

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**

**DATE:** 05 SEPTEMBER 2016  
**LEAD OFFICER:** SARAH J SMITH, COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP AND COMMITTEE OFFICER  
**SUBJECT:** QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC  
**DIVISION:** ALL DIVISIONS



**Questions from Roger Abbott on behalf of residents at Puddenhole Cottages, A25 Reigate Road, Brockham**

I am writing on behalf of some of the residents at Puddenhole Cottages who have difficulty crossing the A25 in order to get to Brockham or indeed to catch a bus to Dorking. You may be aware that some of the properties are owned by a Housing Association at "affordable rent". Of these there is a block of very small bungalows reserved for single older members of our community. There is a tendency for such residents to have mobility problems and it is imperative that these people have a safe crossing point on the A25.

In addition you will be aware that there is a very popular footpath from the top of Brockham Lane leading up onto the North Downs and on to Box Hill. You will see from attached Photographs One and Two in Appendix A, that there is a dropped kerb in the central reservation at this point. However, there is no such corresponding dropped kerb at the sides of the road. Clearly therefore, somebody at Highways did make provision for a safe crossing at this point but, for some unknown reason, the job was never completed. We need to know the reason for this.

There have been many representations to Highways over the years for a safe crossing at this point but they have been turned down on the grounds of poor sight lines. You will see that the sight-line on the south side of the carriageway looking east towards the traffic is excellent (as shown in Photograph Three in Appendix A). On the north side however, I agree that, at this point, the sight-line is not excellent (as shown in Photograph Four in Appendix A), but probably adequate. But, Photograph Five in Appendix A from only 5 yards further west, shows an excellent sight-line. Sadly, this image does also show that some idiot has parked illegally right on the corner of the Puddenhole Cottages Road!

Therefore I see that a pedestrian crossing controlled by traffic lights can easily be installed at this point and the argument of poor sight-lines does not really stand-up. Funding for such a crossing, or at least some of the funding, can come from the the as yet unused "planning gain" of the nearby developments: MO/2011/1253 (The Chapel, Brockham Green, Brockham) & MO/2011/1711 (The Jolly Farmers, Reigate Road, Betchworth). The funds from these developments were allocated to some form of street lighting and footway schemes on Kiln Lane Brockham, which is where I live. Nobody knows where the Kiln Lane project came from and Brockham Parish Council are not only unaware of it but, when I discussed it with them recently,

expressed the view that they did not see any need for such so-called “improvements”. Those funds should be diverted to the far more urgent project as I have identified above.

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

The dropped kerbs that are located on the central island, and are shown in Photographs One and Two of Appendix A, are in a section of the A25 Reigate Road which is effectively a dual carriageway. On the eastbound carriageway there is a right-turn lane into Brockham Lane and a through lane, and on the westbound carriageway there is a left-turn slip lane into and out off Brockham Lane and a through lane (please see Photograph Three in Appendix A). This section of the A25 is also subject to a 50mph speed limit.

As shown within Photograph Four in Appendix A, the visibility on the northern side of the A25 Reigate, opposite where the existing dropped kerbs are located on the central island, is poor for any pedestrian wanting to cross this 50mph dual carriageway road. For these reasons no corresponding dropped kerbs were installed opposite the existing dropped kerbs on the traffic island to provide an informal crossing facility at this point. Similarly although there is a slight improvement to the visibility as you walk 5 yards further west, as shown in Photograph Five in Appendix A, it is not sufficient for an informal pedestrian crossing facility to be provided at this point.

A review of reported personal injury collisions shows that four slight personal injury collisions occurred on the A25 Reigate Road in the vicinity of the junction with Brockham Lane during the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/04/13 to 31/03/16). However none of these collisions involved pedestrians.

Due to the dual carriageway and existing speed limit on the A25 at this location, any crossing provided here would need to be signal controlled. However under existing Department for Transport guidance for the design of pedestrian crossings, signal controlled crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions such as the A25 Reigate Road/Brockham Lane junction. This is so that drivers are given an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a signal controlled crossing and to brake safely. Consequently any crossing located here would need to be constructed some distance away from the existing slip lanes at the A25 Reigate Road/Brockham Lane. There are also a number of vehicle accesses and on-street parking facilities that the crossing would also need to be located away from, in order to ensure that they are not obstructed.

As a result of the above there is not a suitable location for a crossing to be installed close to the A25 Reigate Road/Brockham Lane junction and the existing bus stops.

Therefore in order to install pedestrian crossing facilities to enable pedestrians to cross the A25 Reigate Road to access Brockham and the bus stops, the existing A25 Reigate Road/Brockham Lane junction would need to be converted into a traffic signal controlled junction. The cost of a scheme of this kind is well in excess of the “planning gain” achieved from existing nearby small scale developments.

There is currently no funding available to convert the A25 Reigate Road/Brockham Lane junction into a traffic signal controlled junction with pedestrian crossing facilities. However, this scheme could be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) List of schemes for possible future funding and prioritisation alongside other schemes identified as requiring funding.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Questions from Mr John Moyer

1. In Cleeve Road Leatherhead the major application MO /2016 /0594 has now been approved for a care home and around 80 dwellings. A separate application has been made MO/2016/ 1280 in outline for 85 homes (though 119 at community involvement stage) also with access to Cleeve Road. In their advice to MVDC, will SCC be ensuring that the traffic analysis for the second application will take account of traffic from the first now that it is approved, as the [Cleevegardensltd.co.uk](http://Cleevegardensltd.co.uk) application may not? And also from other developments (under occupied new offices at Randalls Way, The Square and reopening of One Springfield Drive after refurbishment) and also 80 units permitted on Therfield school land with access to Cleeve Road but not implemented. What is officers assessment of the saturation point, particularly in the evening peak when it can take 15 minutes to queue from Cleeve Road into Leatherhead town centre, and queues extend back to Springfield Drive / River Lane. In the other direction there are queues from Woodlands Lane/Stoke Road junction back to the Woodlands Park Hotel? Are options for some improvements to the difficult Kingston Road/Cleeve Road/Dilston Road junction being explored in pre-application discussions? And what about the Oaklawn/Woodlands and A244/Oxshott Road junctions (several recent accidents)? Can the pre-application discussions be subject to community engagement rather than left out of the exhibitions developers hold? What is SCC's overall strategy for improving traffic flow and road safety on the north and west approaches to Leatherhead A245/244 and off the M25. What use are SCC making of the findings of MVDC's Infrastructure Needs Review?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

Mole Valley District Council is the Planning Authority for most planning applications. The county council itself gives planning permission to a rather more limited range of developments, including minerals extraction, waste and county-controlled schools. It is not possible to make any comment on a specific planning application.

If a development is large or likely to affect the road network, then Mole Valley District Council may ask Surrey County Council for comments. For most applications, a recommendation is made on whether permission should be granted, or granted with certain conditions attached, to the district council which makes the final decision.

In general terms, the consultation process for Planning Applications can be found on the Mole Valley District Council web site at <https://www.molevalley.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=17698>, and is in accordance with the Statement of Community Engagement.

In September 2012 a report was approved by the Mole Valley Local Committee to reduce the speed limits on Oaklawn/Woodlands and A244/Oxshott Road from National speed restriction to 50mph, and this had been implemented.

There have been proposals for high friction surfacing on the circulatory at the M25 Junction 9B interchange, on the approach to the M25 southbound off-slip traffic signals. Changes to the road markings, either simple or spiral lane markings, at the M25 Junction 9A have also been investigated. Unfortunately, neither of these proposals has been able to be progressed further.

The Road Safety Working Group has investigated the junction of A245 Randalls Road and Oaklawn Road, from 2011 due to the accident record prioritising this junction. Some works to enhance the visibility and position of the signs, and the provision of high friction surfacing on the A245 approaches were undertaken in

2012. Although this had some beneficial effect on the accident records, it was further proposed to discuss the feasibility of a roundabout at this location in May 2015. However, this proposal was not taken forward due to the site constrictions of the bend in the road restricting sight lines. The junction continues to be monitored.

The Surrey Transport Plan, Mole Valley Local Transport Plan and Forward Programme, sets out the strategy for managing traffic. The purpose of the strategy is to address current transport issues and support the growth set out within the District Local Plan. The forward programme provides a high level programme of transport infrastructure required to address problems and deliver growth. They also provide an evidence base for future funding bids.

The objectives of this strategy are to sustain economic growth by managing the impact of traffic congestion in Mole Valley by providing and promoting more attractive sustainable travel

choices, improve road safety and the perception of safety. These objectives are in accordance with Surrey's Environment and Infrastructure priorities.

The Mole Valley Infrastructure Needs Assessment will inform the priorities and infrastructure works bids, and the Local Transport Plan when it is next updated.

.....

2. Transform Leatherhead. SCC has updated its website on the Sustainable Transport Bid and MVDC have on request updated on the bid public engagement aspects before the bid is made to C2C LEP. The bid is understood to cover cycle and dual-use paths, walking, signage and bus information/routing and potentially improving links between business parks and Leatherhead station. Will the bid cover consolidation of the 3 or 4 different shuttle buses operated by Unilever, CGI, KBR, to be followed by QEF, Beechcroft as conditions of their planning approvals, and potentially public access to those services. Is the Cobham Chatterbus a model that could be supported for Fetcham/Leatherhead? No transport bid will be truly sustainable unless it is holistic. Also what discussions with Southern and Network Rail are taking place about the bid and the integration of bus and rail services. What is the rationale for a cycle path from the station to the business parks given that most cycles cannot be taken on rush hour trains. There is already a cycle path from the station to Therfield school which SCC have had to be nagged all summer to maintain and cut back. Will there be funds in the bid for maintenance of any new paths?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

It has not been possible to provide you with a full and detailed response to your question, before the Local Committee. Although the question was submitted within the time frame allowed, due to the detailed nature of the question and the Officers with a thorough knowledge of this project being on leave, a written response will be produced for you on their return.

.....

3. Transform Leatherhead. Highways analysis. What is the timescale for this and will a separate LEP bid for highway improvements be made? The STP bid is not enough by itself and should not be seen as the answer to traffic in a car-centric town on a motorway. The town centre regeneration (Bull Hill etc) is totally unviable without significant highway improvements to the gyratory. Information is quite vague about whether this will be pursued by whom and whether SCC and MVDC are working

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

together as closely as they could be. What reassurance can the committee and stakeholders be given that SCC is fully on board? Is the Local Committee an appropriate forum for updates to be received? Will SCC also be willing to consider including Library, youth and helpshop facilities in what could be a much better location in any Bull Hill development?

**Response from Surrey Highways:**

It has not been possible to provide you with a full and detailed response to your question, before the Local Committee. Although the question was submitted within the time frame allowed, due to the detailed nature of the question and the Officers with a thorough knowledge of this project being on leave, a written response will be produced for you on their return.