

Questions from members of the public (tabled)

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**



**DATE:** 13 SEPTEMBER 2017  
**LEAD OFFICER:** SARAH J SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

**SUBJECT:** QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

**DIVISION:** ALL DIVISIONS

**Question from District Councillor Wellman**

Thank you for the written response to my question dated 22nd June 2017. In it, it is made clear that the SCC local maintenance engineer inspected the section of pavement in question on the A2003 for all kinds of defects. And also that the pavement cannot be widened. However, as I highlighted in my question, the camber of this section of pavement is extremely steep and may well exceed statutory limits. The section in question runs from the pedestrian crossing at the turning into the Ridgeway, downhill to the first house on Flint Hill. Or it could be described as the section approximately opposite the turning into Tollgate Road. In the details of assessments made, there was no mention of any check of the camber. It is particularly dangerous around the sweep of the bend. Can the camber be checked please, and might I be given the results? (20 sec video taken from a horizontally mounted camera fixed in the arm of a motorised wheelchair to see how steep the camber is, was forwarded to the Highways team to view).

**Response from Highways Team:**

Whilst it is appreciated that the existing pavement on the western side of Flint Hill between the existing pedestrian crossing and the first house on Flint Hill is sloped, there are no statutory limits relating to the gradient of pavements such as this, that were constructed some time ago. If a new road is constructed, there are design guides that relate to cambers and cross falls, however these cannot be applied retrospectively to existing roads. It is acknowledged that the gradient of this section of the pavement on Flint Hill has raised safety concerns.

It would be necessary to widen the pavement in order to reduce the gradient. If the pavement were widened, substantial work would be necessary in order to protect the adjoining retaining wall. Flint Hill is a narrow road, especially along the section just to the south of the junction with Tollgate Road, which is approximately 5m wide. Widening the pavement would reduce the width of an already narrow road to an unacceptable width for an A class road. Therefore it is unfortunately not possible to widen the pavement of Flint Hill in order to reduce the gradient.

**Question from Buckland Parish Council**

The Committee, when it met on 16th November 2016, agreed to support a SCC Highways proposal to “implement a Traffic Regulation Order restricting any motorised vehicles and any horse drawn vehicle wider than 1.5m (4ft 11ins) be implemented in the section of Buckland Lane (D318), which also includes BOAT No. 479, between borough boundary with Reigate and Banstead and a point 12.4m north of the junction with Lawrence Lane”. The reason given for this recommendation was “to address road safety concerns raised by Surrey Police following 4-wheeled vehicles rolling down the embankment due to subsidence on D318 Buckland Lane.”

The Highways Update to the June meeting included the following “The TRO Notice is to be advertised to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a 1.5m (4ft 11ins) width restriction on Buckland Lane (D318), Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) 479 (Buckland), Buckland Lane (X25120) and BOAT 98. Once the TRO is in place works will be carried out to install physical barriers and appropriate signage.”

Buckland Parish Council questions why SCC is taking so long to implement a TRO that:

(i) gained the support of both the Mole Valley and Reigate and Banstead Local Committees in 2016 and

(ii) is needed to address public safety concerns raised by Surrey Police.

**Response:**

Thank you for your question regarding the statutory advertisement of the width restriction in Buckland Lane. This is a relatively complex Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and so our Traffic Orders Team have taken care to consult with our highways solicitors concerning the drafting of the order and the advertisement of the proposals. If there are sustained objections to the proposed restrictions then there could be a public enquiry to resolve the way forward, so we have taken time to prepare thoroughly. In addition we make hundreds of TRO's each year across the county of varying urgency and complexity, many in response to emergency situations, and so this scheme has had to be progressed in the context of a wider programme of work. However, pending a final check by our solicitor we anticipate the statutory notice will be made in October 2017

**Question from District Councillor Paul Kennedy**

Do Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District Council have any plans to improve the way they work together to ensure better enforcement of planning conditions relating to the protection and reinstatement of road surfaces and verges, having regard specifically to the repair of lorry damage caused to River Lane in Fetcham during the current major development work?

**Response:**

As part of the approved planning application at River Lane Yard, River Lane, Fetcham (ref: MO/2015/0401), a condition was recommended by Surrey County Council in its role as County Highway Authority which included a requirement for the developer to provide a pre-commencement highway condition survey. This condition was applied to the decision notice issued by Mole Valley District Council.

The applicant submitted details pursuant to the relevant condition in 2016 which did not include the pre-commencement highway condition survey. This was unfortunately overlooked at the time. Whilst this was an error, had a survey been provided, it would not have changed the outcome of the current situation at River Lane.

With respect to recovering costs from the developer for highway maintenance, we do not believe that the issues on River Lane could be solely attributed to vehicles associated with the River Walk site. The main reasons for this are the age and quality of the road; the HGV movements linked to the previous use of the development site; and other activity on River Lane which was also contributing to the issues. It appears, for example, that some verge damage had been caused by building work elsewhere on River Lane, and by resident parking.

Taking the carriageway defects around an 'inspection chamber cover' just to the south of Friars Orchard as an example, it is apparent from Google Streetview that the carriageway was already deteriorating in this location as far back as July 2015. For this reason, it would be difficult to justify laying blame for the defect on a housing developer. Given the previous use of the site – a yard that generated a fairly significant amount of HGV movements – it is possible that any further deterioration that has been caused by heavy vehicles would have occurred regardless of the development.

In summary, the issues that have arisen on River Lane are not due to an inherent issue with the current arrangement for dealing with conditions, and there are no plans to change the way SCC and MVDC work together. Care will be taken to ensure that all aspects of pre-commencement conditions are completed, however.

This page is intentionally left blank