

Questions from Members of the public

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

DATE: 22 JANUARY 2020

LEAD OFFICER: JESS EDMUNDSON, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

DIVISION: ALL



1. Question submitted by John Moyer:

Just to update that the old 479 timetables (at North Street both directions) are no longer visible at all, as TfL have put up notices about a short term diversion of 465 They have been into the displays and made a change but not 479 related. So all adding to confusion there but at least the real time information is available at these stops.

There is enough CIL available now to plan RTI for other stops. Given 479 is a priority bus corridor will this be organised? A project plan can be submitted to CIL officers at MVDC. Ashted, Fetcham and Bookham CIL is available in addition to Leatherhead. MVDC has confirmed officers can submit a bid for CIL. Cobham already has RTI at most bus stops so it can be achieved if there is joined up working.

Response:

Highways, Transport and Environment are responsible for managing and delivering the real-time passenger information (RTPI) system in Surrey. We recognise from our residents, and working in partnership with the local bus operators, the importance of providing high quality information to better inform journey planning and attract more passengers. This is why we have installed over 300 RTPI displays across the county.

In consideration of the 479 bus route corridor in particular, there are a number of displays which have already been installed in Bookham, Fetcham and Leatherhead. We have also secured further developer funding to provide additional displays in Bookham and Fetcham, which will be delivered during the next financial year (2020/21). We are always looking at ways to secure further funding to deliver bus stop infrastructure improvements, including the provision of RTPI, and submitting a CIL bid to Mole Valley District Council is an example of this.

2. Question submitted by Cllr James Friend:

Given the recent number of accidents and near misses that have been experienced on the A25 road as it passes through Westcott, would the Local Committee please arrange for a road safety survey to be undertaken covering the stretch and junctions from Milton Court Lane to Coast Hill Lane to identify potential improvements that might improve overall safety for road users and pedestrians, including school children walking to and from Surrey Hills and Priory schools. The survey needs to include aspects of potential deterrents to inappropriate overtaking as well as potential speed management

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

actions. If funding is a key concern to the undertaking of such a survey then please can Mole Valley District Council consider part funding this one off item?

Response:

Road Safety

Every time there is a collision resulting in personal injury recorded by the police, the information is compiled and added to computer mapping to aid analysis. A summary of the information can be viewed by the public via www.crashmap.co.uk. Officers undertake analysis of collisions to assess whether there are any particular patterns and common factors to the collisions, or whether there are any particular locations with a greater history of collisions that may warrant more investigation.

There was a collision on the A25 Guildford Road in Westcott on 28 October 2019 involving 2 vehicles. The driver of one of the vehicles very sadly died as a result of this collision. The collision is being investigated by Surrey Police. Officers will wait upon the results of the detailed police investigation before drawing any conclusions as to the causes of this incident, and whether there might be any highway improvements that might mitigate the possibility of any future collisions.

From the data prior to the recent fatal collision there were a total of 15 collisions on this stretch of road (approximately 1.7 km long) in the period from December 2014 to November 2019 (the most recent period for which data has been compiled). This included one collision resulting in serious injury and 14 collisions resulting in slight injury. Two slight injury collisions involved pedestrians. Four slight injury collisions involved motorcyclists. For any collision the police can record a range of possible contributory factors. These may be subjective, and can often be selected after the event, away from the scene so need to be treated with caution, but can none-the-less give an indication of possible causes and any patterns:

- Six collisions involved shunts
- Seven collisions involved loss of control of the vehicle
- One involved "failure to look properly"
- One involved overtaking
- One involved exceeding the speed limit

Following consideration of the data for this stretch of road it is concluded that there isn't any obvious pattern of collisions that could easily be mitigated by highway improvements.

Speed Management

Speeds have been surveyed using speed detection radar mounted on lamp columns at two locations on this stretch of road for a one week period from 8 to 15 June 2018:

- Lamp column number four near the entrance to Surrey Hills School (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/Nj5Rv5529VDCD2kp7>). This showed mean average speeds of 36 mph and 85th percentile speeds of 41 mph.
- Lamp column number 11 near the thatched roof bus shelter (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Questions from Members of the public

<https://goo.gl/maps/9JzYXo8spN3EbkK49>). This showed mean average speeds of 30 mph and 85th percentile speeds of 34 mph.

This shows that there is some speeding on some parts of the route (near the school). Due to concerns over vehicle speeds two vehicle activated signs have been installed on this stretch of road previously. These light up to remind drivers of the speed limit if drivers are approaching too fast:

- Facing westbound traffic near the junction with Milton Avenue (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/N5YMggicRsgFFWXUA>)
- Facing eastbound traffic prior to the junction with Heath Rise (location can be seen on Google Street View via this link: <https://goo.gl/maps/qRFd3JSAhKJP7WdV9>)

The speed limit between Dorking and Westcott was changed from 50 mph to 40 mph in March 2011. This may have helped to reduce the speed of westbound vehicles entering the 30 mph speed limit within Westcott.

The 30 mph section of road within Westcott is included on the Mole Valley speed management plan as a site requiring enforcement by the police. County council officers are meeting with police colleagues on 29 January 2020 to discuss the speed management plan, and will request an update and consideration of potential options for speed management and enforcement.

Inappropriate Overtaking

Double white lines are used to prohibit drivers from driving on that area of road used by the vehicles travelling in the opposite direction, generally where overtaking visibility is restricted either by bends or the brow of hills. For more double white lines to be considered for Westcott there would need to be clear evidence of injudicious overtaking being a problem (which is not apparent in the collision data) and forward visibility being restricted below the thresholds set out in national standards. As a double white line system has already been introduced within Westcott it is most likely that any stretch that meets the standards already has been provided with such lining. Providing more double white lining might encourage higher speeds which would be undesirable.

3. Question submitted by Ron Billard, Mole Valley Cycling Forum:

There are nowhere near enough multi user paths suitable for cyclists, walkers, mobility buggies. Those that exist tend to be poorly maintained and badly signed.

Now that everybody is recognising that there is a climate emergency and an obesity crisis, may we please request that the multi-user path alongside the A24 southbound of Dorking from North Holmwood to Beare Green is regularly swept and signposted to show the route for cyclists:

North end of Spook Hill

South end of Spook Hill

Underpass at Holmwood Corner.

Underpass at Beare Green

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

Noting that the path clearance undertaken by Surrey County Council failed to achieve an adequate standard of surface suitable for other than mountain bikers or serious walkers, may we request that plans be drawn up for a pathway of a similar standard to that of the A24 north of Dorking, so that when money does become available SCC stands a chance of obtaining funding.

Response:

The existing shared footway/cycleway that runs alongside the A24 ends at the junction with Spook Hill in the north and the junction with Old Horsham Road at Beare Green in the south. There is currently no funding available to extend the existing footway/cycleway along Spook Hill, or to the underpasses at Holmwood Corner and Beare Green. However, schemes to provide a signed on road cycle route along Spook Hill and Old Horsham Road to connect to the existing underpasses under the A24 will be added to the Integrated Transport Scheme list for possible future funding.

Responsibility for sweeping the existing footways/cycleways within Mole Valley rests with Mole Valley District Council. Unfortunately the Local Area Team has no funding available to carry out work to side out the existing footway/cycleway and cut back vegetation along this 1.5 mile footway/cycleway.

It is appreciated that the Mole Valley Cycle Forum would like the existing shared footway/cycleway to be of a similar standard to that of the A24 north of Dorking. The cost of constructing such improvements would exceed that available to the Local Committee, which has a budget for minor local highway improvements. Such large scale strategic infrastructure improvement schemes should be included within Surrey County Council's Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme in order for other sources of funding for this scheme to be sought and so that initial design work can be carried out. Surrey County Council's Local Area Team will therefore request that Surrey County Council's Major Transport Projects Team, add this strategic scheme to Mole Valley's Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme.

Improvements to the existing footway/cycleway on the A24 Horsham Road between the junctions with Spook Hill and Old Horsham Road, so that it is similar to that of the standard on the A24 to the north of Dorking could be eligible for Strategic CIL funding if identified through Mole Valley District Council's emerging Local Plan. However, this scheme could be considered for CIL funding, by Mole Valley District Council, if it was part of a series of highway improvements. This would be required to be linked to new housing sites, if these progress through the Local Plan process. Any proposals of this nature would be identified later in the Local Plan process when there is more certainty about where new development is to take place.

4. Question submitted by Eric Palmer:

On the A25 eastbound from Dorking towards Reigate, there is an area of cross-hatching between The Watermill and the Wyevale Garden Centre which was implemented to keep vehicular traffic away from the edge of the road which is understood to be liable to subsidence. This has effectively reduced the width of the road which means vehicles are only able to give limited space when overtaking cyclists. Whilst cyclists could ride through the cross-hatching, it is strictly speaking not legal to use and in any case the hatching is not necessarily comfortable to ride through.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

Consequently, would Surrey Highways create a cycle lane through the cross-hatching adjacent to the edge of the carriageway? There is a precedent to this on the A24 southbound from Givons Grove through the Mickleham bends.

The southbound carriageway from Givons Grove Roundabout to Mickleham on the A24 just before the Frascati Restaurant has a narrow cycle lane which ends in a double hatched blocked end i.e. intending cyclists to cede priority to main road traffic.- any cyclist approaching this end point generally at speed (it is at the bottom of the hill) has to attempt to look behind 180 degrees) whilst main road motor traffic's view is straight ahead and unencumbered. The priority should be changed. The writer travels along this route four times a week and feels it represents a completely unnecessary hazard to cyclists.

Response:**A25 Reigate Road, Dorking**

The A25 Reigate Road, Dorking runs in an east west direction between Dorking and Reigate and forms part of the principal road network. There is a section of vehicle restraint system or crash barrier along the north side of Reigate Road between the drive to Castle Mill Lodge and the D311 Boxhill Road at Wyevale Garden Centre. This barrier is adjacent to a steep drop to the River Mole and is in place to prevent vehicles leaving the road.

There is a 290m length of hatched road markings bounded by a solid white line on the edge of the eastbound carriageway. These markings are along the majority but not the total length of the barrier, and vary in width. There is a double white line system along this section of Reigate Road that prohibits drivers from crossing the white line as overtaking visibility is restricted by the bends.

An investigation has been carried into the collision history on the section of the A25 Reigate Road between the drive to Castle Mill Lodge and the D311 Boxhill Road at Wyevale Garden Centre. During the period January 2016 to March 2019 (the latest dates for which data is available) there have been 2 collisions involving serious injury and 3 collisions involving slight injury. One of the collisions involved a pedal cyclist, when a stationary vehicle near the Coach Road moved off and collided with a pedal cyclist.

It is acknowledged that the hatching restricts the width of the eastbound carriageway. However the existing lining system has been designed to ensure sufficient carriageway widths for all classes of vehicles, including buses and Heavy Goods Vehicles that use this principal road.

It is requested that a cycle lane is created through the hatched markings at the edge of the eastbound carriageway. The variable width of the hatched markings means that it is not clear whether there would be sufficient width for a cycle lane along the entire 290m length of the hatching. If it were possible to provide a cycle lane in through the hatching then this would be of limited benefit, given the short distance involved. For these reasons there are no plans to provide a cycle lane through the hatching on the A25 Reigate Road in Dorking as is requested.

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

A24 London Road, Mickleham

The A24 London Road, Mickleham runs in a north south direction between Leatherhead and Dorking, and forms part of the principal road network. There is a cycle lane at the edge of the southbound carriageway with hatched road markings between the cycle lane and main carriageway.

A restaurant, Frascati, is located beside the southbound carriageway of the A24 London Road close to the junction with School Hill. There is a parking area beside the road and a bus stop in front of the restaurant. A gap in the hatched markings means that cars and buses accessing the parking area and bus stop can do so without crossing the hatching. Cyclists are required to give way at this gap in the hatching and there are give way lines across the cycle lane to indicate this.

An investigation has been carried into the collision history on the section of the A24 London Road between Mickleham Drive and the B2209 Old London Road. During the period January 2016 to March 2019 (the latest dates for which data is available) there have been 2 collisions involving slight injury. One of these collisions involved a pedal cyclist that collided with a vehicle at the junction of Old London Road.

It is suggested that the priority is changed so that cyclists no longer need to give way at this gap in the hatching outside the Frascati restaurant. Changing the priority would mean that upon occasion cars and buses would need to stop on the main A24 London Road carriageway to allow cyclists to proceed. This would lead to the potential for conflict between vehicles travelling southbound on the main A24 London Road carriageway and any stationary vehicle. For this reason there are no plans to change the priority on this cycle lane as is suggested.

There is an off carriageway cycleway on the verge beside the northbound carriageway of the A24 that southbound cyclists can use should they so wish.

5. Question submitted by Peter Seaward, Bookhams Residents Association

SCC Highways made considerable improvement to the water catchment facilities at the corner of Dorking Road/Chapel Lane/ Admirals Walk/Polesden Lacey Road, Bookham. The new set back gully was meant as a catch all for grit and other debris that otherwise would flow down Dorking Road. This system so far appears not to be achieving this as evidenced by the need to clear all the soakaways recently. Would Highways have another look at this grit/debris problem and possibly consider a cross catch pit trap in the form of a large cattle grid. This might help solve this long standing problem.

Response:

Works were carried out during financial year 2018/19 in Bookham at the junction of Dorking Road/Chapel Road/Polesden Road and Admirals Road to enhance the existing drainage system. The works included the provision of 4 additional gullies and capacity improvement works to the existing soakaway.

Unfortunately not all existing drainage assets at this location were recorded on the database of drainage assets. These assets were captured during a recent visit to the site, this visit has also highlighted some minor improvements that are proposed for this drainage system during the financial year 2020/2021.

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

It is appreciated that more major improvements to this drainage system are desired by local residents, and some drainage improvements in Bookham are being explored through the Bookham Flood Forum. However a scheme such as is described would not be suitable in this location, and no funding has been currently identified for further major drainage improvements at this location.

The cyclic cleaning programme for road gullies and soakaways is undertaken separately. It should be noted that in certain locations, such as this one, cleaning needs to be carried out at night due to the proximity of gullies to the road junction. All assets will now be cleaned as per the scheduled programme for this road.

6. Question submitted by Jon Favell:

What are the plans to tackle the failing road surface along the A245 By Pass Road (Leatherhead)?

There is widespread delamination occurring, specifically in the westbound direction, which is further compounded by over 65,000 HGVs per annum and widespread speeding. There appears a very real intention to return the road to base concrete, which doesn't feel appropriate or fair given the volume and nature of transit it has to support, i.e. a further increase in house vibrations and noise pollution levels for the long suffering residents.

Response:

A245 By-Pass Road, Leatherhead was assessed for planned maintenance works by officers and unfortunately did not prioritise when compared with other roads county wide which are on Horizon 2 programme. The last occasion this road was fully resurfaced was 2002.

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

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

Full list of schemes is published on our website
<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

We will continue to inspect these roads for individual Safety Defects, and arrange repairs as appropriate.

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

7. Question submitted by Roger Troughton, Mole Valley Cycling Forum:

According to the DfT's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS) published April 2017, this has within it a requirement for councils to prepare Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs).

Without these in place, councils and regional areas will have no ability to bid for any central government pots of money to improve cycling and walking networks.

Is it possible to point us in the direction of the LCWIP for Mole Valley? If there isn't one, when will it be in place? If there are no plans to produce one, who should this be escalated to?

Response:

The [Mole Valley Cycling Plan](#) was adopted by the Local Committee in September 2014. The elements of infrastructure proposed in the Cycling Plan were subsequently published online and can be viewed through the [Surrey Cycle Infrastructure Map](#).

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs) provide a best practice evidence-led method for local authorities to plan both walking and cycling infrastructure. Surrey County Council has been in the process of piloting the method in Woking over the past year through resources granted by Department for Transport and the LCWIP is expected to be completed in the next 2-3 months.

Going forward, it is the council's intention to support districts and boroughs by helping them to produce LCWIPs for other areas of the county in due course, including Mole Valley. These LCWIPs will expand on and supersede existing Cycling Plans (where already in place) and apply lessons learned from Woking. However, the timescale for this is uncertain as no council funding has been allocated towards resourcing the development of LCWIPs at this stage. As things progress, this may be something individual district and borough councils can help with by allocating resource to assist the development of LCWIPs within each area. Local level expertise and area knowledge will be vital to support the planning and development stage of each LCWIP, and to see the process through to implementation of proposed measures.

8. Question submitted by Mike Giles, Westhumble:

In common with many areas in the Mole Valley and broad swathes of the UK as a whole, the villages of Mickleham and Westhumble experience unacceptable levels of exhaust noise, principally from motorbikes, with the odd high-performance sports car thrown in. Maximum noise tends to be generated by motorbikes or performance cars travelling at speed, but very significant levels often occur during acceleration, even below specified speed limits, or worse still, from stationary vehicles in car parks, seemingly demonstrating their impatience for other riders to be ready to set off. Like Heineken, these high levels of exhaust noise reach parts that other traffic noise cannot reach and can be clearly heard at surprising distances from the main roads.

A readily achievable partial solution to our problem on the A24 is the extension of the average speed camera system, which is demonstrably successful elsewhere and has significantly reduced the amount of noise heard from the camera controlled section of the A24, compared to the levels still emanating from the unmonitored stretch into Dorking. There is, of course, a seasonal element to the frequency of this problem, but instances can occur at almost any time, from early morning to late night.

Can SCC Highways Department please give an assurance that, in common with the Chief Constable and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey, it recognises the

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

problem created by this noise, which the government has acknowledged as a hazard to health, and confirm that SCC is fully aware of Department of Transport tests begun in June, involving 'noise cameras' in Kensington and Chelsea, along with temporary sites in Hampshire during November, and can they further confirm that, along with other agencies, they will be developing an integrated plan to control noise on all roads and in car parks in this area, with equal regard to regulation of speed, in particular dangerous speeds through villages which serve as 'escape routes' from the camera controlled highway.

Response:

It is acknowledged that a minority of vehicles using Surrey's roads can be excessively noisy. It is also acknowledged that such noise can travel some distance, and can affect a number of local residents in a particular area.

The enforcement of excessively noisy vehicles is a matter for the Police and Environmental Health Teams at District and Borough Council's, it is not the responsibility of Surrey County Council as Highway Authority.

There is currently a Department for Transport (DfT) trial in progress into acoustic cameras. These cameras are being investigated for their potential to identify excessively noisy vehicles. As the enforcement of such vehicles is not a matter for Surrey County Council and the results of the DfT trial are not yet published, Officers are not able to comment on Surrey County Council's position on any future noise control plan.

The use of safety cameras (such as average speed cameras) to encourage improved compliance with the speed limit, is reserved for locations where there has been a serious history of collisions and where speeds have been measured and found to be a problem. This is to ensure that police enforcement and court prosecution resources are prioritised at the sites that need them the most. It also helps maintain public support for safety cameras as a road safety tool rather than being perceived incorrectly as a "tax on the motorist".

There are no plans to consider the extension of the existing average speed cameras system on the A24 as a tool to manage road traffic noise on the A24. It would also be questionable as to whether the use of average speed cameras would successfully tackle the problem – excessive engine noise can be created by hard acceleration within the speed limit, or even by revving engines of stationary parked vehicles.

9. Question submitted by David Allbeury, Westhumble Residents' Association:

- a) The Plantlife campaign, launched last year, advocates a departure from standard council regimes for maintaining verges and central reservations, by reducing the frequency and changing the timing of most grass cutting. This encourages the flourishing of wild flowers, aided and abetted by additional seeding, thereby improving the environment for wheeled and pedestrian road users alike, whilst benefiting wildlife, with the added spin-off of reduced costs. Longer grass and wild flowers on rural roads can be most attractive, swaying in the breeze of

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

passing traffic and compensating to some extent for the loss of wild flower meadows, whilst on central reservations taller vegetation can also reduce the glare of oncoming headlights at night.

Will Surrey County Council Highways Department give an assurance that they have been party to communications with Plantlife and that, amongst SCC's New Year's resolutions, they will be following the advice offered by them, in common with other UK councils.

Response:

SCC have attended two symposiums last year, where representatives of PlantLife were present. A trial is being undertaken on the Southern end of the A24 this coming financial year, where some areas will have a 1m swathe cut on all verges, but no more on the first cut. The second cut will have a full width cut, to prevent woody vegetation taking over the grass verges. The A24 has multiple cross over points and junctions onto and off the dual carriageway, and many parts of the road are not suited to a Plantlife style cut.

- b) Further, that savings inherent in the reduced frequency of grass cutting on road verges and central reservations in general will be devoted, at least in part, to areas which are currently not maintained adequately, giving rise to visibility issues for motorists and warranting more frequent attention than they currently receive, such as the central reservation at the junction of the A24, with Westhumble Street, where visibility is often obscured for traffic turning into Westhumble Street from the Burford Bridge roundabout, or locations not on a regular maintenance schedule at all, such as the raised verges on the south side of Chapel Lane, between the railway bridge and Pilgrims Way.

Response:

The A24 at Westhumble is cut twice a year. Last year we received three complaints in May about sightline issues, which was addressed by our normal phase 1 cut, just two weeks later. We received no further complaints that year, and undertook a second cut in accordance with our schedule at the very start of October.

Cutting the grass on the A24 is only part of the cyclical maintenance that Surrey County Council and Mole Valley District undertakes working in partnership. The temporary traffic management allows street cleansing, litter picking, gully emptying, sign maintenance and road maintenance to be carried out, and grass cutting is a minimal cost of all these in comparison.

The raised verges in Chapel Lane do not consist of grass but are a mixture of wild flowers and woody vegetation. It would not be possible to use a grass cutting contractor to maintain these areas of verges.

- c) It would also be appropriate to cut areas of grass within town boundaries more frequently than previous practice to distinguish between rural and urban environments, particularly the central reservation coming into Dorking from the

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

Denbies roundabout and the Cockerel roundabout at the junction of the A24 and A25, where more 'manicured lawns' would not be out of place.

Response:

It is illogical to cut some grass more frequently, whilst leaving other grass to grow long. The specification for urban grass is four cuts a year, and rural grass 2 cuts a year. This specification will not change, in order to make grass look nicer (or more manicured). Mole Valley District Council choose not to top up the money that Surrey County Council provides to ensure that the grass is cut to make the highway safe. Other Districts and Boroughs, cut the grass more frequently in urban areas, by topping up the maintenance budget.

10. Question submitted by Martyn Williams, Leatherhead Residents Association:

Even if the Committee accepts the officer recommendation as regards Option 2 for implementation in the medium to long-term (which prohibits parking on the High Street) why not permit extended afternoon parking in the short term to see whether it leads to any improvement in footfall. It can always be cancelled if it doesn't work or , if notwithstanding that it does ,the Council decide to proceed with option 2 nonetheless

Response:

Effectively we would have to spend the same money on implementing a permanent solution, as we would a temporary one, which may well then require removal once the temporary period has finished – this would then require more funding to be spent on removing anything that was put in as a temporary solution, such as signing.

11. Question submitted by Susan Leveritt, Leatherhead Residents Association:

For years, traders in the upper part of the High Street have loaded from Elm Road behind, and for the lower High Street traders, goods vehicles would stop in Church or North Street loading zones and trolley the deliveries around to the High Street. Now, the Transform Leatherhead team, for Option 1 (with parking) have planned for loading bays to be located actually on the High Street in the separately paved upper and lower "parking lanes", resulting in their only being enough space left for 8 cars to park in the lanes. Strangely, even though delivery requirements should be identical for parking or no parking options, Option 2 does not have the upper loading bay.

If these unsightly loading zones are created, they would attract vans to use the 20 minute parking to have their lunch, possibly leaving their engines going as happens in the North Street loading bay. This would hurt the air, as would the Waitrose & Greggs lorries, which the experienced drivers PREFER to back into the Church St loading bay and then exit again the same way, rather than negotiating the very sharp >90 degree angle into the High Street, further exacerbated by embedded bollards alongside. The lack of common sense is hurting the air.

The question is this: Could we please scrap the additional unattractive loading bays on the High Street, enabling space for more nicely designed spaces for cars to park after the pedestrian zone, and bring more businesses to the traders? And wouldn't that also

ITEM 4a

Questions from Members of the public

mean benefitting from the after-school buzz that we enjoyed before parking was taken away?

Response:

The request for loading bays in the High Street came directly from retailer feedback as part of the consultation. These retailers, whilst supportive of the removal of parking generally required the ability to load/unload close to their shops due to concerns it wasn't practical to trolley goods more than a short distance, especially in bad weather.

The new loading bays including in the proposals would be available outside the pedestrian hours of 10am-4.30pm Monday – Sunday. This would avoid the scenario described above.

The terms of the planning consent for the Waitrose store requires the HGV to exit Church Street in forward gear by way of the High Street.

As the Leatherhead Residents Association is aware, the July 2019 public consultation did include a proposal to create formalised on-street car parking spaces on the High Street to reflect as close as possible the LRA's proposals, but as set out in the report before Local Committee, this received less support.

12. Question submitted by Cllr Paul Kennedy:

How does Surrey County Council propose to address the evidence of speeding in Kennel Lane, Fetcham which is apparent from the latest speed survey?

Response:

Surrey County Council work closely with Surrey Police to maintain a local speed management plan for each and every District and Borough in Surrey including Mole Valley. This means that any time concerns are raised by local people over the extent of speeding vehicles or because of a pattern of collisions thought to be associated with speed, the county council will investigate the extent and nature of the perceived speeding problem using Speed Detection Radar boxes. This equipment consists of a box that can be attached to a lamp column or other convenient item of street furniture, usually for a week, without anyone really knowing it is there or what it is for. This information is compiled for a range of sites which are then reviewed at meetings every six months for each District or Borough involving police and county council highways and road safety specialists. At the meetings the sites that have been investigated are prioritised depending upon the extent and nature of the speeding problem, the number of casualties and levels of public concerns, and possible interventions are discussed and agreed. Interventions will depend upon the nature of the site and the seriousness of the problem and may include community speed watch, police enforcement (which may consist of speed camera enforcement from within a stationary van, handheld speed camera, or hand held radar to pull drivers over), or could consist of highway engineering improvements such as electronic vehicle activated signs to remind drivers of the speed limit, or traffic calming (subject to funding and consultation). It should be noted that traffic calming schemes can be expensive and are not always universally popular.

Speeds were measured on Kennel Lane from 26 September to 7 October 2019 using a Speed Detection Radar box mounted on lamp column number seven (approximately 30m to the south of the junction with The Oaks). This showed average mean speeds of

www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley

Questions from Members of the public

34 mph northbound and 35 mph southbound. The 85th percentile speeds (the speed above which the fastest 15 per cent of vehicles were travelling was 39 mph northbound and 42 mph southbound). This shows that there is a comparatively high level of speeding on this stretch of road compared to many other locations with a 30 mph speed limit. We have checked the county council's database of collisions resulting in personal injury recorded by the police. A summary of this information can be viewed via www.crashmap.co.uk. This shows that since 2014 to the end of November 2019, there has been one collision on 23 August 2016 between a pedal cyclist and a pedestrian resulting in slight injury to both. Although any one collision is one too many, this one collision does not highlight a problem with a history of collisions associated with speeding vehicles. This data, along with data for other sites across Mole Valley is due to be discussed at the next Mole Valley speed management plan meeting scheduled for 29 January 2020 where the type of intervention will be discussed with the police.

13. Question submitted by Andrew Matthews:

The new car parking meters installed at Norbury Park are to be removed in April. The cost of installation and removal is significant. In order to salvage something from the misadventure, could it be considered that Electric Car Charging points are installed in their place?

Response:

Following the Cabinet decision in December to cease charges to park in countryside estate car parks, the service is currently developing proposals for a voluntary payment scheme, to support future investment in the countryside. The voluntary payment scheme is likely to utilise the current pay meters as a way of avoiding any cost of removal. The voluntary payment scheme is due to go live in April 2020.

This page is intentionally left blank