

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE:** 06 JUNE 2018**LEAD OFFICER:** SARAH J SMITH, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER**SUBJECT:** QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS**DIVISION:** ALL**SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL****Questions submitted by Tim Hall (Leatherhead and Fetcham East):**

Drainage Contract and Cleaning

1. Can I ask how many gullies and drainage assets were cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/8?

Response:

There were 14,407 cleans of individual drainage assets in Mole Valley in 2017/18.

2. How many drainage assets were not cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/8?

Response

2,017 individual drainage assets were not cleaned in Mole Valley in 2017/18, often because of cars parked over gullies at all attempts to clean.

Breakdown:

The total number of registered individual drainage assets in Mole Valley: 12,475

Total amount of visits to those assets: 16,424 (not all assets can be cleaned on every visit due to parked cars obstructing the asset).

Total amount of assets cleaned: 14,407 (some assets are cleaned more than once, often due to frequently high silt levels in the gully).

Total amount of assets not cleaned: 2,017

3. How many drainage assets were added to the asset register in each of 2016/7 and 2017/8?

Response

It is appreciated that there were a large number of individual drainage assets, such as gullies, that were not on the interactive Surrey map, and that this made it difficult for residents to report blocked gullies using the “report it” tab on the website.

Some of the “missing” gullies were missing from the asset register, while others were missing from the interactive map on the “report it” tab on the website, but were still included within the asset register.

In 2017/18 there were 478 missing assets added to our interactive mapping system. The Local Area Team holds a list of roads where there are known missing assets and are currently checking that these are now on our asset register and on the interactive map on the “report it” tab on the website so that residents can report any problems with these assets.

Information on the number of assets added to the register in 2016/7 was not available before the deadline for a response, the Area Highway Manager will provide an update as soon as this information is available.

4. How many drainage assets have not yet been added to the asset register or were not on it at 1st April 2018?

Response

The local team have identified a further 13 sites / locations (approximately 48 “missing” assets) as of 1st April 2018. These have been added to the client jetter to map these missing assets as otherwise they would not be able to be added to the asset register. They are being dealt with as resources and priorities permit and the local area team are seeking additional centrally funded resources to map these assets and to address blocked or damaged assets. Once cleaned, recorded and outlets checked they will be added to the interactive mapping system and programmed for inclusion in future cyclic cleaning

Questions submitted by Chris Townsend (Ashtead)

1. The pedestrian crossing on the A24 nearby Bramley Way - what has happened to the Design stage of this project - this has been outstanding for around a year?

Response

The design team is currently progressing the feasibility report, assessing four possible locations for the pedestrian crossing on the A24 Epsom Road in the vicinity of the junction with Bramley Way. The feasibility report will be complete by the end of June 2018. Once the report is complete, it will be sent

to the divisional member for comment, and a decision on the preferred location.

It is acknowledged that this design has taken longer than had been hoped; this is due to the limited design resource available.

2. The traffic lights at Downsend School (junction of A24 and Grange Road etc.) are out of sync. !! Traffic queues build up during the day (particularly at peak times) causing considerable delays - half term this week and queues are still there. Is traffic coming to and from the M25 causing these problems - can we please check as it does seem to be the traffic lights that cause the delays?

Response:

A Traffic Systems Engineer has assessed the signals at the A24 Leatherhead Road/Grange Road/Ermyn Way junction. The results of this assessment showed that there was a problem with the existing configuration of the signals and a detector fault. An engineer is due to attend the site during the week commencing 4th June to resolve the problem with the existing configuration and to further investigate the fault.

3. When are the 20mph limits coming into force around both St. Giles School and CLFS (Dene Road and Park Lane)?

Response:

Traffic calming measures are needed to help enforce the existing advisory 20mph speed limit outside St. Giles Infants School and the City of London Freemans School. Traffic calming measures would also enable a permanent 20mph speed limit outside of these schools to be made.

In the 2015/16 financial year funding was allocated from the Local Committee Integrated Transport Scheme budget to design traffic calming measures to support the proposed permanent 20mph speed limit. However, following the reduction in the Integrated Transport Scheme budget there is no funding currently available to construct the traffic calming measures.

The Local Area Team will continue to seek any external funding opportunities for this scheme.

4. When is the work in Ottways Lane, Ashtead due to finish as residents are very concerned as to the time it is taking?

Response:

These are SES Water works to replace old iron water mains and services to properties.

SCC Officers have been liaising with SES Water regards progress of the works as it has been recognised that works have fallen behind the original agreed programme.

Completion of the main laying is now scheduled for mid-June. SES Water will then move into Timber Hill, running in line with service connections through to mid-July.

SES Water have commenced the road crossing of the A24 at the junction with Ottways Lane on Monday 4th June. This is to connect with the main on the other side of the carriageway. These works were deferred to avoid a clash with the Epsom Derby weekend.

SCC Officers continue to liaise with SES Water regards progression and completion of this scheme, regularly attending site to monitor progress.

Questions submitted by Stephen Cooksey (Dorking South and the Holmwoods)

1. A few weeks ago essential repairs closed Ashcombe Road for a day with resultant traffic deadlock in the centre of Dorking lasting some hours. I understand that further work including a further closure is planned for next month. What arrangements are being made to prevent traffic gridlock in Dorking town centre when the next closure of Ashcombe Road takes place?

Response:

The surface dressing works have been scheduled to take place on Saturday 23 June when traffic will be lighter. The work is expected to take half a day and the road will be reopened as soon as the new surface has been laid. Road markings will be re-painted approximately a week later, but the road will not be closed while the lining takes place.

Advanced warning signs will be placed on the road on 6 June. We will post tweets on @SurreyTravel and @MoleValleyLC Twitter accounts, if members could re-tweet our messages we would appreciate it.

Surface dressing is a highly weather dependent road treatment. The road surface must be dry and warm enough for the material to be laid. Because of this there is a surface dressing “season” which runs from June to August. The specialist surface dressing contractor is only in Surrey for two weeks and after 23 June they are scheduled to move on to another contract so Surrey County Council have had to try to find a date within that two week window or risk the work not taking place this year.

In addition to the limited amount of time we have the contractor in Surrey, there are exams ongoing in The Ashcombe School up until Friday 22 June. Surrey County Council has been talking to the Head Teacher of the school to work with them to find a date that would cause the least disruption to the children sitting exams.

2. Since the 'upgrading' of the traffic light system took place in Dorking town centre a few months ago there have been a series of apparent faults particularly at the Vincent Lane / Westcott Road junction which have caused serious traffic congestion in the town centre. Could residents be assured that the system is now clear of any faults and is now working at maximum capacity?

Response:

Following the upgrading of the traffic light system in Dorking town centre, Surrey County Council's traffic operations team received a number of reports from the public that Dorking town centre was experiencing traffic congestion, particularly at the Vincent Lane/Westcott Road junction. Engineers visited the site who found no fault at the Vincent Lane/Westcott Road junction, but found a faulty detector at the Pump Corner junction, which has since been replaced.

However following further reports of congestion, additional investigations were carried out, as a result signal timings were tweaked and changes to the configuration of the signals are planned to be completed by 8th June 2018. Further recent investigations have also revealed another detector fault, which will be investigated when work to change the configuration of the signals is carried out.

Once the above works are completed this will help to alleviate some of the congestion within Dorking, however it will not resolve it completely. This is because Dorking, inherently has a capacity issue which makes it particularly sensitive to congestion, namely that West Street is only one lane due to existing buildings and receives traffic filtering in from a number of approaches (Junction Road, Station Road, Vincent Lane and Westcott Road). However, it is hoped that once the above works are complete, this will help to alleviate some of the congestion in Dorking.

Question submitted by Paul Kennedy (Fetcham West)

1. What are Surrey County Council's procedures for ensuring that utility companies restore the roads and footpaths they dig up to a good condition, and what is the council's assessment of the effectiveness of those procedures as they affect Mole Valley, having particular regard to the condition of the roads following recent works in the the Fetcham/Bookham/Leatherhead area?

Response:

Surrey County Council has 9 dedicated Streetworks Officers whose role is to inspect Utility Companies' activities across Surrey, both whilst in progress to check for compliance to Permit conditions for granted works and to ensure appropriate site safety measures, and also upon completion of works to ensure the highway has been reinstated correctly. This team of Streetworks

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Officers report to the Streetworks Compliance Team Leader, based at the NMIC in Leatherhead and they operate a very robust, effective function undertaking inspections of a percentage sample of all works as well as responding to any concerns/complaints about works undertaken. Where defective reinstatement is identified, the Utility Company is required to make good at its cost, to the county council's satisfaction.

Utility Company reinstatements of the public highway are guaranteed for 24 months after completion and so further inspections are also scheduled towards the end of this guarantee period, in order to pick up the need for any remedial works before the guarantee period expires. The reinstatement completed by the Utility Companies is required to meet a National specification; the Specification for the Reinstatement of Openings in the Highway (SRoH).

The volumes of inspections Surrey can re-charge for, regardless of whether the reinstatement is passed or failed are set out in the Code of Practice (CoP) for Inspections, New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, (NRSWA). Both the SRoH and the Inspections CoP are currently under review by the Department for Transport and members of the Highways and Utilities Committee (HAUC) – England.

It should be noted that current legislation allows utility companies to complete 'temporary reinstatement' upon completion of their works, using an interim material, provided the reinstatement is level. They are required to return to complete 'permanent' reinstatement within 6 months of their original works being completed. This temporary reinstatement is often mistaken as the final surface, which can lead to concerns from the general public, until permanent reinstatement is completed.

Questions submitted by Hazel Watson (Dorking Hills)

When roads cross culverts, frequently there are railings alongside the road as a safety measure. However, a number of these safety railings in the Wotton and Abinger area have fallen into disrepair.

As there appears to be an increasing backlog of repair work in relation to these railings which are adjacent to culverts:

- (i) What regular inspections are made of the railings beside roads and alongside culverts to ensure that the railings are fit for purpose?
- (ii) For such railings in Wotton and Abinger Parishes, what repair work is currently outstanding and scheduled to take place to ensure that all such railings are fit for purpose? and
- (iii) What budget is held for ongoing repair work to these railings and, if there is no specific budget, how will the repairs to such culverts, which is a safety issue, be carried out in a timely manner?

If no inspections are made and no list of outstanding repair work exists, will a review of all culverts and associated railings in Wotton and Abinger Parishes take place before the next meeting of the Local Committee? Will a report be presented setting out: the condition of the railings at each culvert, a description of the necessary

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

remedial work that needs to be carried out, and the way the necessary safety work will be funded in the current financial year?

Response:

Culvert protection barriers are not inspected as part of the highway safety inspection process. However, if a damaged culvert protection barrier is identified during the course of a safety inspection, and if the damage would pose a hazard to pedestrians or vehicles, then a repair would be ordered. Otherwise, the local area team would be informed and would arrange for repair as appropriate. It should be noted that large culverts are considered to be a structure (eg small bridge) and this would be dealt with by Surrey's infrastructure team.

Where damage to culvert protection barriers are reported to Surrey, these are inspected by the Local Highway Officer and appropriate action taken. Where damage is the result of a traffic collision, follow up action is taken by Surrey's contractor to make safe (where considered necessary) and to put in hand permanent repairs.

The local area team is not aware of any culvert protection works outstanding or scheduled at this time in either Wotton or Abinger.

There are no specific budgets for culvert protection works. However the Local Committee's revenue budget can be used when available. Where damage has been caused by a known third party then funds are recovered for the repair by our contractors.

If the divisional member is aware of any damaged culvert protection barriers in her division, it is proposed that she contact the Mole Valley Maintenance Engineer. These sites will then be inspected, a solution agreed and repairs ordered, subject to the allocation of funding.

This page is intentionally left blank