



Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 11 December 2013

Petitions [Item 5]

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Nick Norman, Normandy Action Group Attracting 95 signatures (submitted to SCC website) Speaker: Sir Michael Aaronson
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Worplesdon / Normandy
Summary of concerns and requests	<i>We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to introduce appropriate "slow down" signage plus traffic calming measures in Glaziers Lane, Normandy in order to improve safety for road users and local pedestrians. Particularly in the area of the north of Glaziers Lane where the railway bridge crosses the North Downs line at an oblique angle. This induces vehicles to negotiate the bridge dangerously in the middle of the road at its apex. The introduction of appropriate "slow down" signage plus traffic calming measures (such as speed bumps, road width reduction and single lane passing) on the approaches to the railway bridge would mitigate this danger by managing the flow of traffic and its speed.</i>
Response	This request had been submitted previously by Normandy Parish Council and was considered by the Transportation Task Group for inclusion in the 2014/15 programme of schemes, see agenda item 12. Highways officers advised the task group that Surrey Police were in the process of checking vehicle speeds in Glaziers Lane. Subject to these checks new vehicle activated signs, as well as other signs and roads markings, would be installed. These would be funded by the local SCC member from his committee allocations. In view of this the task group did not prioritise further traffic calming, since they considered the efficacy of planned work should be assessed first.

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Annelize Kidd, resident of Merrow Woods Attracting 51 signatures as submitted to SCC
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Guildford East / Merrow
Summary of concerns and requests	<i>To slow down through traffic at Merrow Woods</i>
Response	The petition will be considered by the committee's Transportation Task Group and a response will be provided to the next formal meeting of the committee on 12 March 2014.

TABLED ITEM

Principal petitioner/ organisation	Mrs E Loch, resident of Onslow Village Attracting 401 signatures
SCC Division / GBC Ward	Guildford South West / Onslow
Summary of concerns and requests	<i>This petition calls upon Surrey County Council to adopt a 20mph speed limit in the follow streets: Queen Eleanors Road, Elmside, Thorn Bank, Friars Gate, Curling Vale, Litchfield Way, Vicarage Gate, The Square, Orchard Road, Bannisters Road, Hedgeway, East Meads, West Meads, Ellis Avenue, Powell Close and Wilderness Road.</i>
Response	The petition will be considered by the committee's Transportation Task Group and a response will be provided to the next formal meeting of the committee on 12 March 2014.

Public Questions and Statements [Item 6]

1. Submitted by Jim Allen, resident of Burpham.

Please can all pedestrian crossings in Burpham be re-timed to align with timings in central Guildford?

It has long been thought in Burpham that the pedestrian crossing timings are -poorly assigned meaning pedestrians wait for 50 seconds before change - no matter density of traffic - in Central Guildford they are instantaneous on button push. - This leads to pedestrians crossing on Red with the road clear and the lights changing after the pedestrian has crossed. The poor timing also means if the pedestrian crosses the road on green man they can be over 50 yards away before the lights go Green - this does not occur in Central Guildford - re timing will increase road capacity and improve traffic flow by not delaying motorists.

Answer

All but one of the signal controlled crossings in the area covered by the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan are Toucan crossings, catering for both cyclists and pedestrians, while the great majority of those in the town centre are Pelican crossings.

Toucan crossings have detection equipment which senses pedestrians and cyclist using the crossing and can extend the green man time. Pelicans do not have this equipment.

Toucans hold traffic on red, then red/amber, then green, the same as a signal controlled junction. Pelicans hold traffic on red, then flashing amber at which time drivers can proceed if the crossing is clear (at the same time displaying flashing red man/green man to those crossing), then green.

The crossings Burpham and the town centre are located in roads with 30mph speed limits. However, where *measured* speeds on the approaches exceed 35mph both Pelicans and Toucans must be equipped with additional remote loops embedded in the road surface which detect any vehicles travelling at higher speeds and automatically extends the vehicle green and the subsequent vehicle red, both by two to four seconds.

TABLED ITEM

This feature is intended to reduce the risk of shunt accidents, loss of control accidents and perhaps most importantly vehicle/pedestrian or cyclist accidents.

The crossings in Burpham are located in roads with higher measured speeds, so are equipped with remote vehicle detection, while those in the town centre are generally not since measured approach speeds are less than 35mph.

For the reasons above, the Toucans crossings in Burpham will differ notably in operation from the Pelican crossings in the town centre, generally with a greater delay in going to red for vehicles, and also holding traffic on red for longer. Both are a consequence of inherent design features added in the interest of road safety.

2. Submitted by Kate Dumbleton, Fairways RA

As Chair of Fairway Residents Association, when the issue of time limited parking outside the shops on the Epsom Road in Meroo is considered, I would like to make the Committee aware that Fairway is a private road and is already experiencing problems with shoppers parking in the road. Whilst there is little that can be done to prevent such parking, can the Committee please take into account the likelihood this problem will only get worse if and when parking restrictions outside the shops are introduced. Can the Committee therefore help alleviate our problem by authorising road signs on each side of the entrance to Fairway as follows "FAIRWAY – PRIVATE ROAD – NO PARKING"?

Answer

Highways officers will check, but we believe the grassed splays at the junction of Fairway with the Epsom Road do not form part of the public highway. If this is the case, the Residents Association can erect signs here without the consent of Surrey County Council as Highway Authority.

3. Submitted by Amanda Mullarkey, Cranley Road Area RA

Re: Cranley Road Area Controlled Parking Zone

Please will the committee agree to a pause in the schools area order [TRO] to enable a meeting to be held between Officers and Cranley Road Area Residents' Association to consider the impact of the proposals on the schools area?

In view of:

- the absence of a consultation prior to embarking on a statutory process,
- the commitment to engagement in the Statement of Community Involvement,
- the serving of statutory notices as the only means of consultation (on lampposts for a 21 day period during the summer holiday when so many people were away or getting ready to do so),
- the absence of follow up with those who did respond and request a meeting,
- the constructive approach to partnership between Cranley Road Area Residents' Association, the Council and Councillors, and
- the absence of notification that the matter would be considered in September,

And noting:

- Cranley Road Area Residents' Association has worked closely with Tormead School to secure significant changes to coach parking in the vicinity of the school,

TABLED ITEM

- the importance of basing decisions on up to date experience of parking issues in the area rather than comments made some time ago or before the controls in this and surrounding areas were introduced, and
- that the Council is poised to formally advise only those who managed to respond in the summer holiday that the measures will be implemented subject to changes agreed in September,

Answer

The proposed change was agreed by the Committee in September after careful consideration of the representations made. The agreed change is to reposition limited waiting parking bays closer to the schools and to reduce the limited waiting period in bays closest to the schools from 4 hours to 2 hours. The idea is to make more space around the schools available for parents waiting to pick up children so they do not resort to parking on yellow lines and in other areas where parking causes more congestion. The change was proposed because in 2009 when we made a smaller change of this nature we received over 100 requests from parents, teachers and residents to look at more wide-ranging changes.

A proposed scheme was agreed by the Committee and on 12 July 2013 statutory notices were placed on lampposts and a notice was published in the local paper inviting objections by 9 August 2013 (28 days). This is the way required in the legalisation for publicising proposed changes to parking restrictions. The usual period for objections is 21 days but we extended it to 28 days because the dates fell in the holiday period. We also took the step of writing to organisations that may have a particular view and this included the schools, The Cranley Road Area Residents Association (CRARA) and Pit Farm Tennis Club. Until now, we have not received a reply from CRARA but received considerable correspondence from the tennis club.

We received 42 representations concerning the proposals around Cranley Road and this included a 124-signature petition. All but two of the representations focused on the effect on the tennis club. Of the representations that did not relate to the tennis club one was from a resident who was generally supportive of the changes and the second was from Mrs Mullarkey. Mrs Mullarkey was concerned about the effect on her property and the effect of the proposed changes generally.

Mrs Mullarkey said in her representation that she would be happy to discuss her comments. Her representation clearly set out what she objected to and why and so we did not need a meeting. Our acknowledgement of her representation told her that the comments would be considered at a future meeting of the Local Committee and they were presented to the September meeting. The Committee agreed to implement the scheme with a number of minor amendments.

The controlled parking zone was extended to Cranley Road in 2006 and the requests for more parking outside the schools for parents were made in 2009. The problems with parking outside the school continue although we are aware that significant changes have been made to coach parking. However, these do not remove the problem or the reason for the change. The process we followed to implement the change was more than required by

TABLED ITEM

the regulations and in accordance with our normal process, Mrs Malarkey's concerns were considered as part of the process, and the change has been agreed. There is no reason to delay the implementation of the changes which are intended to benefit both parents picking up and residents in the area but if Mrs Malarkey's concerns are realised the restrictions can be reviewed in the future.

3. Statement submitted by Keith Chesterton, Chairman Guildford Cycle Forum

Re: Proposed Mount Pleasant One Way

On behalf of the Guildford Cycle Forum & cyclists generally, we request that the Committee do not proceed with this scheme.

We understand from the Guildford Dragon website, that the proposal is for traffic to be allowed to go only downhill to the Portsmouth Road.

Mount Pleasant is used by cyclists going between Portsmouth Road, coming from the Godalming direction, and the Royal Surrey Hospital, the University & the Farnham Road area, to avoid using the town centre gyratory. Whilst Mount Pleasant is steep, using it is much preferable for cyclists than descending down Portsmouth Road to High Street/Park Street, braving the dangers of the gyratory and then having to climb back up over the Farnham Road railway bridge.

This proposal forces cyclists to use roads classified by the Surrey Travel Smart team as "hostile" to cyclists. In addition to increasing the danger to cyclists, we feel sure few motorists would appreciate more cyclists using these already very congested roads.

Secondly, making roads one-way leads to higher traffic speeds as drivers recognise that they will not be faced by on-coming traffic. The possibility of meeting traffic coming in the opposite direction has a natural traffic calming effect (as in Castle Hill). Increased speed cannot be good for the safety of all of those using Mount Pleasant – motorists, pedestrians and cyclists - because it is a narrow and winding road.

Thirdly, the extent of 'rat running' through Wherwell Road and Wodeland Avenue is already a concern for local residents as drivers travelling from Farnham Road to the Portsmouth Road seek to avoid travelling around the gyratory. In our view, this proposal will inevitably result in more traffic being encouraged to use this route through these residential roads as drivers will perceive that there will be less likelihood of facing congestion from being confronted by traffic travelling in the opposite direction.

For these reasons we urge the Committee to reject this proposal.

We would add, that if the aim is to prevent rat-running, this could best be achieved by closing Mount Pleasant to all motor traffic & making it a pedestrian/cyclists only road (apart from residents) although this might prove a step too far!

Answer

The aims of the making Mount Pleasant one-way in a southerly direction are to reduce rat running along residential roads between the A3100 Portsmouth Road and the A31 Farnham Road, and to improve road safety, particularly at the junction of Mount Pleasant with The Mount and Wodelands Avenue. The scheme is recommended for inclusion in the 2014/15 highways programme on today's agenda.

TABLED ITEM

The committee would like to thank Mr Chesterton for identifying potential safety and amenity issues for all road users. Should the recommendation to include in the Mount Pleasant in the 2014/15 programme be agreed, Highways officers are asked to address these issues in consultation with the Guildford Cycle Forum, which Mr Chesterton represents

Member Questions [Item 7]

1. Submitted by Councillor Bob McShee

There is already heavy congestion at the Tesco Roundabout, Egerton Road, during the rush hour, and with the imminent opening of the Onslow Park and Ride further congestion will be caused. Traffic lights at this roundabout had previously been proposed, so when will the traffic lights be installed to prevent additional traffic delays in this area?

Answer

Through the Guildford Local Sustainable Transport Fund programme and as part of the development of the Onslow Quality Bus Corridor a proposal is being considered which may reduce traffic congestion at the Egerton Road/Tesco Roundabout, and would also enhance the cycle and pedestrian facilities. SCC/GBC Officers have met with the Highways Agency who are supportive of these proposals and have agreed to work collaboratively.

Traffic modelling surveys were carried out late autumn 2013 to help understand a potential solution. This work will be taken forward and an update will be provided to Guildford Local Committee March 2014. Funding for this scheme is available through the LSTF until March 2015.

2. Submitted by Councillor Bob McShee

With the extension of St. Josephs School, Aldershot Road due to provide a further 90 places at the school, additional traffic will be generated by parents taking and collecting their children. There is already considerable congestion from the school entrance back to the Rydes Hill roundabout, then along the Aldershot Road in both directions, the same occurs at the Broad Street junction with the roundabout. What measures are going to be taken to alleviate this problem?

Answer

When the planning permission was granted by Guildford Borough Council for the expansion of St Josephs School the following condition was included:

'Prior to the September 2013 pupil intake, St Joseph's Catholic Primary School shall produce an updated School Travel Plan and submit it for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The school shall then implement the approved travel plan and thereafter maintain and develop the travel plan to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The School Travel Plan shall include initiatives designed to reduce the number of car journeys to and from the school and to encourage maximum use of school transport, public transport, walking, cycling, scooting and car sharing by staff, pupils and visitors.'

It is understood that 57% of pupils attending St Joseph's live within 2km of the school. In keeping with the above condition the objective of the School Travel Plan is to reduce the number of vehicles generated by the school and effecting a reduction in any associated congestion.