

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)



DATE: 30 NOVEMBER 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 response to my question about Camber measurements on Flint Hill given in Sept 2017. In that answer it was said that to reduce the camber the pavement would have to be widened. Would widening the pavement really be necessary? Is it not just possible to raise the road side pavement level so that it more closely matches the higher side that lies against the retaining wall? Since the pavement is on a hill, water will down and run off it in any case. So, if it is level across its width, it will not cause a problem with water sitting on it, but it will be much safer. This operation could be carried out without the need for widening and would make the stretch from the Ridgeway downhill to the first house on Flint Hill much more suitable for buggies, mobility scooters, prams and pedestrians.

Response:

Further to the response given in September 2017 and the councillor's previous questions the Engineer has confirmed that any engineering solution would be likely to involve altering surface levels and existing kerb levels as a part of any scheme to resolve the camber and surface issue highlighted.

Unfortunately this location (A2003 Flint Hill) has not met the criteria for funding as a part of the County Council's current Pavement Horizon programme and therefore it is not possible to progress the matter at this time as no alternative funding is available.

Question from District Councillor Friend

Residents of Westcott have little access to real-time bus information when standing on Guildford Road seeking to travel to either Dorking, Guildford or beyond. When will these bus stops be upgraded with real-time information displays?

Response:

Currently there is no identified funding for any real-time passenger information (RTPI) displays in the Westcott area. These could be funded by developer funding (CIL, S106, PIC) or by member allocation. Ideally an RTPI display would be installed in a bus shelter but in certain circumstances they can be free-standing on the bus stop pole and are dependent on a power supply. Each display costs circa £10,000 (supply, installation & power supply) so best value would need to be considered at any suggested location taking into account the frequency and number of bus service(s) and the number of passengers using the stop.

If the bus operator is providing a real-time passenger information feed to local RTPI systems then live arrivals can already be found on the Traveline South East application via smart phone, or tablet or on Traveline South East's website.

Question from Michael Agius (on behalf of Bookham Residents Association)**1. Drainage in Central Bookham**

Could we please have feedback on when the investigations into drainage problems in central Bookham will be completed, namely:

- Lower Road between East Street and The Squareabout
- Church Road between The Squareabout and Fife Way

We understand that some repairs are meant to have been undertaken recently to the newly found pipe in Lower Road abutting the church wall and that SCC Highways think that this outlets to a surface water drain in Church Road. However we know that there are still at least two broken or blocked gully connections across Lower Road from gullies on the south side to the newly found pipe along the church wall, which is why runoff ponds on the south side at the bus stop.

Further we know there are blockages in the drain down Church Road which we understand SCC Highways now think is the main outlet from the central area.

With respect, surveys have been carried out piecemeal over many years by different teams and having closely followed the investigations throughout, we are not convinced that the surveys have established that

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

runoff from the gullies in Lower Road actually reach Thames Water's surface drain in Church Road from Fife Way northwards. Once the cross road gully connections in Lower Road have been restored, we would consider that a further CCTV survey is required over the entire length, to ensure a continuous flow is possible from East Street to Fife Way.

Response:

Further maintenance investigation work has stalled pending capital funds for a full survey and further detailed investigations on the Lower Road. Previous jetting works have identified a number of issues and localised repairs have been carried out as resources have allowed in an effort to improve the situation. It is unlikely that further meaningful progress can be made without significant capital funding to resolve the outstanding issues at this location.

2. Drainage in Little Bookham Street

Could we please have an update on SCC Highways investigations into drainage in Little Bookham Street. We understand that they have investigated gully connections which run from gullies on the west side, south of The Windsor Castle pub, to Thames Water's surface water drain which runs down the east side of the carriageway. However SCC have yet to investigate what drainage there is in the west side verge from the pub northwards to opposite Bennetts Farm Place. It is thought that over this length an old ditch has been filled in over the years and sections piped under house accesses, all of which prevent the positive flow of runoff from the higher ground to the west into Thames Water's surface water drain. As a result water can be seen ponding in the verge and as this seeps under the carriageway, it has severely weakened the west side of the road over time. For their part Thames Water have yet to repair several sections of blocked/collapsed surface water drain from Lower Road to Bennetts Farm Place. Until SCC and Thames Water have finished their investigations/repairs, the extremely urgent resurfacing of Little Bookham Street under Project Horizon cannot be carried out.

Response:

Some drainage investigation have been undertaken by SCC on the West side of Little Bookham Street and this work has identified a blockage / break in the verge opposite and just south of Bennetts Farm Place. This location has been added to the works programme for the drainage repair gang. Limited resource availability means we are unable to confirm when this work will be carried out. The actual ownership of the pipe has yet to be proved, or if it links with the Thames Water system on the opposite side.

We can confirm that in an effort to resolve various issues in Little Bookham Street some ditching work was completed just north of the shop (although the ditch ownership is unclear).

Question from Stuart Cursley

The emergency access to River Walk via Mole Road which has been opened up by developers is far wider than the original width of approximately 3.7m shown in the approved plans for MO/2015/0401, which would be sufficient to provide the required turning curve for emergency vehicles. The access constructed is 7.4m wide and twice that shown on the drawings and the kerb and fencing has not been reinstated. However, Mole Valley District Council is refusing to take enforcement action in reliance on a statement that, subject to insertion of two more bollards, "[t]he County Council has confirmed that such an arrangement would be satisfactory and provides a physical barrier to prevent the formation of unauthorised access from River Walk to Mole Road as required by Condition 10".

Is Surrey County Council really satisfied that the proposed enlarged emergency access is in accordance with the approved plans for MO/2015/0401?

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 stated the requirement for the developer to provide a "physical barrier fronting Mole Road... to prevent the formation of unauthorised access to that road in accordance with the approved plans". This condition was applied to the decision notice issued by Mole Valley District Council.

The intention of this condition was to ensure Mole Road does not become a through-route for vehicles accessing the development site. It is considered by Surrey CC officers that this objective would be met by the addition of two further bollards across the opening between Mole Road and the River Walk site. Therefore, SCC officers have no concerns that the layout would cause any safety or capacity issues on the highway. SCC, within its role of County Highway Authority, can only take action where highway safety is a concern, and has no power to enforce planning conditions that were issued by a District Planning Authority.

It is clear that the layout provided is not strictly in accordance with any approved plan. Since the deviation from the agreed plan does not affect highway safety, this issue relates only to compliance with the terms of the condition. This is a planning issue and could only be enforced by the relevant Planning Authority - in this case Mole Valley District Council. It is for Mole Valley to decide whether a breach of condition has occurred, and whether enforcement action is appropriate.

Question from Jeremy Benham:

Kennel lane in Fetcham was originally a cul de sac opened as a thoroughfare in the 70s. The original road construction was of concrete which was later tarmacked over. It was obviously never built to service heavy vehicles at least every 30 minutes and not built for its intended use today. As a result the road is sinking and breaking up and causing severe vibrations to many properties in Kennel lane.

How soon can we expect for the road to be re- constructed and repaired?

Response:

Surrey County Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand and reductions in funding. To maximise funding from central government Surrey prioritises major maintenance schemes on the Horizon 2 programme in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management.

All roads on the Horizon 2 programme have been prioritised in accordance with the cabinet approved prioritisation process. The process takes account of criteria including: condition; network priority; risk and network management.

I know that it is disappointing to residents that Kennel Lane is not prioritised for resurfacing works. However, the road will continue to be inspected and any safety defects that meet the intervention level will be fixed.

Questions from District Cllr Kennedy

1. Several stretches along Lower Road in Fetcham and Bookham have footpaths on one or other side only, with the result that pedestrians can face difficult and dangerous crossings in order to continue their journey, particularly at the junctions with Bell Lane, Kennel Lane and Amey Drive. Has the Council given any consideration to establishing safe crossing points or other safety features at these junctions particularly for elderly and disabled residents as well as schoolchildren?

Response:

Lower Road is a D-Class road running from the District boundary in the west running through the village of Bookham to the junction with Cobham Road in Fetcham in the east. The current system of street lighting indicates to motorists that the speed limit is 30mph. Traffic calming in the form of speed humps are in place along the section of Lower Road that runs through the centre of Bookham village, between the junctions of The Lorne and Pine Walk. There are no traffic calming measures on Lower Road in the vicinity of the junctions with Bell Lane, Kennel Lane and Amey Drive. There are informal crossing facilities in the form of dropped kerbs and tactile paving present on Lower Road at the junction with Bell Lane.

It is not possible to install formal crossing facilities on Lower Road at the junctions of Amey Drive, Kennel Lane and Bell Lane due to the proximity of existing private accesses. However there are informal crossing facilities on Lower Road at the junction with Bell Lane.

A review of the personal injury collisions recorded by Surrey Police, shows that there has been nine reported collisions on Lower Road between Amey Drive and Bell Lane, from 1st October 2014 to the 30th September 2017 (the latest 3 year period for which data is available). However none of these nine collisions occurred at the junction with Amey Drive, the majority of these collisions (seven) occurred at the roundabout junction with Bell Lane and the other two occurred at the junction with Kennel Lane. None of the collisions involved pedestrians.

Due to the seven personal injury collisions at the Lower Road/Bell Lane roundabout junction the Road Safety Working Group, which consists of road safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways, commissioned a scheme to reduce the number of personal injury collisions at this junction. As a result a scheme to install road markings in order to reduce the width of the circulatory carriageway on the roundabout has been designed and is to be installed by the end of March 2018.

Officers appreciate the concerns raised regarding pedestrian safety on Lower Road, particularly at the junctions with Bell Lane, Kennel Lane and Amey Drive. The Local Area Highway Team receive a large number of requests for pedestrian crossing points and road safety measures on roads within the Mole Valley area. There is very limited funding available to implement such measures, and therefore all such requests need to be prioritised. The most recent collision history, existing informal crossing facilities at the Lower Road/Bell Lane junction and the difficulty of providing formal crossing points at these junctions, mean that regrettably the request for additional crossing points and additional safety features at these junctions would not be prioritised over other requests for measures of a similar nature in the Mole Valley area.

2. What findings and actions are expected to result from the recent visit to Fetcham by Surrey Highways officials to consider traffic conditions near the junction between Cobham Road and The Street?

Response:

A meeting between Surrey County Council Highways officers and County Councillors was held on site on Cobham Road, Fetcham on 3rd November. At the meeting, the scope of improving highway capacity and safety through Fetcham village centre was considered. It should be noted that no personal injury collisions have occurred at the Cobham Road/The Street junction or in the near vicinity during the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 01/10/14 to 30/09/17).

Whilst the meeting was a good opportunity to understand Councillors concerns with traffic and parking issues in Fetcham, it was clarified there is no Local Committee funding currently available to implement highway improvement schemes in this area. It was explained in this meeting that development-related contributions towards transport infrastructure can only be justified where the impact of the development is materially greater than the existing permitted use of the site. Further, it would need to be demonstrated by the Council that improvements towards improved infrastructure are necessary in order that the development can operate without materially damaging the conditions of highway safety or capacity.

The proposals for the former Tudor Motors Garage site were discussed at length. It is the view of SCC officers that the number of trips that would be generated by the proposed development would not be a significant increase over the potential of the site to operate as a garage. As part of the proposal, an informal pedestrian crossing from the site to the other side of Cobham Road has been proposed, which is required to aid pedestrians to the site, including those who have parked in the parking bays outside the parade of shops. In addition, parking restrictions are proposed on Cobham Road around the site, in order to ensure the development does not encourage parking in close proximity to the roundabout. These are considered the only highway improvements that can be directly attributed to the development. It was agreed that further detail of the informal pedestrian crossing would be required from the developer prior to implementation, and a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit carried out.

The possibility of requesting a financial contribution from the developer to fund or part fund wider capacity, parking or safety schemes was discussed. There is little scope to secure a financial contribution for the reasons above - the proposal is not materially worse than the currently permitted use in terms of traffic generation. It was also noted that there is, at present, no highways scheme that a financial contribution could be spent on.

For the above reasons, there are no expected actions in the short-term, but the relevant SCC officers will consider the concerns raised if any viable opportunities to secure improvements are presented in the future.

This page is intentionally left blank