

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)**

DATE: 18TH NOVEMBER 2013
LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA TEAM MANAGER (NE)
SUBJECT: STOKE ROAD, COBHAM
DIVISION: COBHAM AND STOKE D'ABERNON

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

Surrey County Council's Local Committee for Elmbridge has had a long standing ambition to reduce the speed limit in Stoke Road, Cobham from 40mph to 30mph, between Tilt Common and Blundell Lane. The local community petitioned for this change in September 2009, and since that time the Local Committee has been exploring how this change might be implemented.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

For information.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

No recommendations are made at this stage. Officers are working with the Divisional Member and the local community to identify a feasible solution that would facilitate lowering the speed limit in Stoke Road to 30mph.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The proposal to reduce the speed limit in Stoke Road, Cobham, from 40mph to 30mph is at odds with Surrey County Council's Speed Limit Policy. The Local Committee asked the Cabinet Member to consider the proposal. On the advice of officers of both the Council and Surrey Police the Cabinet Member was unable to approve a reduced speed limit. Therefore the Local Committee instructed officers to undertake a feasibility study to examine what engineering measures would be needed to facilitate a reduction in speed limit to 30mph.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 A feasibility study has been completed and is included as Annex A to this report. The study includes a complete analysis of traffic conditions and the relevant accident history.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The feasibility study assessed three options:

ITEM 10

- Option 1 – Speed cushions – see Annex B;
- Option 2 – Traffic islands – see Annex C;
- Option 3 – Roundabouts – see Annex D.

3.2 All three options have advantages and disadvantages, which are detailed in the feasibility report in Annex A.

3.3 The speed cushions option is the most likely to result in reduced traffic speeds, but also carries the highest cost in terms of the negative impact.

e.g.

- noise and vibration
- it would mean the road could not be ploughed in snow conditions
- competitive driver behaviour as they align their vehicles with the cushion

3.4 The traffic islands option considered the introduction of a number of new traffic islands. This option would not guarantee a reduction of traffic speeds sufficiently to facilitate lowering the speed limit to 30mph.

3.5 The roundabouts option was not ideal from a technical point of view, and therefore would not be recommended.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 In October 2013 the Divisional Member chaired a meeting between the Cabinet Member, the Ward Member, officers, and representatives of the local community to discuss the findings of the feasibility study. All those present agreed that neither speed cushions nor roundabouts were preferred as possible solutions.

4.2 The traffic islands option was preferred; it was agreed that this option should be developed further.

4.3 For example the feasibility study did not include any modifications to the existing traffic islands; it only considered provision of new traffic islands. It was felt that this was an omission as the existing traffic islands may provide additional encouragement to drivers to slow down, if they were modified with this end in mind.

4.4 For example the lane width past the new and existing traffic islands could be wider to be more favourable to cyclists, or narrower to have a greater traffic calming effect. It was felt that a narrower lane width past the islands should be considered, together with the consequent safety implications for cyclists.

4.5 Officers will therefore develop the traffic islands option further, to explore how it could be modified to achieve the maximum possible speed reducing effect. Officers will also examine any negative consequences of making these adjustments, together with the cost.

4.6 It is anticipated that this further feasibility work will be completed by the end of the Financial Year.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The financial implications of the three options considered are detailed in the feasibility report in Annex A.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The Divisional Member has been working with Ward Members and representatives of the local community to identify a feasible solution that would facilitate the lowering of the speed limit to 30mph, in accordance with the wishes of the local community.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

- 8.1 A well-managed highway network can contribute to reduction in crime and disorder as well as improve people's perception of crime.

9. CONCLUSION:

- 9.1 When the traffic islands option has been developed, a meeting will be convened again with the Divisional Member and representatives of the local community. Officers will then report to the Committee the findings of the feasibility study, and make recommendations as to the next steps.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Officers will undertake further feasibility work to develop the traffic islands option.

Contact Officer: Nick Healey, Area Team Manager (NE)

Consulted: Divisional Member, Ward Member, Cabinet Member, representatives of the local community.

Annexes: 4

Sources/background papers: None.

This page is intentionally left blank