SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (TANDRIDGE)

DATE: 3 December 2021

SUBJECT: Public Questions

DIVISION: All

Question 1 – Wendy Russell, The Coach House, Tupwood Scrubbs Road

Can I respectfully ask the committee if they consider that an outdated country road speed limit of 60 mph is appropriate in 2021?

Specifically for this committee I refer to Tupwood Scrubbs Road which leads to Caterham viewpoint, then on to Gravelly Hill and War Coppice Road. There are many blind bends, it is a residential area and an AONB with a beauty spot at the viewpoint attracting many walkers, cyclists and horse riders.

There are several off-road accidents a year and sadly last year a death. Please consider reducing this speed limit and introduce traffic calming accidents before another fatality occurs.

Answer from Philippa Gates, Traffic Engineer, 0300 200 1003

Tupwood Scrubbs Road is a single carriageway rural road that runs from Tupwood Lane in the north to Caterham Viewpoint, where the name of the road changes to Gravelly Hill. Gravelly Hill runs from Tupwood Scrubbs Road at Caterham Viewpoint in a westerly direction to the junction of War Coppice Road and Weald Way. There is a right-angle bend at Caterham Viewpoint where Tupwood Scrubbs Road joins Gravelly Hill.

There is currently a 60mph speed limit on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill. It is not unusual to have a 60mph speed limits on rural roads such as Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill, and this is the national speed limit for roads of this nature. We receive many more requests for speed limit changes than it is possible to deliver in a given year. These are prioritised and need to comply with our “Setting Local Speed Limits” policy. This policy sets out the process of how speed limits can be changed.

Part of the prioritisation process is to consider the collision history of the road. An investigation has been carried out into the collision history of both Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill in the three year period between 1 November 2018 and 31 October 2021 (the most recent 3 year period for which data is available). The County Council has a record of collisions resulting in personal injury that are reported to the Police, but not damage only collisions. During that period there has been one reported personal injury collision, on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill which occurred on 1 February 2020. This is the collision referred to in the question, that very sadly resulted in a fatality. It is appreciated that it is very distressing for those affected when there is a collision that they have either seen or heard about on a road close to where they live. Officers are not able to comment on the circumstances of this collision.
The County Council does take concerns about road safety seriously and road collisions across the County are continually monitored. This sad accident was referred to the Tandridge Road Safety Working Group in December 2020 for action to be determined. This group consists of Road Safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways. The minutes of the meeting record that there was no highway defect and other engineering measures including a change in speed limit were not recommended at that time.

There are a number of rural roads in Tandridge north of the A25 and west of the A22 that have a speed limit of 60mph. It is proposed that these roads are grouped together and added to the Integrated Transport Scheme (ITS) list for future prioritisation for a reduction in speed limit. This would investigate whether these roads would comply with Surrey County Council’s Policy “Setting Local Speed Limits” for a signs only speed limit reduction. If some or all of the roads comply with the policy it will be necessary to make a legal Speed Limit Order and put up the necessary signs to enable the Police to enforce the new speed limit. The Local Committees Forward Programme of funded schemes is made up from schemes on the ITS list. The Forward Programme been agreed for the 2022/23 and 2023/24 financial years.

There are currently no plans to implement traffic calming measures on Tupwood Scrubbs Road or Gravelly Hill as is suggested. However, Officers will investigate improving the bend signing on Tupwood Scrubbs Road and Gravelly Hill during the 2022/23 financial year, and any work will be subject to available funding.

**Question 2 – Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Operation Horizon**

**Background:**

In the LAC meeting on 12th Feb 2021, there was a great discussion regarding the committee having a written forward plan of works to be undertaken as part of the “horizon” programme as requested by Cllr Morrow. He was advised that all the information was available online and available for “anyone” to access.

In July of this year, I had a meeting with Zena Currie regarding another highways issue with several other councillors. Zena was very clear with the meeting the the LAC would be focusing on decisions to be made, indicating that anything added or removed from the highways programme would need to be agreed by the LAC.

Back in February Tillingdown Hill and Gaist Avenue were on the “horizon” map. This was where councillors were advised to find information. It was due to be completed in the year 21/22.

Jeffrey Gray met with a Surrey officer in July where multiple issues were discussed, this road included. In email discussion he requested a date for completion and to review adding in Waltham Road which is as bad and laid at the same time as Tillingdown Hill and Gaist Avenue, and to review the sunk pavement between Rodgers Close and Abotts Walk.

In September when reviewing the dates for completion, it appeared that the dates for completion of this project have moved to 2022 or 2023. The latest update on the website is it will be completed in 2022. At no point were the Ward Councillors or the Divisional Member consulted or informed.
Questions asked together with answers provided by Matthew Gallop, Asset Policy and Programme Team Leader, SCC Network and Asset Management Group:

Can you confirm when these roads will be completed?
Tillingdown Hill & Gaist Avenue will be prioritised 2023 at the earliest. They have both provided difficulties in programming due to their construction being concrete and necessity for additional feasibility in selecting a suitable treatment. Tillingdown Hill is proposed for concrete restoration, Gaist Avenue will be considered for alternative treatment such as micro-asphalt following further engagement with our new Highways Management Contractor.

Can you confirm if Waltham Road can be added to the programme?
Waltham Road will be assessed in the next few months for inclusion on the Horizon programme.

Can the pavement between Rodgers Close and Abbotts Walk be added to the programme?
The pavements in Tillingdown Hill do not currently prioritise for planned maintenance and inclusion on the Horizon programme. The local member may be able to consider using their allocation short lengths such as between Rodgers Close & Abbots Walk.

Can you confirm who on this committee approved the change in date?
Maintenance programmes do not require approval from the Local Committee, and none was sought.

Can you confirm if no elected member approved or was informed of the change, who was accountable for making this decision?
Highways maintenance programmes are determined and issued including revisions by the Asset Programme Manager.

Can you confirm in writing the look forward programme for 2022/23 financial year for Caterham Valley, Whyteleafe and Harestone given the inaccuracy of the online tool?
Programmes will be published for 2022/23 after budgets are approved in the new year. Unfortunately, we cannot provide written versions of the programmes however it is possible for users to export selected areas in MS Excel and create their own written versions. Accuracy should be equal as published programmes both past and present are sourced from the same database with the web map being updated more frequently.

It was unfortunate that Tillingdown Hill & Gaist Avenue were prematurely displayed on the 2021 programme web map. These schemes were put forward with others for consideration to include in a trial of an innovative technique of fine milling and acrylic repair. The scope of work potential had not been defined which has led to their postponement. The way we treat trial sites, and their publication has been reviewed with additional steps in the process to ensure this doesn’t happen in the future.

Question 3 – Cllr Jenny Gaffney & Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Grit Bins

Background:

Over the summer, I noted two grit bins had been removed from my ward. One outside 355 Stafford Road and the other at the junction of Milner Approach and Stafford Road.

When I queried this with the highways team, I was advised that “All grit bins owned by Surrey County Council are given a score to determine their value to the network. If a grit bin falls into a state of disrepair and does not meet a minimum score threshold, we do not automatically reinstate a new one in its place. In this instance, the bin did not meet the score
required for renewal, therefore a new one will not be put back.” This was from the “Asset Policy and Programme Team.”

Following this email I submitted a request for the information around this as I hadn’t seen a change in policy to grit bins or the impact it would have come through the LAC.

At a meeting in July, Zena Curry suggested I email her with my questions and she would look into it. Following a number of follow up emails, I am still yet to have a response. My most recent follow up was 3rd October.

From Cllr Gray, I have been advised that the bin at the bottom of Stafford Road will be reinstated, but this is yet to happen and we are now in winter.

Questions asked and answers provided by Dan Squibb, Highways

How many grit bins have been removed from Tandridge this year?
In this year’s programme there are 7 bins to be removed in Tandridge. These are all for the same reason – condition meant the bin has come to end of life and they scored below 100 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset ID</th>
<th>Bin Plaque Number</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>USRN</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Work Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>10545</td>
<td>KINGS CROSS LANE</td>
<td>39500588</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>10538</td>
<td>STYCHENS LANE</td>
<td>39501011</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>10728</td>
<td>BANSTEAD ROAD</td>
<td>39500047</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6210</td>
<td>11797</td>
<td>GUN PIT ROAD</td>
<td>39500469</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>10597</td>
<td>NUNAPPLETON WAY</td>
<td>39501311</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>10590</td>
<td>SHIP HILL</td>
<td>39500926</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6255</td>
<td></td>
<td>HARESTONE HILL</td>
<td>39500479</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When was the scoring of grit bins introduced?
Scoring was introduced in approximately 2010-11 through a Cabinet approved Task Group

What are the measures that the grit bin is assessed against?
Please see assessment form below
## Highway Grit Bin Assessment Form

### Site Name

### Location

### Coordinates

### Requested by

### Assessed by

### District team area

### Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Points weighting</th>
<th>Points allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular Movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is site on Priority One precautionary treatment route</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Void location rejects application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is treatment area off priority one routes on which bin will be safely located</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1:10 or over</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1:10</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface gradient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult junction requiring precise timing to exit, or Within 25m of and falling towards junction with: -</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Exit traffic at peak times)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Traffic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light traffic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bends on slope location with moderate traffic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic density at peak times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of use by pedestrian's steps, ramps, footbridge, subway. (Category 1 &amp; 2 Footways)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bin condition damaged yes / no

Locality density

TOTAL POINTS

Retain/Remove
Who you notified about the decision to remove grit bins this year and which elected member approved it?
The County Councillor for this location, Caterham Valley Electoral Division, is Mr Jeffrey Grey. Cllr Grey does not have sufficient capital maintenance funding available for the replacement of an unprioritised grit bin. However, the Parish Council are able to fund a new grit bin should they choose to prioritise this from their budgets.

District Councillors are not able to fund replacement grit bins directly, but could in collaboration with the County Councillor.

When will the grit bin be reinstated at the junction of Stafford Road and Milner Road?
6282, Stafford Road: We had several requests to remove the bin from outside No. 355 over the last year. The first reason being that it had become damaged around the back, allowing salt to leak out. The second reason being that the resident of No. 355 was looking to install vehicle cross over (VCO) and the bin was obstructing the area at this time. When this bin was initially identified, it was agreed the score was not particularly high, therefore, after being removed there was no justification for it to be replaced as far as our policy went, unless the Member wishes to fund one at this location from their budget (although they do not have funds remaining for this year). This is on a P2 salting route.

1803, Milner Approach: Our inspection data and an enquiry alerted us to the disappearance of this facility. According to our records, this bin met the required 100 point threshold and we will be reinstating a new one in its position before the winter season. Our programmes have gone out to tender and we expect delivery will commence around early to mid-October.

If the Parish wishes to adopt, fund or install their own bins along this road, they are welcome to do so.

Question 4 – Cllr Annette Evans & Cllr Alun Jones, Tandridge DC re Pavements

Background:
The pavement from Waspes Lodge to Greenhill Avenue along Croydon Road has been completed in Valley Ward recently. This was not on the look forward programme for 2021 back in February.

The work is described as “Slurry Surfacing”. Following a number of complaints from residents, I have visited the “work”. The surface is patch leaving the subsurface tarmac showing. This will result in damage to the new surface following winter ice. There are several tyre marks and foot prints across it. Underlying surface unevenness has not been resolved, making the pavement more dangerous as there are now no colour changes where there is uneven surface. Finally, in places the surface is breaking up.

Questions and answers from Matthew Gallop and Jane Young, Highways:

Who made the decision to add this section of pavement to the 2022 works and who was it agreed with? Why were local councillors not consulted or informed?
Croydon Road pavements were included by the Asset Programme Manager on the first revision of the provisional programme issued to Contractors in May 2020. There is no consultation for maintenance programmes and no approval is required. Provisional programmes are issued early to supply chain partners for planning & coordination purposes to reduce delivery risk. The programme is made visible to Councillors & the public at the same time via the Horizon webmap in Feb / March following budget approvals.
What quality checked are carried out on contractors completing these works?
The subcontractor carrying out the works is supervised by our Principal Contractor Kier. The works are checked for finished quality by our SCC Engineer when the work has been completed.

What issues had been reported in the last 12 months with regard to the surface in this section of pavement?
Sorry we have not had time to find this information yet, we will check the street history for any reported issues.

When will the pavement be revisited to make good the “work” that has been completed?
The work was completed 20/11/21 and will be checked for quality by our SCC Engineer before any payment is agreed, this should be within the next few weeks. Any work that is not up to the required standard will need to be redone by the contractor at their own cost.
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