

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 12 DECEMBER 2014

SUBJECT: FORMAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS

DIVISION: LINGFIELD, GODSTONE



5. Pinch Points

"The pinch point construction on Godstone road Lingfield was intended to make it safer for vehicles entering and leaving the Bays development of 18 houses. The monitored trial period has been completed and so it is assessed. The 30 mph signs have been moved further East which is a definite help to safety. If the pinch points were removed, and the Village sign{s} placed near, the full effect of the speed reduction would be seen.

At peak times, vehicles from The Bays would have easier exit and access and the damaging effect of heavy traffic forced near to the iconic thatched cottage would be reduced. Would Highways consider this, or modification, as it could be achieved now, with no cost to Surrey County Council?"

Response:

The pinch points were constructed to reduce the traffic speeds along Godstone Road to ensure that vehicles exiting the Baytrees development had adequate visibility in the leading traffic direction (i.e. to the right). Without the reduction in the traffic speeds, the access would not meet the relevant visibility standard. The Baytrees junction operates like any other priority junction with Baytrees traffic giving way to traffic on the major road - Godstone Road in this case.

The Parish Council have indicated that a number of damage only accidents have happened at the pinch points. The County Council has had involvement in two – once where a claim was unsuccessfully made against us and once when the signs had to be replaced. The signs at the pinch points are clear however and comply with both the Highway Code and the Traffic Signs Manual. Priority is clear and unambiguous.

Without the pinch points, there will be no physical measures to restrain traffic speeds on Godstone Road and speeds will inevitably increase. They cannot simply be removed; they would need to be replaced with an alternative speed control measure.

The indicators used in the monitoring of the scheme were agreed by the Local Committee. It is Officers' view that on the basis of those agreed indicators, there is no justification for the scheme to be removed and/or substantially amended at the expense of the applicant. The outcome of the monitoring is being discussed later at this meeting but should the Committee find that amendments are required; Officers advise that they will have to be funded from an alternative source.

ITEM 5

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