

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (SURREY HEATH)****DATE: 2 JULY 2015****LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE****SUBJECT: PETITION RESPONSE – IMPLEMENT SAFETY MEASURES TO MIDDLETON ROAD / UPPER PARK ROAD BRIDGE FOR ALL USERS****DIVISION: SURREY HEATH****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Response to petition set to be received by the Local Area Committee in July 2015. The petition requested highway improvements to the resolve safety concerns.

The petition's details read: Following an incident, involving a pedestrian and a car, we would like the Council to implement safety measures for the protection of the general public, which includes cyclists, pedestrians and drivers. The bridge sees heavy pedestrian usage around school hours from both directions ranging from Nursery School to Sixth Form children. It is also used as a general thoroughfare for dog walkers and other pedestrians throughout the day due to its easy accessibility to the town centre.

The bridge has significant danger factors:

Blind bends at each end, two way traffic with no pedestrian safety area, no pavement/lighting, the hump on the bridge is prone to skidding in icy conditions, restricted width, insufficient/confusing road signage & markings, traffic speed

This subject has been raised several times over the last few years to no avail and this time we would like to ensure that safety measures are implemented. Please support the safety of your local community now and into the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Surrey Heath) is asked to note that:

- (i) The current signage and markings on Upper Park Road and Middleton Road for the bridge are adequate and no further work is required.
- (ii) Maintenance work will be undertaken to address overgrown vegetation on the approaches to the bridge.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The layout of the approached to the bridge and the road over it have been altered over the years, introducing priorities, advanced warning signs and markings. The personal injury collision data for the bridge shows that the recent injury was the first recorded injury on the bridge since 2000 and that the relative safety of the bridge is good and no change to signage is necessary.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/surreyheath

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Middleton Road is a privately owned road with highway rights over it. Upper Park Road is a publically maintained road and joins Middleton Road half way across a bridge over the railway line between Bagshot Station and Camberley Station.
- 1.2 Both approaches to the bridge are at an angle to the railway. The bridge straightens up over the railway to minimise its length, but creates a blind bend on either side.
- 1.3 The bridge is the only pedestrian access across the railway between Heathcote Road and London Road (A30).
- 1.4 Middleton Road travels towards the A30, but is currently not connected. Advanced signage on Upper Park Road has been provided to reduce the amount of traffic using the route in hope of accessing the A30. Middleton Road does allow access to Camberley town centre through Portesbery Road, but the route from Church Hill is considerably longer than the alternative and is unlikely to attract much through traffic.
- 1.5 The bridge is a network rail asset and the structure below the road surface is their responsibility to maintain and improve.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 Advanced warning signs have been provided for the bridge on both sides warning of carriageway narrowing and pedestrians in the road. In addition, priority has been indicated for traffic from Middleton Road above traffic from Upper Park Road. The priority is indicated by a combination of signage and markings.
- 2.2 Edge of carriageway markings have been provided approaching and across the bridge. The markings narrow over the bridge and hatching is provided on both sides to encourage vehicles into the centre of the bridge and away from pedestrians crossing.
- 2.3 Additional SLOW markings have been provided on both sides in advance of the bridge to encourage drivers to take care when approaching.
- 2.4 When visiting the site, vegetation was found to be partly obscuring some of the advanced warning signs and reducing forward visibility around the approach from Upper Park Road. Although these were noted as only a minor issues and only potential points, an order has been raised to cut back to the vegetation to improve the area.
- 2.5 Personal injury collision data for the area shows that the accident earlier this year was the only noted personal injury collision in fifteen years. As a result, the area is comparatively safe and additional measures are not necessary.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The current bridge is a network rail structure and improvements would need at least their consent. In addition, widening the bridge would be excessively

expensive and not an option in this location. The same can be said for constructing a new dedicated pedestrian bridge.

- 3.2 Controlling traffic with signals has been considered. Although this may allow formalisation of pedestrian footway, the layout of the two roads and the cost of providing a link between the two means that the scheme is highly unlikely. In addition, removing risk of oncoming traffic could result in increased speeds across the bridge. If this happens, then it could potentially increase the number of personal injury collisions on the bridge.
- 3.3 Providing a formalised footway without any signals would reduce the current width of the road to a point where two vehicles cannot pass. If it was done with markings alone then it could give pedestrians a false sense of security.
- 3.4 Although adequate advanced signage has been provided, the signs could be replaced with yellow backed versions. The improvement would make the signs more visible to highway users, but will incur a cost in their replacement.
- 3.5 Continue with ongoing maintenance to keep signs and visibility clear. It is the responsibility of the landowner to maintain their vegetation so that it does not adversely affect the highway. However, if overhanging vegetation is an issue and landowners do not regularly maintain their vegetation then Surrey County Council can undertake the work and be reimbursed the cost by the landowner.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Surrey County Council have consulted with Surrey Police on the current layout and the accident history of the bridge.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 No funding has been determined at this point.
- 5.2 If funding for the agreed action is not available, the scheme will be added to the Local Transport Plan for Surrey Heath so that the Local Area Committee can consider it as an option in forthcoming years.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways 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.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
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	Set out below.

8.1 Public Health implications

The personal injury collision recently was the only collision in the last fifteen years. Although only three years of data is considered, the history of the bridge suggests that the location is comparatively safe against others within Surrey Heath.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The layout of the bridge has been altered over the years to improve safety. The inclusion of priorities, advanced warning signs and markings have all been provided to reduce the risk of personal injury collisions on the bridge.
- 9.2 The recent personal injury collision was the only collision since 2000. When compared to other sites across the borough, this location has a good safety record.
- 9.3 Given the location, and the limited impact on the highway as a whole, it is recommended that no further improvements to the area is undertaken and Surrey County Council continue to undertake maintenance where necessary.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Work on the vegetation will be undertaken to improve visibility along the road.

Contact Officer:

Peter Orchard – Traffic Engineer (0300 200 1003)

Consulted:**Annexes:****Sources/background papers:**