

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 12 DECEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: CATERHAM VALLEY; LINGFIELD; CATERHAM HILL



1. Parking on Grange Road, Caterham Valley

"Given the constant commuter parking on Grange Road, Caterham which is causing great inconvenience to local residents and detriment to their living standards - including partial blocking of drives, very dangerous sight lines, creation of blind spots; even parking by Council vehicles blocking drives completely - what is the status of the introduction of parking restrictions to Grange Road?"

Response:

Inconsiderate parking can be very frustrating for residents and highway users alike. The councils parking enforcement team can take action if a vehicle parks to obstruct (or partially obstruct) a driveway or dropped kerb access onto the highway. If the enforcement team are notified by the resident, a Penalty Charge Notice can be issued to the obstructing vehicle. The parking enforcement team can be contacted by calling 01737 276000.

There are currently no specific plans to introduce parking controls on Grange Road.

We inspected the road as part of our 2014 parking review and did not witness parking that we considered to be obstructive or dangerous, and therefore did not recommend introducing parking controls to the local committee. In many roads parking provides an amenity for local residents and businesses and this needs to be balanced against the perceived nuisance it can cause.

We will inspect the road again under our next parking review, for which site visits are due to take place in January 2015. The resulting report of recommendations is due to be presented to the local committee for initial approval on 6 March 2015.

If the local committee approve new proposals we will need to carry out a statutory consultation and seek potential comments and objections before any new restrictions can be implemented on the ground.

Contact Officer: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager,
03456 009 009

ITEM 5

2. Pinch Points in Lingfield

"Lingfield parish council was invited by SCC Highways to join in the monitoring of Godstone Road pinch-points. Motorists, having negotiated the Eastern 'pinch-point' (nearest the village), are disinclined to give way to traffic leaving Bay Trees. Parked cars further East along the Godstone Road ensure traffic speeds are not excessive whilst the Westerly pinch point would continue to reduce speeds into Lingfield. The parish council is of the view that the Eastern pinch-point is dangerous and does not allow traffic from Bay Trees to exit in safety.

Please would the Local Committee confirm that the £30,000 bond held by Surrey County Council against Asprey Homes Ltd, will be retained until the Easterly 'pinch-point' is removed and the original road at this point is reinstated?" "

Response:

The pinch-points in Godstone Road, Lingfield were constructed in order to facilitate the development of affordable housing at Bay Trees, Godstone Road, Lingfield. They were necessary in order to provide a safe access and egress to the site. Without the pinch-points, traffic speeds will be higher and the visibility at the junction of Bay Trees and Godstone Road will be substandard. The Local Committee agreed at the meeting on 9 December 2011 that the scheme should be monitored for a year after completion. In practical terms, the pinch-points will have been completed for two years in December allowing for a longer monitoring period than originally envisaged. This is because the highway works in their entirety were not completed until September 2013.

Pinch-points are a common tool used across the country to manage speeds. Surrey Police have stated that 'they fail when drivers make poor decisions, but this is true for most speed counter measures'. The Parish Council has provided information in respect of incidents at eastern pinch point and between the two pinch-points. The majority of incidents would appear to be as a result of poor decision making. This does not make it inherently dangerous as in many cases it would appear that driver behaviour is the cause. Surrey Police have stated that they would not support the removal of the pinch-points.

The parked cars further east on Godstone Road did not influence traffic speeds prior to the construction of the pinch-points, there is no reason to presume that they will have any effect now. The removal of the pinch points and the reinstatement of the original road layout would result in an increase in traffic speeds. The visibility at the junction of Bay Trees and Godstone Road would then be substandard, with an increased risk of collision at this point. If the pinch-point is removed, it will have to be replaced by another speed reducing feature.

The right of way for vehicles remains with traffic on Godstone Road. There is no requirement for Godstone Road traffic to give way to vehicles exiting from Bay Trees and therefore there should be no expectation that this will take place. Vehicles exiting from Bay Trees should only emerge onto Godstone Road when it is safe to do so. This is the basic premise at all priority junctions.

Surrey County Council holds a £25,000 bond against Asprey Homes should the monitoring period dictate that changes are needed to be made to the pinch-points. This was a requirement of the legal agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 between Surrey County Council and Asprey Homes which permitted Asprey to undertake the highway works. Monitoring has been undertaken on the

www.surreycc.gov.uk/tandridge

basis of congestion, traffic diversion, traffic speeds and recorded personal injury accidents.

Analysis of the scheme in terms of the agreed criteria does not indicate any significant impact. In respect of the congestion criteria, journey times along Godstone Road have increased by a maximum of 23 seconds but this is due in part to the reduced traffic speeds, not solely the pinch-points. The outcome of the monitoring is being discussed later at this meeting but it is the view of Officers that, on the basis of the agreed criteria, it would be unreasonable and contrary to the terms of the Section 278 Agreement to retain the bond. If the Local Committee determines that the eastern pinch-point should be removed and replaced with another speed reduction feature, it should not be done using Asprey Homes' bond.

Contact Officer: Caroline Smith, Transport Development Planning Team Manager East, 020 8541 9975

3. Parking restrictions on Tupwood Lane, Harestone Hill and Grange Road, Caterham Valley

"Since the Council signed off double yellow lines down most of Tupwood Lane and parking restrictions down Harestone Hill, Grange Road which connects these two roads now has cars parked on it all day. It is a very steep and narrow road with no restrictions and has very inconsiderate commuters parking here all day - sometimes blocking/partially blocking our driveways and more often than not well over the dropped kerb.

We residents (on the uneven numbered side) have to exit our driveways completely blind due to the steepness of the road and parked cars. There is an accident waiting to happen as Grange Road is used as a rat-run for local schools and the town centre so traffic speeds down it.

What are the plans to address this dangerous situation?"

Response:

Inconsiderate parking can be very frustrating for residents and highway users alike. The councils parking enforcement team can take action if a vehicle parks to obstruct (or partially obstruct) a driveway or dropped kerb access onto the highway. If the enforcement team are notified by the resident, a Penalty Charge Notice can be issued to the obstructing vehicle. The parking enforcement team can be contacted by calling 01737 276000.

There are currently no specific plans to introduce parking controls on Grange Road.

We inspected the road as part of our 2014 parking review and did not witness parking that we considered to be obstructive or dangerous, and therefore did not recommend introducing parking controls to the local committee. In many roads parking provides an amenity for local residents and businesses and this needs to be balanced against the perceived nuisance it can cause.

ITEM 5

We will inspect the road again under our next parking review, for which site visits are due to take place in January 2015. The resulting report of recommendations is due to be presented to the local committee for initial approval on 6 March 2015.

If the local committee approve new proposals we will need to carry out a statutory consultation and seek potential comments and objections before any new restrictions can be implemented on the ground.

Contact Officer: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager, 03456 009 009

4. Rook Lane Crossing, Caterham Hill

"Chaldon Village Council continues to be concerned at the risks to pedestrians, including school children, the elderly and people with disabilities, when crossing Rook Lane, particularly at the junction with Chaldon Common Road.

The excess speed of traffic in this area is a well-known hazard.

A potential solution is a pedestrian crossing near the junction of Rook Lane/Chaldon Common Road. Chaldon Village Council is aware that Section 106 funds may be available for the design of such a scheme from the Oak Grove development.

This is an issue that has previously been raised with Surrey County Council and we would be most grateful for an update on the measures taken to date, any future planned action to deal with the known risks and whether the Local Committee would consider such a scheme from the Oak Grove development funds?"

Response:

To follow

Contact Officer: John Lawlor, Highways Area Team Manager, 03456 009 009