

Questions from Committee Members (tabled)

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**

**DATE: 15 JUNE 2016**

**LEAD OFFICER: SARAH J SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**DIVISION: ALL**



**Question from Cllr Rosemary Dickson (Leatherhead South ward)**

Clinton Road in Leatherhead is in a very poor state of repair owing to the developers of Highlands House using the road to bring up materials in large vehicles on a daily basis. As a result the road now has large potholes. Can this road jump up the list for repairs and can the developers be asked for a contribution towards the work required because the road was fine until they started using it? When could we hope to see the road repaired?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The Maintenance Engineer has confirmed that the situation is being monitored and instructions have been issued to carry out safety defect repairs. These repairs will be carried out shortly.

It is unlikely that a developer would directly contribute to road maintenance activities without prior agreements being in place as the highway is available for use by all road users which would also include various delivery vehicles. There are no highway maintenance agreements in place for this location.

The road will also be considered for future surfacing programmes in consultation with the local member as funds permit.

**Questions from Mr Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods)**

**Congestion**

It was announced earlier this year that up to £100,000 would be made available by Surrey County and Mole Valley District Councils for traffic studies in Dorking. Could the Committee be informed about the plans for implementing this study – when it will begin, details of the programme, the estimated cost and when it is expected to be completed.

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The proposed traffic study in Dorking will be aligned to the requirements for bidding for infrastructure schemes to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and the results of the Infrastructure Needs Assessment that has been carried

out by Mole Valley District Council. The first stage of commissioning the study is to prepare a brief and this is scheduled for June. Approved traffic study consultants will then be invited to tender for the study, and this will determine the timescale and cost at that time. It is proposed that the study will inform any business cases required for bids to the LEP.

## **A24**

I have received the following request from the Hope Spring Eternal Project Manager: 'We have received a number of concerns about the increase of footfall potentially crossing the A24 as a consequence of the development of the new Deepdene Trail. There have been a lot of enquiries about the possibility of reducing the speed limit to 30mph. When we have taken groups along the road there have been many comments about the speed limit expressing the opinion that the speed limit is inappropriately fast given the presence of crossing points. We have flagged up with Highways that the new entrance to Deepdene Gardens is off the A24 and as such there will be greatly increased footfall.'

In addition to this there have been many requests from local residents for a reduction in the speed limit. There are significant crossing points for children attending St Paul's School.

Presently the section of the A24 leading from the north to South Drive, just beyond the Cockerel roundabout has a limit of 40mph which increases to 50mph at that point. In the light of these requests could an investigation be undertaken with a view to reducing the speed limit from 50mph to 40mph between the Cockerel and North Holmwood roundabouts?

### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

Officers have attended a meeting on site with officers working on the Hope Spring Eternal project to discuss pedestrian access to the new Deepdene Trail. At the meeting it was noted that visitors arriving by car would be encouraged to park in the car park to the rear of Dorking Halls. It was agreed that pedestrians would be signed to the main entrance to the Deepdene Trail from the car park along the southern footway of the A25 Reigate Road, turning right at the Deepdene roundabout onto the eastern footway of the A24. Pedestrians would be signed to cross the A24 at the existing pedestrian refuge south of Deepdene Drive, then along the western footway to the trail main entrance. The pedestrian refuge is located within the 40mph speed limit and provides good visibility of on-coming traffic.

It was acknowledged that pedestrians may approach the entrance from Cotmandene, crossing the A24 at the pedestrian refuge south of the entrance to Kuoni and the main entrance to the trail. The speed limit at this point is 50mph and the visibility is more restricted, particularly to the south. Officers agreed to arrange for a speed survey to be carried out, in accordance with Surrey's speed limit policy, to determine if a reduction in the speed limit to 40mph would comply with the policy. The results of the survey will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the local divisional Member. It should be noted that there is no funding allocated at the present time to progress a reduction in the speed limit.

**Vincent Lane**

A significant number of vehicles exiting from Lidl make an illegal turn in the Vincent Lane one-way system to enter Vincent Road as a short cut to South Street. This is an illegal and dangerous movement across Vincent Lane to enter Vincent Road which itself has an access only designation. The police are clearly unable to provide the necessary enforcement resource to prevent this happening. Would officers look again at the possibility of providing a traffic engineering solution to this problem?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The A25 Vincent Lane forms part of the one way system in Dorking and suffers from congestion during peak periods. There is a Lidl supermarket on the west side of Vincent Lane. Vincent Road is a residential road that joins Vincent Lane on the west side immediately south of the Lidl car park entrance and connects to the A25 South Street. There is a traffic order on Vincent Road which prohibits motor vehicles from entering Vincent Road unless they are accessing properties in that road.

It is acknowledged that some motorists, on exiting the Lidl car park turn right into Vincent Lane, and immediately left into Vincent Road in order to access South Street. This manoeuvre is therefore in contravention of both the one-way working order on Vincent Lane and the prohibition of motor vehicles order on Vincent Road. The Police are responsible for enforcing both of these orders, but unfortunately have limited resources for enforcement.

In July 2015 Officers consulted residents and businesses on Vincent Road on a proposal to stop up the road to through traffic by providing a physical barrier in the vicinity of no. 20a Vincent Road. This would have stopped motorists turning right out of Vincent Lane by stopping up the through route to South Street. However the majority of residents and businesses consulted did not support the proposal and for this reason the scheme was not progressed further.

Deliveries to the Lidl store are made via the car park access on Vincent Lane. It would not be possible to make changes to the kerb alignment at the car park entrance to make it more difficult for vehicles to turn right into Vincent Lane without adversely impacting on these deliveries. It is essential that vehicles delivering to Lidl are able to access the car park and that when doing so, they do not block traffic flows in Vincent Lane.

The only way of preventing vehicles making the illegal right turn out of the car park would be the introduction of physical measures as outlined above. The introduction of such measures would not be feasible for the reasons given and there are no plans to investigate this matter further.

**Howard Road**

A complaint has been received from a resident of Howard Road regarding the consultation process undertaken last year when the road was being considered for a residents parking scheme. The complainant believes that the consultation process was inadequate in that it did not indicate clearly that written agreement from a majority of residents was required before a scheme could be accepted or that a response was required from residents both in favour and against the introduction of a scheme. A similar complaint was received from a resident in Spital Heath and the

Local Committee agreed that that consultation should be repeated in order to ensure that all residents had full information.

Would the officers responsible for residents parking consultations consider ensuring that all future letters indicate clearly that it is necessary for 70% of residents to agree before a scheme is eligible for approval, that responses are required from all residents and that a mechanism is put in place to ensure that all residents are able to respond, not just those who have access to the County Council website?

Would the Committee consider a further consultation in Howard Road and Arundel Road without the necessity of providing evidence of 70% support in advance of a consultation being undertaken?

**Response from Surrey Parking Team:**

The letter that we sent to the residents started by saying: "Surrey County Council has received requests for residents' permit parking in your road, and we are carrying out a consultation to find out what residents think about this."

Further on in the letter we said: "Please let us know your views about parking in your road by completing our online questionnaire".

Both these sentences suggest that we were carrying out an information gathering exercise, and were inviting comments from anyone who received the letter, not just those opposed to the scheme. Indeed of the 18 responses we received from Howard Road, 10 were in support of the scheme, from which we can therefore assume that most residents did understand the fact that they could reply positively as well as negatively.

The consultation in Howard Road took place before the new policy requiring evidence of 70% support came in. While it is true that the letter did not say that the support of a majority of residents is required, we think that is self evident, considering that the scheme is asking residents to pay a sum of money for a permit. It would seem most unfair to impose this cost on residents without majority support. Nonetheless we will make sure this is clear in future.

In the letter, it also said: "If you do not have access to the internet, you can use the facilities at your local library, or alternatively please phone the number at the top of this letter and a member of our contact centre will be happy to go through the questionnaire with you over the phone." This is because we recognise that not everyone has their own access to our website.

The consultation that we carried out in Howard Road and Arundel Road is almost identical to consultations that we have carried out in many other roads in other parts of the county, which have proved successful in garnering residents' views before considering whether to progress to formally advertising the introduction of a permit scheme, with the accompanying costs.

As we have already carried out a consultation in the roads, we think that if the residents of Howard Road and Arundel Road do want a residents' permit scheme, they should be able to show evidence of 70% support for the idea, in the same way that we would expect of any other road.

**Horsham Road**

There have been consistent complaints of traffic speeding on the section of Horsham Road leading to Flint Hill and the police are clearly unable to provide the necessary enforcement resource to prevent this happening. Would officers look at the possibility of providing a traffic engineering solution to this problem?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

In order to understand the speed of vehicles at this location an automatic continuous 7 day speed survey will be carried out. The results of this speed survey will be analysed alongside the personal injury collision record for this road. The findings will be reported to the Local Committee Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the local divisional member. Should traffic engineering measures be deemed appropriate, the progression of a scheme will be considered for inclusion on the Mole Valley Forward Programme of highway schemes. A scheme may then be taken forward for feasibility, design and implementation, subject to approval by Mole Valley Local Committee and the level of funding available.

**Question from Councillor Raj Haque (Fetcham West ward)**

Concern has been raised by the elderly residents of Morley Court, which is being run by Fetcham United Charities, regarding speeding vehicles which pose a danger to these residents while crossing over to make use of the Reading room in Fetcham from time to time.

Will the appropriate Department of SCC consider traffic calming measures or any other appropriate means to bring the speed down so that, residents of Morley court and others may cross the road safely and without any fear of being hit by a speeding vehicle?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

Morley Court is located on the corner of Cobham Road and River Lane in Fetcham, The Reading Room is located opposite Morley Court on Cobham Road. Cobham Road has traffic calming installed in the form of 2 full width road humps. These full width road humps have been installed in order to reduce vehicle speeds and are located just after the start of the 30mph speed limit close to the entrance to Wellmeadow Cottages, and outside Morley Court.

There are a number of informal crossing points in the vicinity of Morley Court in the form of dropped kerbs with tactile paving. These crossing points are located on Cobham Road either side of the junction with River Lane, and in River Lane at the junction with Cobham Road. The mouth of the River Lane junction has also been recently narrowed and the central island removed to reduce the width of carriageway that pedestrians need to cross, and to help to reduce the speed of vehicles entering and exiting River Lane onto Cobham Road. The informal crossing point on Cobham Road located outside Morley Court is on the existing full width road hump helping to reduce vehicle speeds on the approach to this crossing.

During the three year period April 2013 to end of March 2016, the latest period for which data is available, there have been no collisions involving personal injury along Cobham Road, from the start of the 30mph speed limit to the roundabout at the junction with The Street.

As there are existing informal crossing facilities and traffic calming in place, as well as there being no personal injury collisions, Officers would not recommend the introduction of further speed reduction measures.

### **Questions from Mrs Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)**

1. The pavements alongside the Ashcombe Road are in a poor state of repair and the grass verges have not been properly reinstated following the recent gas works although the contractor has now left the site. The result is that in poor weather conditions, there can be substantial pooling of water on the footpath and the verges become very muddy. The result is that pupils walking to The Ashcombe School can be forced to leave the pavement and walk in the road - the A2003 - which is clearly an unsafe practice. As a result, can assurance be provided that the resurfacing of the Ashcombe Road pavements is included in the Operation Horizon pavement programme so that school pupils do not have to walk on the road to avoid mud and puddles?

#### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

The scheme is being assessed for inclusion with Pavement Horizon. Scheme details should be confirmed later in the summer following stakeholder engagement.

2. The pavements on the north side of Church Street between the junctions with Station Road and Myrtle Road are sloping excessively which is causing problems for elderly residents, particularly from Canterbury Court who use the path as their main route to the town centre, who can be unstable on their feet and who are at risk of falling onto the road. Can the camber on the pavement be reduced thereby making the pavement flatter and thus safer for the elderly residents who use this footpath?

#### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

The scheme is being assessed for inclusion with Pavement Horizon. Scheme details should be confirmed later in the summer following stakeholder engagement

3. A speed survey was originally promised for Hollow Lane in early 2016 and then delayed to the Spring of 2016. Can the results of this speed survey now be published and, if the results support the initial speed survey results taken by the Police, can a date be given when a proposal to reduce the speed limit on Hollow Lane to 40mph will be brought to this Committee?

#### **Response from Surrey Highways:**

Speed surveys in Hollow Lane and Leith Hill Road have been commissioned through our Traffic Survey Team. The results of the surveys will be shared with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Divisional Member when available. If the measured speeds comply with Surrey's policy "Setting Local Speed Limits" for a speed limit reduction then a decision, based on the survey results, the views of the Police and the collision record on Hollow Lane and Leith Hill Road, will be taken as to whether

any scheme to reduce the speed limit on these roads to 40mph be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes list for possible future funding.

4 The County Council had committed to painting white lines at either side of the road in front of all of the cottages in Hollow Lane but in error the contractors painted a white line in the centre of the road in front of half of the cottages. This is not acceptable to use this error as an excuse for not completing the white lining along the side of the road which has long since been agreed with residents and as such will a commitment be made to a date when this work will be carried out?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

It was previously agreed to lay edge of carriageway markings on the section of Hollow Lane in front of the cottages. As advised at March Local Committee, when Hollow Lane was resurfaced the centre line was unfortunately reinstated along part of the length in front of the cottages. Investigations have been carried out into whether there is sufficient road width both to lay edge of carriageway markings on the stretch of Hollow Lane where the centre line has been reinstated, and maintain adequate running lane widths. These investigations have shown that it will be possible to extend the edge of carriageway markings from where they currently finish outside no. 8 Hollow Lane northwards to beyond the cottages. These lining works will be carried out during the 2016/17 financial year.

5 A pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane near Triangle Stores has been requested to enable school children to safely cross the road to walk to and from St Martin's School. Whilst the project could not be funded through the ITS schemes in the current year, a commitment was made to reassess this scheme and see if it could be implemented in forthcoming years. Can an update on this reassessment be given: has it been carried out and, if so, what are the results of the reassessment. If not, when will it be carried out and when will the results be published?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

A safety meeting was held at the site in February 2014, attended by the local divisional member, officers from Surrey County Council's (SCC) Sustainable Travel Team and Local Highways Team, the Headteacher of St Martin's School and parents of pupils from St Martin's School.

Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team was advised of the findings and outcome of the meeting. As a result of this meeting the provision of a pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane was included on the list of schemes to be considered for progression by Mole Valley Local Committee. The progression of this scheme is subject to agreement by the Local Committee, available funding and prioritisation alongside other schemes.

Since the meeting of February 2014 a new policy 'Road Safety Outside Schools' has been introduced. The policy sets out the process that will be used by SCC for investigating and responding to concerns raised about road safety outside schools. The county council's Sustainable Transport Team lead the process to investigate concerns over road safety outside a school, and the county council's local highways engineers, road safety engineering specialists and police road safety colleagues are also invited to assist. The assessment also considers the suitability of a school crossing patrol as a possible safety measure.

The assessment results in a report containing options, where appropriate, to tackle the concerns that were raised. If engineering measures are recommended, then the local committee decide whether to allocate money from their budget for any improvements, depending upon the extent of the problem, the estimated costs and the funds available.

As some time has elapsed since the previous assessment, officers consider it is appropriate to re-assess the issues. The Sustainable Transport Team will be requested to arrange for a safety assessment in accordance with the 'Road Safety Outside Schools' policy. It is anticipated that the assessment will take place during the autumn term. The results of the assessment will be shared with the local divisional member and St Martin's School.

6 In March 2015 a commitment was given to assess the possibility of painting 30 mph roundels alongside 30 mph repeater signs on Boxhill Road but no assessment of the feasibility of this suggestion was ever provided. 30mph roundels have now been painted at the two ends of the 30 mph speed limit and at one of the repeater signs in the middle. Can an explanation be given as to why only part of the proposal has been implemented and can the necessary 30 mph roundels be painted in conjunction with all 30 mph repeater signs on the road?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

When investigations were carried out into laying 30mph road marking roundels on Box Hill Road, it was noted that there was an existing 30mph roundel in place at the western (National Trust) end of Box Hill Road. A 30mph roundel was laid at the eastern end of the 30mph section of road next to the terminal sign adjacent to The Tree Public House. A pair of roundels was also laid to correspond with the 30mph repeater signs east of the junction with Woodlands Park. 30mph road marking roundels are used to reinforce the speed limit and it is not necessary to lay them to correspond with every repeater sign. Furthermore they can be a maintenance liability as the road marking paint tends to wear with the repeated passage of vehicles. For these reasons there are no plans to lay further 30mph roundels on Box Hill Road.

7 On the A24 on the northbound carriageway on the Mickleham bends there are missing reflector posts and a missing chevron above the beech hedge. In addition in relation to the southbound carriageway on the central reservation just south of the junction with Old London Road at Mickleham the chevron is incomplete with a number of missing vertical panels missing. When will these posts and chevrons be replaced?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The Maintenance Engineer has confirmed that the repair of one damaged Chevrolflex chevron and replacement of another missing Chevrolflex chevron sign in the central reservation has been put in hand along with the replacement of several missing/ damaged verge marker posts on the northbound carriageway and a missing chevron sign above the beech hedge. It is likely that this work will need to be phased around other highway work currently programmed in this area, specifically utilising specialist traffic management for high speed roads.

8 The 2015 parking review has been implemented but the implementation is incomplete in relation to the following roads where yellow lines are missing: the junction of Wathen Road with Rothes Road, Dorking; Hart Gardens, Dorking; Furlong Road, Westcott; Ranmore Road, Dorking; Mint Gardens, Dorking (only partially installed - the lines need to be extended to the corner of the road); Old London Road, Mickleham; and the Bus Clear Way on Boxhill Road near Surrey Hills Park, Box Hill. Can confirmation be given as to when these missing yellow lines will be painted to complete the implementation of the 2015 parking review?

**Response from Surrey Parking Team:**

These details have been passed over to our contractor and the work will be carried out as soon as possible.

9 The drains in Tot Hill could not be cleared this spring as the lid to the drain was jammed and the County Council was unable to take action to clear drains in such circumstances. Can an update please be given and a commitment made as to when the drains in Tot Hill, Headley will be cleared?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The drains (gullies) in Tot hill have been freed and specific gullies included on a programme of additional cleansing / jetting due to be carried out during the week commencing 15th August subject to road space being available.

10 The County Council has declined to provide a second street light in Lonsdale Road although this is needed to promote pedestrian safety and although the existing street light in the road (albeit that Lonsdale Road is a private road) is provided by the County Council. Can a clear explanation be given as to when the County Council is prepared to provide streetlights in private roads given the significant number of streetlights in private roads in Dorking (including but not limited to Lonsdale Road, Ridgeway Road, Deepdene Vale and Vaughan Way) were replaced during the county-wide street-column renewal project and can details be provided for all private roads in the Dorking area where the County Council pays the costs of electricity for lighting the streetlights and the maintenance of these lighting columns (new bulbs etc)?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

Lonsdale Road, Dorking is a private road and is therefore not publicly maintained. Although funding was available through the county-wide street-column renewal project, to replace a number of streetlights in private roads, there are no proposals to fund any future maintenance of street lights or provide additional street lights in private roads in Dorking.

11 Funding for two pairs of gateways in Walliswood was committed from the > Dorking Hills Community Enhancement/Localism funding during the 2015/16 financial year. Can an update be given as to the status of this project and can a commitment now be made to a date by which these gateways will be installed?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The Maintenance Engineer apologises for the delay in the installation of the special gateway signs and confirms that these will be erected as soon as the gang resource to carry out the work is available, which is expected to be within the next few weeks.