



## **SCC LOCAL COMMITTEE IN ELMBRIDGE – 24 June 2013**

### **AGENDA ITEM 9**

#### **PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

##### **Question 1: Gerald Gilbert, Elmbridge 50 Plus**

###### **Traffic Congestion and Safety in the Walton Thames Crossing Corridor.**

Does the Committee agree with Elmbridge Seniors' contention that the temporary road to/from Walton Marina and the cantilevered foot/cycle path on the downstream side of the Victorian Viaduct should both be retained for a trial period of three months after the road under the bridge to the Marina is restored, to give motorists an opportunity to try an alternative route to/from Cowey Sale, avoiding any right-hand turns?

If so, will the Committee make its views known to Surrey Highways and so the Walton Bridge project team?

##### **The Chairman will give the following response:**

Over the summer Surrey County Council will be forming a project team, formulating the terms of reference and project plan (including public consultation) with milestones, to undertake a transport study along, and adjacent to, the A244 Walton to Halliford corridor, aimed at infrastructure improvements for vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, heavy goods vehicles and buses.

A report on this proposed study, to address traffic management issues in the wider area than Walton Bridge, will be taken to both the Elmbridge and Spelthorne Local Committees in September.

The specific question about the use of the temporary road can be included in this study.

##### **Question 2: Mole Kenny**

Does the Local Committee agree with me that steps should be taken to by Surrey Highways to alleviate the traffic congestion on both sides of Walton Bridge?.

- Walton bound traffic from Shepperton is forced to use Russell Road and Walton Bridge Road unnecessarily as this traffic could be easily filtered into the new crossing route by returning Walton Lane into a two way traffic road as it used to be. This would decrease the traffic at Marshalls Roundabout, and Fordbridge Road in Sunbury especially in the evenings.

- North, south, and east bound traffic approaching from Oatlands Drive on the north side are forced to share a single lane eastbound, because of the unnecessary pedestrian refuges towards the bridge traffic lights. The removal of these central refuges would allow south and east bound traffic to be segregated from bridge bound traffic and increase the traffic throughput at this busy junction.

I would like this Committee to make these small road changes to Surrey highways even if only for a six months trial period.

I would also like to see The Elmbridge Local Committee work with the Spelthorne Local Committee as it affects residents and workers on both sides of the crossing.

**The Chairman will give the following response:**

Over the summer Surrey County Council will be forming a project team, formulating the terms of reference and project plan (including public consultation) with milestones, to undertake a transport study along, and adjacent to, the A244 Walton to Halliford corridor, aimed at infrastructure improvements for vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, heavy goods vehicles and buses.

A report on this proposed study, to address traffic management issues in the wider area than Walton Bridge, will be taken to both the Elmbridge and Spelthorne Local Committees in September.

**Question 3: Yaser Shabsogh**

We have double yellow lines that appeared outside our house in Castle Road about 2 months ago. I wrote to the council to get details of how this happened and was given a general response. "The new parking restrictions were put in to improve road safety. We are sorry that you did not feel consulted about the new parking restrictions, but these were advertised legally via local newspapers and notices erected locally and all residents comments were taken into account prior to the scheme being installed". I would like to know which papers this was advertised in and when. I can't find a formal record of this change either in your minutes or in the list of restrictions by road on the web site. The only reference is in a meeting on Monday 25th of February, where on annex 1 there is a mention of double yellow lines on the junction of Castle Road and Oatlands Drive, which is NOT where our house is. Can someone clearly tell me the specifics of how this decision was made, communicated to people and what would be the appeal process?

**The Chairman will give the following response:**

The proposal was developed as part of the 2011/12 review of parking in Elmbridge after we had received requests from residents of Castle Mews who found that vehicles were parking too close to the junction and obstructing the sightlines for drivers pulling out onto Castle Road. We had also been contacted by the refuse service at Elmbridge Borough Council whose vehicles had been having difficulty accessing Castle Mews, so they asked us to try and help keep the entrance clear. The proposal was included in the report that was agreed by the Local Committee at its meeting on 28 November 2011. We advertised our intention to introduce the double yellow lines in the Surrey Herald on 14 June 2012 and the Surrey Advertiser on 15 June 2012 and we put up street notices on lamp posts etc. at the same time.

There is no appeal process as such, but we have already received a request for us to look at the location again and see whether there is any scope to change the lines and this has been added to the list for consideration in next year's parking review.

**Question 4: Martyn McCarthy**

Please can committee members consider a permanent solution, in time for the start of the new term in September 2013, to the fact that vehicles are now frequently ignoring the banned left turn from New Zealand Avenue into the High St in Walton on Thames?

The vehicles turn immediately into a pedestrian crossing and anyone crossing at the time is doing so on a green pedestrian light. Due to the proximity of Ashley Primary School, this often means that children aged 4 to 11 are nearly hit by vehicles making the illegal left turn.

Last month I emailed several parties, including Surrey Police, SCC Highways, the MP, local County Councillor and SCC Cabinet Portfolio Holder, after witnessing incidents over the last two years and then finding myself the victim of an incident recently. The replies I received were not that helpful. It seems to me that nobody wants to take ownership of this pressing problem.

We would like an additional sign placed nearer the junction which states NO LEFT TURN. There is also a round regulatory sign at the junction but at approx 8' high this is above a driver's line of sight & cannot be seen once a driver has committed to the illegal left turn (the sign is also filthy). The current regulatory sign is obscured from drivers by the traffic light in front. We would like a bollard placed on the corner with a smaller regulatory sign in a roundel, incorporated within the bollard. Although design dictates a smaller sign, it would be in the line of sight for drivers.

**The Chairman will give the following response:**

The Highways Service are aware and have already considered this issue. The current signage is correct and is in accordance with the Traffic Signs Regulations & General Directions 2002. There are a total of seven pieces of information on the approach to this junction, which a driver would have to ignore / disregard to make this left turn: banned-left-turn sign on the advanced direction sign on the approach, three proceed-straight-ahead arrows incorporated into the traffic signal heads, two straight-on arrow markings on the carriageway, and finally the banned-left-turn sign. Drivers are however deciding to ignore the signs, which are there for safety reasons and enable pedestrians to cross the road within the phasing of the traffic signals. Therefore we do not believe additional signs / markings would make any difference to wilfully negligent drivers.

This is essentially a Police enforcement issue as by ignoring the signs the drivers are committing a criminal offence, for which the Police as the sole highway enforcement agency has powers to deal with offenders.

The Police have already been informed of the concerns previously notified to us, but we will contact them again to request that extra resource is used to monitor this location.

**Question 5: Mark Sugden**

Were any significant issues identified and resolved when the scheduled gully cleaning took place in Claygate in March 2013 and what are the intended gully cleaning dates for Elmbridge in 2013/14?

**The Chairman will give the following response:**

Gully cleaning was carried out in Claygate during January and March and no significant issues were identified.

This year gully cleaning in Elmbridge is due to commence late October 2013 and continue until end of March 2014. The website is being updated and the 2013/14 programme will be published shortly.