



**Surrey County Council Local Committee (Guildford) 12 March 2014**

**Petitions [Item 5]**

<b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b>	Graham Mansfield, resident Attracting 66 signatures Speaker: Cherry Engel
<b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>	Horsleys / Wisley
<b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>	<i>This petition requests that Surrey County Council reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph or even 20mph along the entirety of Wisley Lane, Woking, Surrey. The current speed limit implies that the road is safe to drive at 40mph and as a consequence the road is extremely dangerous for vehicles, cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.</i>
<b>Response</b>	The Committee would like to thank Mr Mansfield for presenting the petition regarding reviewing the existing speed limit in Wisley Lane.  At the meeting of 11 December 2013 the committee agreed the programme of highway schemes for the 2014/15 financial year which includes £10,000 allocated towards reviewing, and potentially reducing, the speed limit in Wisley Lane.
<b>Principal petitioner/ organisation</b>	Shalford Parish Council Attracting 111 signatures Speaker: Parish Councillor Bill Burkett (Chairman)
<b>SCC Division / GBC Ward</b>	Shalford / Shalford
<b>Summary of concerns and requests</b>	<i>The residents of Peasmarsh would like Surrey County Council's Highways department to reduce the speed of vehicles on the A248 in the proximity of Oakdene Road whether by reducing the speed limit or by adding vehicle activated or other working signs and to reinstate access for emergency vehicles from the A3100 to Oakdene Road close to the Astolat roundabout.</i>
<b>Response</b>	The Committee would like to thank Shalford Parish Council for presenting the petition to investigate the possibility of reducing the speed limit in the vicinity of the A248 Broadford Road and Oakdene Road junction and to reinstate access for emergency vehicles from the A3100

	<p>to Oakdene Road, close to the Astolat roundabout.</p> <p>The current speed limit in Broadford Road between the A3100 Portsmouth Road and the A281 Horsham Road is 40mph which officers consider to be an appropriate limit given the nature of the road, and which accords with SCC's Speed Limit Policy. There is a difficult bend in Broadford Road just to the east of the Oakdene Road junction where the road narrows and rises/falls which requires drivers to exercise caution. In the past five years a single accident has been recorded by the Police in the vicinity of the bend and the junction, which was as a result of the driver losing consciousness while at the wheel approaching the bend from the east.</p> <p>Officers have reviewed existing signs and road markings and consider that they are adequate and clearly warn drivers of the bend from both directions, and of the need to slow down.</p> <p>However, the anti-skid surface in the vicinity of the bend is in poor condition and the road markings are worn. Officers will organise re-marking the road at the bend and investigate local re-surfacing, though no timescale can be given for the latter in view of the need for extensive repairs to the road network following the extremely wet Winter.</p> <p>The planning conditions for the development of the Astolat site in 2002 required the construction of a new roundabout forming a junction with the A3100 Portsmouth Road and the site access road as well as stopping up the junction of Oakdene Road with the A3100 Portsmouth Road.</p>
--	--

### **Public Questions and Statements [Item 6]**

#### **1. Submitted by Roger Hall, resident of Onslow Village.**

Regarding ITEM 10 on the agenda

Having regard to representations\* on reducing the number of proposed parking bays in Wilderness Road between The Crossways and Litchfield Way to improve sight-lines, the Committee is invited to respond to the following question:

“In developing the parking proposals, has account been taken of the possibility that parking bays when occupied could obscure the view of traffic coming up or down Wilderness Road for drivers attempting to safely exit their driveways and, in

## TABLED ITEM

consequence, has the right balance been struck between the provision of bays and the need not to compromise safety in this section of Wilderness Road?"

(\*See representations 10275, 10373, 10383, 10384 and 10402 in Annex 3 and the Officer comments thereon.)

**Answer**

We have considered the ability of residents to exit their driveways. In response to the various consultations the amount of parking in Mr Hall's section of Wilderness Road has been reduced to improve access for residents. Since receiving the question we have re-visited the site.

At the moment vehicles can park as close as they like to a resident's access. The proposed controls provide a marked bay and limit how close vehicles can park to an access. If the proposal is agreed by the Committee the bay will be set back 1.8m from the dropped kerb. We have used the same set back in similar roads in other parts of the controlled parking zone and it provides sufficient sight lines.

We note Mr Hall would like the length of the bay reduced and we do not think this is necessary. To do this would require the readvertising of this proposal. We are happy to meet with Mr Hall, discuss the situation and monitor it. If the situation warranted it we could consider changing the length of the bay during a future review.

**2. Submitted by Alan Norris**

Proposed pedestrian crossings in Manor Road, Ash

The approval for Guildford BC planning application no: 12/P/00645 for the outline development of 60 houses at land off Ash Green Lane West, Ash provides for S106 payments to include the provision of two pedestrian crossings on Manor Road, Ash - one to be an uncontrolled crossing south of Ash Green Lane West near the bus stop at Elm Lane, and the other to be a controlled crossing to the north of Ash Green Lane West, (i.e. outside Ash Manor School), the actual locations are not specified. (Only one crossing to be provided if the controlled crossing is located south of Ash Green Lane West.)

The provision of two pedestrian crossings on Manor Road near Elm Lane and in the vicinity of Ash Manor School and upgraded bus stops was a recommendation of the County Highways (Transport Development Planning) (ref: letters from Greg Devine to planning officer, 12 June and 26 October 2012). The Transport Statement prepared by Odyssey Consulting Engineers to support the planning application concluded that there would be minimal public transport trips incurred by the development residents in the AM and PM peaks and that there would be no requirement for additional infrastructure or bus services (ref. paras 5.8 and 5.9 of the TS).

The location of a controlled pedestrian crossing near Ash Manor School is presumably intended for the children who need to cross Manor Road to go to and from school. (I cannot find anything within the planning documents as confirmation of this.) This crossing will in effect only be used for a short time each school day (under 200 days per year) when children come to and leave the school, there being only a minimal number of pedestrians who cross Manor Road at other times. A large majority of the children going to and from the school come either from the Ash Street (Greyhound) direction or from Tongham, and they do not need to cross Manor Road. The letter from the head teacher of Ash Manor School to the planning officer (20 Sept. 2012) supports the planning application, but he does not mention anything about requesting a pedestrian crossing on Manor Road.

Does the County Highways have any information on the number of children at Ash Manor School who are likely to cross Manor Road (both near to Kings Avenue and near to Carfax Avenue / Elm Lane) on their way to and from school? (The school should be able to provide this information from the home addresses of the pupils.)

Speeding traffic along Manor Road is a regular occurrence. Will the County Highways / Guildford Local Committee consider applying the S106 payments to provide several road narrowing points in Manor Road with priority in one direction (similar to those in Oxenden Road and in The Street at Tongham) instead of the two pedestrian crossings? Such road restrictions would help to reduce traffic speeds and also provide a reasonably safe place for the Ash Manor School children and others to cross Manor Road in that there would only be a single alternating line of traffic to negotiate. The pedestrian crossings alone will not reduce the speed of traffic travelling in excess of the speed limit.

Does the stipulation of provision of pedestrian crossings within the planning approval documents (under S106 payments) commit the County Highways to provide these crossings?

#### **Answer**

The Committee would like to thank Mr Norris for presenting the background information on the pedestrian crossings in Manor Road.

The condition wording, under permission 12/P/00645, states that there should be a) an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing, dropped kerb with tactile paving, on Manor Road to the south of Ash Green Lane West and b) a controlled pedestrian crossing on Manor Road in the vicinity of Ash Manor School.

Last April a meeting was held, at Ash Manor School, between SCC highway officers and the school Head teacher, to identify and agree the exact location of a controlled crossing in the vicinity of the school. The proposed location, outside the school entrance, was concluded to be the most appropriate location for the controlled crossing.

The SCC Highways Authority has to adhere to what is stipulated on the S106 agreement.

### **3. Submitted by Joanna Cadman, Albury Parish Council**

Albury Parish Council would like to apply to the Local Committee for funding for work to New Road in Albury, which will involve installing kerb stones in order to prevent lorries from continually eroding the side of the road. This scheme was evolved during discussions with Bahram Assadi and Gavin Smith, and seems to be the best solution to an increasing problem.

However, I am not clear how to do this: do we draw up a scheme first and then submit it for consideration for funding, or do we advise you of the requirement and ask Local Committee to consider its merits before proceeding further?

#### **Answer**

The Committee would like to thank Albury Parish Council for presenting the question about the installation of kerb stones in New Road.

There are rural roads throughout the county similar to New Road with the side verge being eroded. SCC Highways Authority does not consider installing kerb stones in such roads as these are relatively expensive schemes to implement. If a short section of a road verge has been damaged and causes debris on the carriageway, which becomes a safety hazard, kerbing could possibly be considered. The section of New Road described that requires kerbing is approximately 560m in length, which would be a relatively expensive scheme. Therefore, kerbing in New Road will not be considered.

SCC officers could possibly consider installing rib edge road markings, which is a raised profile thermoplastic road marking material, subject to funding.

#### **Member Questions [Item 7]**

None received.

This page is intentionally left blank