth Road to Church Street West Northbound | 25.3                       | 21.8                     |
| Goldsworth Road to Church Street West Southbound | 25.5                       | 19.6                     |
| Forge End to Lockfield Drive Northbound          | 29.1                       | 24.6                     |
| Forge End to Lockfield Drive Southbound          | 28.3                       | 24.1                     |
| Lockfield Drive to Peacocks Car Park Eastbound   | 33.3                       | 29.8                     |
| Lockfield Drive to Peacocks Car Park Westbound   | 30.5                       | 25.3                     |
| Peacocks Car Park to Chobham Road Eastbound      | 33.3                       | 29.8                     |
| Peacocks Car Park to Chobham Road Westbound      | 32.0                       | 28.8                     |

- 2.6 Analysis of the speed survey data suggests that the average speeds are contained within the proposed speed limit of 30mph, with the results taken from 4 locations ranging between 19.4 and 29.8mph.
- 2.7 The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds (commonly referred to as the design speed) were as expected higher, ranging from 25.3 to 33.3mph.
- 2.8 As stated in the SCC Setting Local Speed Limits policy (attached in the appendix for reference), "For each speed limit change scenario within Table 2, a threshold is shown by a vertical line. If the measured existing mean speeds are below the threshold then the council will allow a change to a signed-only lower speed limit without supporting measures." It is the case that all of the mean speeds are below the threshold shown in the table.
- 2.9 The Police have been consulted on this matter and have confirmed that the mean speeds are within the parameters allowed in the SCC Speed Limit Policy for this change to a 30mph limit without any further speed control measures being required. They are also of the view that the introduction of the bus lane along the east bound carriageway of Victoria Way from Lockfield Drive is likely to slow vehicles even further. Detailed comments are attached in the appendix.
- 2.10 The reduction of vehicle speeds along Victoria Way is supported by the Surrey Road Safety Team. They confirm that encouraging lower speeds will reduce the risk of collision and the consequences. Detailed comments are attached in the appendix.
- 2.11 An analysis of personal injury collisions for the last 3 years is provided in the appendix. The data shows that there have been no collisions with excessive speed a cause.

### **3. OPTIONS:**

- 3.1 This Committee is asked to note the updates to the TRO amendments brought to the March 2017 Joint Committee, so no formal approvals are necessary, but any failure to do so would mean that the objectives of the Woking Integrated Transport Package to provide safe, high quality public realm with improved transport access to the town centre were not met.
- 3.2 This Committee is asked to approve the advertising of the speed reduction TRO. Any failure to do so would mean that the objectives of the Woking Integrated Transport Package to provide safe, high quality public realm with improved transport access to the town centre were not met.

### **4. CONSULTATIONS:**

- 4.1 The TRO's listed in the March 2017 Joint Committee report which have already been advertised are listed above and the consultation responses are summarised in the table attached in the appendix.
- 4.2 Consultations for the speed reduction on Victoria Way have been undertaken with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team, Surrey's Road Safety Team and the Surrey County Council Area Highways Team, as part of the Woking Integrated Transport Package. Assuming authority is provided to advertise the

proposed amendments, this advertising will give a formal opportunity for representation to be made.

**5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 5.1 The costs of amending the TRO's will be borne by the Woking Integrated Transport Package funds which is comprised of developer funding from the Victoria Square development and Enterprise M3 funding.

**6. RISK MANAGEMENT:**

- 6.1 It is possible that objections to the amendments will be raised and it may be necessary to find solutions through negotiation. The risks associated with not seeking to make the proposed amendments relate to vehicle, cycle and pedestrian safety, improved bus passenger and pedestrian access to the town, and improved public space and amenity.

**7. LOCALISM:**

- 7.1 The proposals will bring positive benefits to the local area.

**8. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:**

- 8.1 It is an objective of Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. Appropriate and proportionate consultation is carried out with residents, and bodies representing particular user groups, to ensure that the interests of all highway users are considered.

**9. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:**

| Area assessed:   | Direct Implications:  |
|--|---|
| Crime and Disorder   | No significant implications arising from this report.   |
| Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)   | The proposal will improve the quality of the environment in the town centre.                          |
| Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children                        | No significant implications arising from this report.   |
| Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults | No significant implications arising from this report.   |
| Public Health  | The scheme will improve the safety for users of the town centre by reducing vehicle speeds and flows. |
| Human Resource/Training and Development                          | No significant implications arising from this report.   |



**10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

10.1 A summary of the representations received as a result of advertising some of the TRO's brought to the March 2017 Joint Committee is attached in the appendix. These have been considered by the Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Colin Kemp, as having delegated authority to make the TRO following consideration of representations, and the view reached is that these representations can be overcome. The Deputy Chief Executive, Douglas Spinks, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Colin Kemp, therefore considers that the TRO can be made.

10.2 This report details the assessment of the speed limits on the stretch of Victoria Way within the town centre. The assessment has been carried out using the County Council's speed limit policy, "Setting Local Speed Limits". The recommendations have been based on the results of the assessment but also on knowledge of that stretch of road and the practical implications of a lower limit.

10.3 The amendments to the TRO will allow the objectives of the Woking Integrated Transport Package to provide safe, high quality public realm with improved transport access to the town centre to be met.

**11. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:**

11.1 Any agreed changes to the speed limit should be advertised, with the intention of making the relevant Traffic Regulation Order and amending the speed limit.

11.2 The relevant TRO's listed in the report which were brought to the March 2017 committee will be made.

---

**Contact Officer:** Louisa Calam,  
Project Manager Town Centre Development  
020 8541 7422

**Consulted:**

Informal consultations have been undertaken with Borough and County Officers, Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team, Surrey Highways Area Team, and Borough and County Councillors for the area.

**Annexes:**

Appendix 1 - Surrey County Council's speed limit policy, "Setting Local Speed Limits"  
Appendix 2 - Summary of Representations from advertised TRO's  
Appendix 3 - Response to Members questions raised at March 2017 Joint Committee  
Appendix 4 - Plans showing speed survey results  
Appendix 5 - Technical Assessment of the Bedser Bridge pedestrian signal crossing  
Appendix 6 - Comments from SCC officers regarding the Victoria Way Speed Reduction

[www.woking.gov.uk](http://www.woking.gov.uk)  
[www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/woking)

Appendix 7 - Personal Injury Accident data summary



**SURREY**  
COUNTY COUNCIL

[www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

Making Surrey a better place

# Setting Local Speed Limits

## Surrey County Council's Policy



## 1. Introduction

The aim of Surrey County Council is to set speed limits that are successful in managing vehicle speeds and are appropriate for the main use of the road. Reducing speeds successfully may reduce the likelihood and severity of collisions, and can help to encourage more walking and cycling. This can help to make communities more pleasant places to live, and can help sustain local shops and businesses. The desire for lower speeds has to be balanced against the need for reasonable journey times and the position of the road within the county council's Strategic Priority Network.

The purpose of this policy is to explain the roles, responsibilities and the procedure that will be followed by Surrey County Council when deciding whether to change a speed limit. The policy also provides advice and guidance on the factors and additional supporting measures that may be needed to ensure successful management of vehicle speeds.

This policy has been developed with reference to national policy issued by central government "Setting Local Speed Limits, Department for Transport Circular 01/2013" and national policy issued by the Association of Chief Police Officers, "Speed Enforcement Policy Guidelines 2011 to 2015: Joining Forces for Safer Roads". This policy was approved by the county council's cabinet on 24 June 2014 and became effective on 3 July 2014.

## 2. Key Principles

### National speed limits

The three national speed limits are:

- the 30 mph speed limit on roads with street lighting (sometimes referred to as Restricted Roads)
- the national speed limit of 60 mph on single carriageway roads
- the national speed limit of 70 mph on dual carriageways and motorways.

These national speed limits are not, however, appropriate for all roads. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities like Surrey County Council to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a need for a speed limit which is different from the national speed limit. For example while higher speed limits are appropriate for strategic roads between main towns, lower speed limits will usually apply within towns and villages. A limit of 20 mph may be appropriate in residential areas, busy shopping streets and near schools where the needs and safety of pedestrians and cyclists should have greater priority. Changing from the national speed limit on a road will require that speed limit repeater signs are provided along the route to indicate the new speed limit.

### Decision making and responsibilities

Within Surrey decisions over most highway matters including setting speed limits are delegated to local committees of elected county council and borough/district councillors. There is a local committee in each of the 11 boroughs and districts within Surrey. Each local committee is provided with an annual budget from Surrey County Council for highway improvements throughout their area, and then the local committee decides

where best to invest their budget in response to local concerns to tackle congestion, improve accessibility, improve safety and support the local economy. Therefore any proposals for changing speed limits including the signing, legal speed limit order and supporting highway measures would require agreement and allocation of funding by the local committee from their budget for highway improvements.

The county council's Area Highways Team, who report to the local committee, will lead the process to assess a potential change in speed limit. The Area Highways Team will be assisted by the county council's central Road Safety Team and will consult with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. The output would be a report and recommendations (in accordance with this policy) for consideration by the local committee, who will then decide whether to allocate funding for a scheme to change the existing speed limit or not.

### **Speed limits and speed management**

Experience shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic by very much if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit. If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. There should be no expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. It is also important to set reasonable speed limits to ensure consistency across the country.

Therefore speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased police enforcement to penalise substantial numbers of motorists.

### **20 mph speed limits and zones**

Within the latest central government guidance issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) there is greater encouragement for local authorities to introduce more 20 mph schemes (limits and zones) in urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential, to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Circular 01/2013 emphasises that research into signed-only 20 mph speed limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds. Signed-only 20 mph speed limits are therefore most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. If the mean speed is already at or below 24 mph on a road, introducing a 20 mph speed limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit. Table 2 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a signed-only 20 mph speed limit.

Where the existing mean speeds are above 24 mph then a 20 mph scheme with traffic calming measures (known as a 20 mph zone) will be required. Research has shown that 20 mph zones with traffic calming measures have been very effective in reducing speeds and casualties, may encourage modal shift towards more walking and cycling and may result reductions in traffic flow on the road as vehicles choose alternative routes.

However traffic calming measures are more expensive and are not always universally popular. Table 1 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a 20 mph zone with traffic calming.

It is possible to implement 20 mph schemes that consist of a combination of physical features (where existing speeds are high), and signs alone (where speeds are already low) on different sections of the same road.

Research has shown that mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits that apply only at certain times of day (using an electronic sign) are not very effective at managing vehicle speeds. Surrey police do not support 20 mph speed limits that are not generally self enforcing. The electronic variable message signage that would be required for a mandatory variable 20 mph speed limit would also place an additional maintenance burden on the county council for little benefit. Therefore Surrey County Council will not support the use of new mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits.

### **Speed limits outside schools**

Requests are often made for lower speed limits outside schools as a result of concerns over the safety of children outside schools. It is the policy of Surrey County Council that there should always be an overall assessment of the safety issues outside a school to investigate and define the problem rather than consideration of the speed limit in isolation. For example the problems may be associated with inconsiderate parking or difficulties in crossing a road that will not be solved through a change in speed limit on its own. Therefore the county council have published a separate policy “Road Safety Outside Schools” that describes how concerns over road safety outside schools will be investigated.

School leadership and parents also have a vital role to play in ensuring the safety of children on the journey to school. Therefore an assessment of the road safety education provided within the school and the school’s travel plan will always be undertaken alongside an assessment of the road safety situation outside the school gate.

Department for Transport regulations now allow the use of advisory “20 when lights show” with amber flashing lights on the approach to schools. However the influence of these signs on vehicle speeds is likely to be minimal and is not enforceable as it is an advisory sign, not a compulsory change in the speed limit. Regulations do not permit amber flashing lights to be used on the approach to signal controlled crossings or zebra crossings.

### **3. Procedure to decide whether to change a speed limit**

#### **STEP 1: Request to change a speed limit is received**

Any requests to change speed limits should be submitted to Surrey Highways via [www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk) or by calling 0300 200 1003. The Area Highways Team will then consider the request and if necessary will consult with the local member and local committee to decide whether to proceed with a full speed limit assessment. Reference will be made to the position of the road on the county council's Strategic Priority Network. If necessary the local committee may need to allocate funding for the speed limit assessment to be completed (to pay for speed surveys for example).

The Area Highway Team will determine the extent of the road to be assessed. The length of road over which a speed limit change is being considered should be at least 600m. This should ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist within a short space of road. However in some cases a slightly shorter length may be suitable where existing highway or roadside features provide a natural threshold which may complement a change in speed limit.

#### **STEP 2: Measure existing speeds and analyse road casualty data**

The Area Highways Team will commission one week automatic surveys of vehicle speeds (in both directions) in order to gather comprehensive data on existing mean vehicle speeds on the road. Several different speed survey locations may be required for longer stretches of road. If automatic surveys of vehicle speeds are not possible then a sample of speeds will be undertaken using a hand held speed measuring device at different times of the day to ensure the sample is representative.

Research has shown that reduced vehicle speeds reduce the risk of collision and also reduce the consequences and severity of any injuries, irrespective of the primary cause. Therefore the Road Safety Team will assess the number and pattern of road casualties along any route where a new speed limit is proposed, with particular attention given to vulnerable road casualties such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. This analysis will help inform the need for any speed management measures to reduce the risk of collisions and to reduce the severity of road casualties, especially vulnerable road users.

#### **STEP 3: Compare the existing speeds with the suggested new speed limit**

National policy issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) provides formulas derived from real examples of speed limit changes to predict the likely impact on traffic speeds of a change in speed limit. Table 2 shows the predicted reductions in mean vehicle speeds following a change to a new lower speed limit using the Department for Transport formulas.

For each speed limit change scenario within Table 2, a threshold is shown by a vertical line. If the measured existing mean speeds are below the threshold then the council will allow a change to a signed-only lower speed limit without supporting measures. If this is the case then proceed to STEP 5.

If the measured existing mean vehicle speeds are above the threshold, then the county council will not allow a lower speed limit without consideration of supporting engineering measures. In this case proceed to STEP 4.

It is anticipated that Table 2 presents data for the vast majority of speed limit change scenarios. However if there happens to be a scenario not covered by the table, then the Area Highways Manager will choose the example in the table that in their opinion provides the closest match to the case in question.

If more than one speed survey has been completed on a longer stretch of road, then it is possible that supporting engineering measures may be required on one part of the road, but not the other. Another option may be to introduce the proposed new lower speed limit on only one part of the road. Caution should be taken in cases where the proposed lower limit is above the existing measured mean speeds as this could have the effect of increasing mean speeds if drivers treat the new speed limit as a target.

Nearly all requests received in relation to speed limits are for a reduction in a speed limit. However though it is likely to be rare, it is also possible to consider a request for an increase in a speed limit. In these cases it should be assumed that this would have the effect which is the exact reverse of the effect of the equivalent speed limit reduction described within Table 2. Extreme care should be taken in any decision to increase a speed limit as this could result in increased speeds and increased risk and severity of collisions.

#### **STEP 4: Conduct feasibility of supporting engineering measures**

Where it is found that the existing measured mean vehicle speeds are too great for a signed-only change to a lower speed limit to be successful, then consideration of supporting engineering measures will be required.

The Area Highways Team will commission feasibility work on what measures may be possible. These may include traffic calming such as narrowing the road, chicanes, priority give-way arrangements, central islands, gateways, or vertical traffic calming. Speed reducing features could also form part of improved facilities for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. However some forms of traffic calming will not be appropriate on major routes with large traffic flows and heavy vehicles, and it may be the case that speed reducing features and a reduction in speed limit is not always viable or desirable for some strategically important roads. For example vertical traffic calming cannot be used on roads that are 40 mph or greater. Accordingly the feasibility work and decision to change a speed limit will need to take into account the position of the road within the county's Strategic Priority Network.

#### **STEP 5: Consult with Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team**

As Surrey police are responsible for the enforcement of speed limits it is essential that they are consulted on any proposals to change a speed limit and consideration of supporting engineering measures. Surrey police have a specialist Road Safety and Traffic Management Team who will be presented with the proposals for the new lower speed limit and any supporting engineering measures along with evidence of existing and predicted mean speeds and road casualty analysis. The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team will be recorded in writing and included within the subsequent report to the local committee. It may also be helpful to seek the views of local parish council's for inclusion within the report to the local committee too.



## **STEP 6: Local committee decision and allocation of funding**

A report describing the outcome of the speed limit assessment and recommendations will be submitted to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The report will include:

- a description of the position of the road within Surrey's Strategic Priority Network
- a summary of existing speed survey results
- a summary of the history and pattern of road collisions resulting in injury reported to the police, highlighting especially any vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people
- the predicted speeds following a change in speed limit
- recommendations for a new speed limit and supporting engineering measures if required
- estimated costs of the scheme
- the views of Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team

The local committee will then decide whether to proceed with the change in speed limit or not, along with supporting engineering measures (where also recommended). If the committee decide to proceed, then the committee will need to allocate money from their budget to fund the scheme. Alternatively the committee may decide not to proceed because the scheme is not warranted, or because they may have other priorities for investment of their budget at that time.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety.

## **STEP 7: Advertisement of legal speed limit order and implementation**

If the local committee decide to proceed with a speed limit change, then in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, a legal speed limit order will be advertised so that people have the opportunity to comment on the proposals if they wish to. Any objections will be considered in line with the county council's constitution. Following advertisement, and after any objections are resolved or over-ruled, then the scheme will be implemented by the county council's highway contractors. Alternatively if the objections are upheld, then the scheme will not proceed.

## **STEP 8: Monitoring of success of scheme**

After at least three months following implementation of the scheme, a one week automatic speed survey will be commissioned by the Area Highways Team. The "after" surveys will be undertaken using the same method as the "before" surveys to allow for a direct comparison to check whether the scheme has been successful in reducing vehicle speeds towards compliance with the new lower speed limit. The county council's Road Safety Team will compile data on before and after speed monitoring following speed limit changes so as to inform the need for any updates to this policy.

If the scheme has not been successful in reducing speeds to a level below the threshold contained within Table 2, then the Area Highway Manager will submit a further report to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The report will include a summary of the before and after speed surveys and consideration of

any further engineering measures that may be possible to encourage greater compliance with the new speed limit. An alternative could be to remove the new lower speed limit and return to the original or different, higher speed limit.

The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management team will be sought, recorded in writing and included within the report to the local committee. This will include an explanation of whether any additional police enforcement would be possible to encourage compliance with the new lower speed limit.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member responsible for road safety.

**Tables to Show Predicted Change in Mean Speeds Following a Change in Speed Limit**

The following definitions are used in the tables below and are the same as those used nationally by the Department for Transport in relation to setting speed limits. The formulas used to generate the values within the tables are taken from Annex A of "Setting Local Speed Limits", Department for Transport Circular 01/2013.

Urban – roads with a system of street lighting (three or more lamps throwing light on the carriageway and placed not more than 183 metres apart).

Rural – roads without a system of street lighting described above.

Rural Village – roads without a system of street lighting described above but with 20 or more houses (on one or both sides of the road); and a minimum length of 600 metres; and an average density of at least 3 houses per 100 metres, for each 100 metres.

**Table 1 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a reduction to a 20 mph speed limit (with traffic calming)**

|                            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measured mean speed before | 20   | 21   | 22   | 23   | 24   | 25   | 26   | 27   | 28   | 29   | 30   | 31   | 32   | 33   | 34   | 35   | 36   | 37   | 38   | 39   | 40   |
| Predicted mean speed after | 14.9 | 15.1 | 15.3 | 15.5 | 15.8 | 16.0 | 16.2 | 16.5 | 16.7 | 16.9 | 17.1 | 17.4 | 17.6 | 17.8 | 18.1 | 18.3 | 18.5 | 18.7 | 19.0 | 19.2 | 19.4 |

**Table 2 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a signed-only reduction in speed limit**

|   |                               |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Change from urban and rural 30 mph speed limit to 20 mph speed limit (without traffic calming)</b> |                               |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Measured mean speed before  | 20                            | 21   | 22   | 23   | 24   | 25  | 26   | 27   | 28   | 29   | 30   | 31   | 32   | 33   | 34   | 35   | 36   | 37   | 38   | 39   | 40   |
| Predicted mean speed after  | 19.9                          | 20.6 | 21.4 | 22.2 | 23.0 | 23.7  | 24.5 | 25.3 | 26.1 | 26.8 | 27.6 | 28.4 | 29.2 | 29.9 | 30.7 | 31.5 | 32.2 | 33.0 | 33.8 | 34.6 | 35.3 |
|   | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Change from urban 40 mph speed limit to 30 mph speed limit</b>                                     |                               |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Measured mean speed before  | 30                            | 31   | 32   | 33   | 34   | 35  | 36   | 37   | 38   | 39   | 40   | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47   | 48   | 49   | 50   |
| Predicted mean speed after  | 30.5                          | 30.7 | 30.9 | 31.2 | 31.4 | 31.7  | 31.9 | 32.2 | 32.4 | 32.7 | 32.9 | 33.2 | 33.4 | 33.7 | 33.9 | 34.1 | 34.4 | 34.6 | 34.9 | 35.1 | 35.4 |
|   | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Change from rural village 40 mph speed limit to 30mph speed limit</b>                              |                               |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Measured mean speed before  | 30                            | 31   | 32   | 33   | 34   | 35  | 36   | 37   | 38   | 39   | 40   | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47   | 48   | 49   | 50   |
| Predicted mean speed after  | 29.3                          | 30.1 | 30.9 | 31.6 | 32.4 | 33.2  | 33.9 | 34.7 | 35.4 | 36.2 | 37.0 | 37.7 | 38.5 | 39.3 | 40.0 | 40.8 | 41.6 | 42.3 | 43.1 | 43.8 | 44.6 |
|   | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| <b>Change from rural village 50 mph or 60 mph speed limit to 30 mph speed limit</b>                   |                               |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Measured mean speed before  | 30                            | 31   | 32   | 33   | 34   | 35  | 36   | 37   | 38   | 39   | 40   | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47   | 48   | 49   | 50   |
| Predicted mean speed after  | 29.2                          | 29.9 | 30.7 | 31.4 | 32.1 | 32.8  | 33.5 | 34.2 | 35.0 | 35.7 | 36.4 | 37.1 | 37.8 | 38.6 | 39.3 | 40.0 | 40.7 | 41.4 | 42.2 | 42.9 | 43.6 |
|   | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

**Table 2 Continued**

**Change from rural village 50 mph or 60 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit**

|                            |                               |      |      |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Measured mean speed before | 40                            | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47  | 48   | 49   | 50   | 51   | 52   | 53   | 54   | 55   | 56   | 57   | 58   | 59   | 60   |  |
| Predicted mean speed after | 37.5                          | 38.1 | 38.8 | 39.4 | 40.1 | 40.8 | 41.4 | 42.1  | 42.8 | 43.4 | 44.1 | 44.8 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 48.1 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 50.1 | 50.7 |  |
|                            | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |

**Change from rural single carriageway 50 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit**

|                            |                               |      |      |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Measured mean speed before | 40                            | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47  | 48   | 49   | 50   | 51   | 52   | 53   | 54   | 55   | 56   | 57   | 58   | 59   | 60   |  |
| Predicted mean speed after | 37.5                          | 38.1 | 38.8 | 39.4 | 40.1 | 40.8 | 41.4 | 42.1  | 42.8 | 43.4 | 44.1 | 44.8 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 46.7 | 47.4 | 48.1 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 50.1 | 50.7 |  |
|                            | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |

**Change from rural single carriageway 60 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit**

|                            |                               |      |      |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Measured mean speed before | 40                            | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47  | 48   | 49   | 50   | 51   | 52   | 53   | 54   | 55   | 56   | 57   | 58   | 59   | 60   |  |
| Predicted mean speed after | 38.7                          | 39.4 | 40.1 | 40.9 | 41.6 | 42.3 | 43.0 | 43.7  | 44.5 | 45.2 | 45.9 | 46.6 | 47.4 | 48.1 | 48.8 | 49.5 | 50.2 | 51.0 | 51.7 | 52.4 | 53.1 |  |
|                            | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |

**Change from rural single carriageway 60 mph speed limit to 50 mph speed limit**

|                            |                               |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measured mean speed before | 50                            | 51   | 52   | 53   | 54   | 55   | 56   | 57   | 58  | 59   | 60   | 61   | 62   | 63   | 64   | 65   | 66   | 67   | 68   | 69   | 70   |
| Predicted mean speed after | 47.6                          | 48.3 | 49.1 | 49.9 | 50.6 | 51.4 | 52.2 | 53.0 | 53.7  | 54.5 | 55.3 | 56.0 | 56.8 | 57.6 | 58.4 | 59.1 | 59.9 | 60.7 | 61.5 | 62.2 | 63.0 |
|                            | New lower speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

**Changes on rural dual carriageways from 70 mph, 60 mph, or 50 mph to a lower limit**

|                            |                                      |      |      |      |      |      |      |                                      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measured mean speed before | 40                                   | 41   | 42   | 43   | 44   | 45   | 46   | 47                                   | 48   | 49   | 50   | 51   | 52   | 53   | 54   | 55   | 56   | 57   | 58   | 59   | 60   |
| Predicted mean speed after | 42.8                                 | 43.3 | 43.8 | 44.4 | 44.9 | 45.4 | 45.9 | 46.5                                 | 47.0 | 47.5 | 48.0 | 48.6 | 49.1 | 49.6 | 50.1 | 50.7 | 51.2 | 51.7 | 52.2 | 52.8 | 53.3 |
|                            | New lower 40 mph speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      | New lower 50 mph speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

|                            |                                      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Measured mean speed before | 60                                   | 61   | 62   | 63   | 64   | 65   | 66   | 67   | 68   | 69   | 70   | 71   | 72   | 73   | 74   | 75   | 76   | 77   | 78   | 79   | 80   |
| Predicted mean speed after | 53.3                                 | 53.8 | 54.4 | 54.9 | 55.4 | 55.9 | 56.5 | 57.0 | 57.5 | 58.0 | 58.6 | 59.1 | 59.6 | 60.1 | 60.7 | 61.2 | 61.7 | 62.2 | 62.8 | 63.3 | 63.8 |
|                            | New lower 60 mph speed limit allowed |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

Summary of representations received to the advertised TRO's dated 30<sup>th</sup> March 2017

|   | Organisation            | Proposal            | Comments   | WBC Response  |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Woking Taxi Association | General<br><br>WITP | <p>Note: Some of the comments refer to the planning application for the temporary control room at 5A The Broadway (private hire area) app ref 2017/0141. These comments have been removed as this a planning matter for WBC.</p> <p>The relocation of the taxi rank with the private hire remaining at 5a will impact on business. The position of the private hire area (5a The Broadway) close to the start of the taxi rank will confuse users.</p> <p>The position of the proposed taxi rank requires access to the driver's side of the vehicle. For DDA access the vehicle provides wheelchair access on the opposite side of the vehicle. This will result in wheelchair users being wheeled into the carriageway to access the vehicle.</p> <p>The position of the Taxi rank will reduce visibility at the private hire access at 5a Broadway, which is already a problem.</p> <p>The scheme does not address the congestion created around the private hire area, as their car park is limited to 4</p> | <p>This will be mitigated by providing a kerb build out in the vicinity with a pole and flag indicating the start of the taxi rank.</p> <p>The existing position of the taxi rank to the west of the rail station already presents difficulties with the position of the wall preventing wheelchair access. The proposed layout can be considered at the stage 3 Road Safety Audit, and if deemed necessary, a further disabled bay could be considered nearby on Chertsey Road.</p> <p>The Town Centre proposals include a proposal to reduce the speed limit along Broadway from 30mph to 20mph. This reduced speed requires a lesser visibility splay, so this issue is mitigated.</p> <p>Alternatives are being considered.</p> |

|   |   |         |  |   |
|---|---|---------|--|---|
|   |   | General | <p>vehicles.</p> <p>The introduction of a one-way street will increase activity and therefore congestion. This will impact on the time and therefore the cost for their customers.</p> <p>The new position of the Taxi rank is a 100m walk from the station, and doesn't provide any weather protection for customers.</p> <p>General comments: Taxi's should be permitted to use the town centre bus lanes.</p> | <p>The aim of the proposals is to reduce congestion in this area of the town centre by restricting vehicular access along High Street, so activity will not be increased as assumed in this representation.</p> <p>The front of the taxi rank is closer to the station than some of the bus stops. It is WBC intention to provide a new "Gate Line" onto Platform 1 at the end of the bus stops, thereby even closer to the new Taxi Rank.</p> <p>A zebra crossing is provided to assist access. The length of the taxi rank is increased in length from that which exists to allow more taxi's to wait which will reduce the waiting time.</p> |
| 2 | Woking Food Bank, Lighthouse 8-10 High Street | WITP    | <p>Their operation requires unscheduled pick-up and drop-off of large quantities of food, which cannot be taken on foot, from/to a wide range of donators including schools, social workers, and churches. They are concerned that obtaining a permit is impractical.</p>  | <p>This representation is not related to the specific TRO's advertised at this time. It is related to the future Experimental Order for restricted access on High Street which is not yet formally open for representations. In any case the proposed White List of vehicles with permitted access will address these issues.</p>   |
| 3 | Bryan Cross – Marjorie Richardson Centre      | WITP    | <p>Concerned that private cars will not be allowed into the High Street during opening hours to deliver or collect. Worried that disabled access will be prevented to Woking <b>CAB</b> and general</p>  | <p>As above</p>   |

|   |   |      |   |          |
|---|---|------|---|----------|
|   |   |      | disabled access will be stopped.  |          |
| 4 | David Maskell<br>– Coign<br>Church            | WITP | Concerned about operation of Woking Food Bank and the requirement for food pick-up from Lighthouse and Nandos<br><br>Similar concerns to ref 2 and 3 above.   | As above |
| 5 | Councillor Ian Johnson                        | WITP | Concerned about how the Food Bank will operate.<br><br>Similar concerns to ref 2 and 3 above.   | As above |
| 6 | Bryan Cross                                   | WITP | Concerned about how the Food Bank and Marjorie Richardson Centre will operate.<br><br>Similar concerns to ref 2 and 3 above.  | As above |
| 7 | The Lighthouse                                | WITP | Similar concerns to ref 2 and 3 above.  | As above |
| 8 | Steve Harridge<br>– Church Path<br>Businesses | WITP | Restricted hours will impact on operations to the point where shops will close. Some units have over 20 suppliers (with regular changes of the vehicle used) so it will be a hopeless task to register their number plate in advance of the delivery. | As above |

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Woking JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 6.00 pm on 22 March 2017  
at Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking GU21 6YL.

**9/17 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS FOR THE WOKING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE PACKAGE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION) [Item 8]**

The Project Manager for Town Centre Development introduced the report which set out the changes to a number of Traffic Regulation Orders which are required to enable the delivery of the Woking Integrated Transport Package in Woking Town Centre.

An amendment was tabled which contained a number of updated plans which were not available when the report was published, as well as further clarification on some of the schemes included in the report.

**Comments in response**

Member comments:

1. In response to concerns about access to Lloyds car park and deliveries to the retail unit it was noted the Borough would work with Woking Shopping security to manage access for authorised users 24/7. **WBC officers will be considering this going forward.**
2. The barrier at the junction with the High Street will be moved slightly to prevent the High Street from becoming blocked. **Yes – this is currently being drawn up in the plans.**
3. It is proposed to provide a disabled parking bay outside the Marjory Richardson Centre. **Yes – current plans and TRO plans show this.**
4. The committee questioned whether an additional drop off was required on the north side of the station, **Consider traffic flows once new layout has established and settled** and asked for the drop off area at Brewery Road to be monitored. **WBC officers will be considering this going forward.**
5. The pedestrian crossing by the Bedser Bridge is currently showing that it will go straight across rather than be staggered and concerns were raised about the impact on traffic flows along Victoria Way. It was explained that the crossing was still under review and designs were being worked up which would provide a balance between pedestrian and traffic flow. **This element of the Woking Town Centre transport proposals has been dropped from the scheme due to the concerns raised by SCC colleagues, so this will not be advertised or implemented.**
6. Members highlighted concerns around potential conflicts between taxis and cyclists on Broadway and asked officers to relook at this. **This layout design was accepted by the SCC Safety Audit team and the police but will be looked at again as part of the S278 Phase 3 RSA when the road has been built.**
7. Concerns were raised about the bus lane and the effect that this would have on traffic turning left off Victoria Way into Chobham Road as well as traffic going straight on. It was noted that the bus lane had been modelled and would be acceptable. The Planning Committee has requested that this could be put in temporarily and if it caused added congestion then it could be removed. **Yes, it can be put in and then removed if it does cause highway safety concerns.**
8. Members requested a bedding in period for residents to get used to the changes in the Town Centre before any enforcement action is taken. **The Experimental TRO will be implemented once the Broadway works are complete, however the camera enforcement is likely to follow on after that, allowing this bedding in period.**

This page is intentionally left blank



**SITE PLAN**  
SCALE 1:1250

**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

NOTE: THE PROPERTY OF THIS DRAWING AND DESIGN IS VESTED IN VECTOS INFRASTRUCTURE LTD. IT MUST NOT BE COPIED OR REPRODUCED IN ANY WAY WITHOUT THEIR PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

| REV | DETAILS                            | DRAWN | CHECKED | DATE     |
|-----|------------------------------------|-------|---------|----------|
| A   | GENERAL LAYOUT AND DETAILS REVISED | KGS   | -       | 16.09.16 |
| B   | SUBMITTED FOR TECHNICAL APPROVAL   | KGS   | PW      | 23.12.16 |

- NOTES**
1. THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY IS SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL (SCC)
  2. BOUNDARIES SHOWN ARE INDICATIVE ONLY BASED ON STOPPING UP ORDERS AND SCC HIGHWAY BOUNDARIES

- KEY**
- - - SECTION 278 BOUNDARY
  - - - PHASE 3 AREA OUTLINE
  - - - PHASE 4 AREA OUTLINE
  - - - PHASE 5 AREA OUTLINE

|   |                      |   |                                  |
|---|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>PROJECT</b><br>WOKING TOWN CENTRE                    |                      | <b>CLIENT</b><br>WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL |                                  |
| <b>DRAWING TITLE</b><br>PHASES 3, 4, 5<br>SITE OVERVIEW |                      |   |                                  |
| <b>DRAWN</b><br>KGS                                     | <b>CHECKED</b><br>PW | <b>DATE</b><br>04.03.2016               | <b>SCALE AT A1</b><br>1:1250@ A1 |

Network Building, 97 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4TP  
t: 020 7580 7373 e: enquiries@vectos.co.uk

**DRAWING NUMBER**  
VD15278-03-0100

**REVISION**  
B







**SITE PLAN**  
SCALE 1:1250

**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

NOTE: THE PROPERTY OF THIS DRAWING AND DESIGN IS VESTED IN VECTOS INFRASTRUCTURE LTD. IT MUST NOT BE COPIED OR REPRODUCED IN ANY WAY WITHOUT THEIR PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

| REV | DETAILS                            | DRAWN | CHECKED | DATE     |
|-----|------------------------------------|-------|---------|----------|
| A   | GENERAL LAYOUT AND DETAILS REVISED | KGS   | -       | 16.09.16 |
| B   | SUBMITTED FOR TECHNICAL APPROVAL   | KGS   | PW      | 23.12.16 |

**NOTES**

1. THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY IS SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL (SCC)
2. BOUNDARIES SHOWN ARE INDICATIVE ONLY BASED ON STOPPING UP ORDERS AND SCC HIGHWAY BOUNDARIES

**KEY**

- - - SECTION 278 BOUNDARY
- - - PHASE 3 AREA OUTLINE
- - - PHASE 4 AREA OUTLINE
- - - PHASE 5 AREA OUTLINE



|   |                      |   |                                  |
|---|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| <b>PROJECT</b><br>WOKING TOWN CENTRE                    |                      | <b>CLIENT</b><br>WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL |                                  |
| <b>DRAWING TITLE</b><br>PHASES 3, 4, 5<br>SITE OVERVIEW |                      |   |                                  |
| <b>DRAWN</b><br>KGS                                     | <b>CHECKED</b><br>PW | <b>DATE</b><br>04.03.2016               | <b>SCALE AT A1</b><br>1:1250@ A1 |

Network Building, 97 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4TP  
t: 020 7580 7373 e: enquiries@vectos.co.uk

**DRAWING NUMBER**  
VD15278-03-0100

**REVISION**  
B



# Bedser Bridge Toucan Crossing, Woking

Technical Note June 2017

---

## Introduction

There are a number of issues regarding the proposed Bedser Bridge Crossing. At present there is a staggered Toucan Crossing which links the Brewery Road Car Park and the town centre near the Woking Borough Council Offices.

Surrey County Council (SCC) Officers have made the following comments on the proposal to change the layout of the Toucan crossing in order to provide a straight across arrangement.

## SCC Comments

### SCC Local Area Highways Manager

Would not support any proposal for a single stage crossing, and would very strongly support leaving the existing crossing as it is. There is no need to modify the operation as it works perfectly well at present.

### SCC Safety Engineering Team Leader

The following comments regarding the proposed toucan crossing are extracted from the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit.as part of the design process:

Controlled crossing across A320 adjacent to Light Box Summary:

Risk of pedestrian / cycle confusion and conflict. The existing staggered controlled crossing, which operates as two separate crossings is proposed to be replaced with two separate controlled crossings which are aligned with each other. There is concern that pedestrians and cyclists will believe that the controlled crossing is a 'straight across' facility and attempt to cross both west and eastbound A320 carriageways in one movement. Conflict with A320 traffic is likely to result. NB. The proposed crossing will have no audible indicators.

The existing staggered controlled crossing, which operates as two separate crossings is proposed to be replaced with two separate controlled crossings which are aligned with each other. On occasions, due to the observed heavy pedestrian / cyclist demand, both crossings will show a red signal for traffic / green signal for pedestrians and cyclists, which will allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross both A320 westbound and eastbound carriageways in one movement. There is concern that pedestrians and cyclists may expect to cross both sides of the crossing on every occasion and hence may attempt to cross both sides of the A320 carriageway regardless of the status of the pedestrian / cycle aspect. Conflict with A320 traffic is likely to result on occasions when only one crossing displays a green man / green cycle aspect.

Pedestrians / cyclists from the southern side of the A320 controlled crossing facility will cross the westbound carriageway when traffic stops and a green man / cycle aspect is shown. However, northbound pedestrians and cyclists may view southbound pedestrians / cyclists

crossing the adjacent crossing across the eastbound A320 (which operates independently) at the same time. Northbound pedestrians / cyclists may therefore assume that they are able to cross both carriageways in one movement, without realising that the eastbound A320 traffic is about to proceed / the status of the controlled crossing has changed to a red man / red cycle aspect. Northbound pedestrians / cyclists entering the eastbound A320 carriageway (to reach the northern footway) are at risk of conflict with eastbound traffic, especially with eastbound traffic travelling within the nearside lane (as vehicles in the nearside lane may have received a green signal for several seconds by the time pedestrians / cyclists occupy the nearside lane). This is of concern due to the potential speed of eastbound vehicles within the existing 40mph speed limit, as well as the fact that traffic in the offside lane may mask pedestrians / cyclists attempting to cross the carriageway. NB. This situation remains a concern for southbound pedestrians / cyclists crossing the carriageway in the opposite direction to reach the southern footway.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**Retain existing staggered crossing facility.**

**Provide a speed limit reduction to 30mph extending from Church Street West to Chobham Road to the east (possibly to Chertsey Road).**

---

## **SCC Senior Transport Planner**

Following comments based on information provided by Vectos, the Transport Consultant:

An audit of the modelling provided by Vectos has been completed. The modelling represents the various scenarios to the satisfaction of SCC.

The options are as follows:

Scenario T37b - layout as existing staggered crossing. No activations of the crossing in the AM and PM as ped flow surveys showed minimal flow. Saturday included ped activity.

Scenario T51 - layout shows a straight crossing running as two separate stages. The crossings are called every cycle in all time periods.

Scenario T52 - layout shows a straight crossing running in one stage. The crossings are called every cycle in all time periods.

In terms of degrees of saturation, in all scenarios the maximum degree of saturation on the approach to the crossing is 64% (under the 90% 'threshold'). Vectos have stated that the queue will not block back to the Peacocks junction and summing the queue lengths together confirms this.

When comparing the results for T51 and T52, there is an increase in the degree of saturation and queue lengths with the straight single stage crossing in T52 as opposed to the straight two stage crossing in T51, but the degrees of saturation are well below the level at which SCC would be concerned.

**In summary, the modelling shows more delay in the T51 straight across in one stage scenario, but this is not at a level which would cause too much concern. If the**



**crossing were to be called more frequently than once per cycle, the impact on traffic would be greater.**

---

## SCC Local Services Group Manager

Would not support a straight across crossing due to concerns regarding possible increased congestion along Victoria Way.

---

## SCC Traffic Systems Team

Had the following comments:

We do not support modifying the crossing to a facility where all the vehicular approaches are stopped whilst pedestrians/cyclists are signalled across the A320. The existing staggered arrangement works very well.

From a technical point of view, LTN 2/95 says to consider staggered crossings if the carriageway is wider than 11m and not to use a single direct crossing if the carriageway is wider than 15m. A single direct crossing will require a significant period of time in order to ensure that pedestrians can cross the A320 safely (5 traffic lanes and the central reserve). The requirements and priorities of the frail and elderly are significantly different from those of young adults or children. The single direct crossing will result in lengthy pedestrian greens and intergreens. It is likely that the pedestrian stage will only be able to be called once every signal cycle because traffic demand is high. This will mean that pedestrians are faced with significant delay waiting for a green man/cycle signal and that there may be a wider window of opportunity for pedestrians to cross the carriageway if a more traditional staggered form of crossing was provided.

Furthermore, a long cycle time can be significant in off-peak periods when it would be advantageous to operate a short cycle time but the presence of the long crossing hinders the flexibility of the cycle time of the junction.

I wish to add that we do not support modifying the existing crossing to a 2-stream crossing with no stagger facility. We agree with the comments submitted by the Road Safety team. In addition, where far-side pedestrian/cycle signals are provided, confusion can be caused if the pedestrian signal can be seen simultaneously. A waiting pedestrian/cyclist will likely "see through" a red signal to a green signal at the opposite crossing. Careful alignment and louvres to limit the field of view will be required and they are not always effective because the louvre does not always have the flexibility and wide range of adjustment. Furthermore, the storage area within the central reserve has been reduced in size which may increase overcrowding within the central reserve due to insufficient space if there are large numbers of cyclists, disabled pedestrians in wheelchairs, pedestrians with small children and pushchairs, etc. The size of the waiting area needs to be carefully considered.

In conclusion we do not support the modifying the crossing to one without a staggered pedestrian facility.

## Options

1. Do nothing; Or rather retain existing toucan crossing as it currently operates
2. Provide straight across layout with two stage phasing
3. Provide straight across layout with one phase straight across movements

## Conclusions

On balance it is considered that the changes to the crossing will not be beneficial to pedestrian movements or safety.

PROPOSED SPEED REDUCTION VICTORIA WAY, WOKING  
Comments from Surrey County Council Officers

---

I have discussed this previously with Louisa and indicated that I would have no objection to this proposal. From the data that you have supplied, the mean speeds are within the parameters allowed in your Speed Limit Policy for this to be changed to a 30mph limit without any further speed reducing measures being introduced. Also with the proposed introduction of the bus along the eastern bound carriageway of Victoria Way from Lockfield Drive to Chobham Road, this is likely to slow vehicle speeds even further.

Therefore given all of the above I can confirm that I have no objection to this speed limit change. The only thing that must be understood is that given the physical nature of Victoria Way it would be impossible for us to be able to carry out any speed enforcement from either hand held equipment or the camera vans. If there were complaints of vehicles exceeding the speed limit and enforcement was required then it would have to come via fixed position cameras. I raise this so there is no misunderstanding in the future.

Graham Cannon

Road Safety & Traffic Management

**VICTORIA SQUARE / BANDSTAND  
A320 VICTORIA WAY  
WOKING  
PROPOSED SIGNAL DETAILS FOR PHASE 3  
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT STAGE 2**

---

B1.4. PROBLEM (Location B, C & D Appendix B – controlled crossing across A320 adjacent to Light Box) Summary: risk of pedestrian / cycle confusion and conflict. Pedestrians / cyclists from the southern side of the A320 controlled crossing facility adjacent to the Light Box, will cross the westbound carriageway when traffic stops and a green man / cycle aspect is shown. However, northbound pedestrians and cyclists may view southbound pedestrians / cyclists crossing the adjacent crossing across the eastbound A320 (which operates independently) at the same time. Northbound pedestrians / cyclists may therefore assume that they are able to cross both carriageways in one movement, without realising that the eastbound A320 traffic is about to proceed / the status of the controlled crossing has changed to a red man / red cycle aspect. Northbound pedestrians / cyclists entering the eastbound A320 carriageway (to reach the northern footway) are at risk of conflict with eastbound traffic, especially with eastbound traffic travelling within the nearside lane (as vehicles in the nearside lane may have received a green signal for several seconds by the time pedestrians / cyclists occupy the nearside lane). This is of concern due to the potential speed of eastbound vehicles within the existing 40mph speed limit, as well as the fact that traffic in the offside lane may mask pedestrians / cyclists attempting to cross the carriageway. NB. This situation remains a concern for southbound pedestrians / cyclists crossing the carriageway in the opposite direction to reach the southern footway.

RECOMMENDATION Retain existing staggered crossing facility.

**Provide a speed limit reduction to 30mph extending from Church Street West to Chobham Road to the east (possibly to Chertsey Road).**

**From SCC Area Highways Manager**

Would not support a reduction of speed limit as it is not felt that a change would amend the average vehicle speeds and therefore would not make Victoria Way safer.

Considers that Victoria Way is a strategic road link and not part of the town centre.

Any changes to Victoria Way should seek to reduce vehicular congestion so far as is practicable.

**SCC Road Safety Team Manager**

I would be supportive of a 30 mph limit on Victoria Way for the following reasons.

The current speed limit of 40 mph is inappropriate for a town centre where we want to support the economic vibrancy of the shops and businesses by making it a pleasant place to be. This includes the off peak period where speeds could be greater and more problematical with increased presence of pedestrians associated with a successful night time economy (cinema, theatres, pubs, bars and restaurants).

The road has signalised crossing points where there are comparatively large numbers of vulnerable road users (pedestrians and cyclists). Encouraging lower speeds will reduce the risk of collision and the consequences.

There have been some collisions along Victoria Way, focussed at the junctions and include shunts for example. Although these might not be recorded as speed related (as they will be within the existing speed limit), lower speeds will reduce the number of these type of collisions and the consequences.

Reducing the speed limit to 30 mph would reduce the signage clutter and ongoing maintenance because the current 40 mph limit requires illuminated terminal signing at every boundary with the surrounding 30 mph roads, as well as a number of repeater signs. All of these will be removed if there is a 30 mph limit throughout the town centre.

Slower and smoother vehicle speeds with a 30 mph limit (as opposed to faster acceleration and deceleration between junctions and queues within a 40 mph limit) will reduce pollution and emissions, so helping to improve air quality. It will also reduce noise.

Speed surveys have confirmed that the proposed 30 mph limit meets our speed limit policy requirements.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL SAFETY ENGINEERING TEAM ACCIDENT REPORT (Summary Table)

FOR PERIOD : 01/02/14 TO 28/02/2017

A320 Victoria Way, Woking (Incl. Jct. Goldsworth Road and Brook House roundabout)

| <b>Road Name</b>  | <b>Date</b> | <b>Severity</b> | <b>Excessive Speed</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| A320 Victoria Way | 07/02/14    | serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 13/02/14    | slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 02/03/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 18/03/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 04/04/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 15/05/14    | Serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 19/05/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 29/05/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 19/06/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 08/08/14    | Slight          | No                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 19/09/14    | Serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 07/11/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 15/12/14    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 27/01/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 03/03/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 21/05/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 28/05/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 06/08/15    | Serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 22/08/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 22/11/15    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 01/01/16    | Serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 15/01/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 05/02/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 20/06/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 01/07/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 08/07/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 14/07/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 22/07/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 26/11/16    | Serious         | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 30/11/16    | Slight          | no                     |
| A320 Victoria Way | 05/01/17    | Slight          | no                     |
|                   |             |                 |                        |

This page is intentionally left blank