

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)**



**DATE: 12 DECEMBER 2018**

**LEAD**

**OFFICER: VICKI EADE, PARTNERSHIPS LEAD (EAST)**

**SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

**DIVISION: ALL**

**Question from Mrs Caroline Salmon**

Safer routes to school:

The Weald School has a footpath well used by children and parents walking with their children to school which is adjacent to the southbound element of the A24 in Beare Green.

The only separation is a metal fence that has been dented in the past, and replaced.

The addition of 1000's of housing units in Horsham has increase the number of cars travelling along the southbound stretch of the A24 at Beare Green especially at peak times.

Can any additional measures such as an ARMCO strip, be added to make the footpath safer as a route to school?

If this is possible, what would need to be done to find funding for this work and when might such improvements take place.

Response:

The A24 Horsham Road is a dual carriageway linking Dorking in the north and Horsham in the south. Its acts as a bypass for a number of villages on this route including Beare Green. The Weald Primary School is located on the eastern side of the A24 Horsham Road, with the village of Beare Green on the western side. In order to walk to The Weald Primary School pedestrians are able to use an existing pedestrian subway to cross the A24 Horsham Road before using the footway on its eastern side to access the school.

Pedestrian guard railing has been installed, where there is sufficient footway width, from the existing pedestrian subway to the pedestrian entrance to the school. This guard railing would have been installed to guide pedestrians to use the subway rather than cross the A24 at surface level.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

The installation of a vehicle restraint system, such as an ARMCO barrier would need to be installed in the same location as the existing pedestrian guard railing. However, because these types of barriers are much wider than the existing pedestrian guard railing, their installation would result in the existing footway being narrowed to an extent which would make it unusable, particularly for pedestrians with pushchairs or wheelchair users. Therefore it is not feasible to install a vehicle restraint system at this location.

A review has been carried out of the personal injury collisions that have occurred along the southbound carriageway of the A24 between the pedestrian subway and the Dukes Head pub, which is located approximately 165m south of the pedestrian entrance to the school. There has been one personal injury collision along this section of the A24 between 1st September 2015 and 31st August 2018 (the most recent 3 year period for which data is available). However Surrey Police did not record vehicle speed as a contributory factor in the cause of this collision, which occurred at the give-way junction on the Beare Green roundabout opposite the Dukes Head pub.

There is a large yellow backed school warning sign on the A24 on the approach to the school which is supported by SLOW markings. An assessment of the existing school warning signs and SLOW markings will be carried out to ensure that they are visible.

### **Question from Jon Favell**

Leatherhead by pass A245

Problem 1). Speeding (specifically in the 30mph section). A highly flawed speeding survey was conducted in November 2015, suggesting average speed of 30.1mph in Westbound (and similar Eastbound) both acceptable and not a cause for concern. I have access to the low level data and anyone with 30 minutes spare could work out that the inclusion of great swathes of restricted (Cophorne Road turnings) and gridlocked traffic (several hours throughout the week, school runs, rush hour etc.) diluted this average somewhat.

A simple analogy would be 50mph + 39mph + 4mph does not make for a safe average speed of 31mph! By Pass is a complex road, and it deserves some bespoke intelligence applied to it. Whilst the exercise was both questionable and flawed, the authorities (they've all been engaged) seem in no way worried by the factual speeding that the survey recorded, some 1.3+ million offences per annum (with a minimum offence of 36mph). They will say, but the road is gridlocked, to which the obvious response would be, then how can you not be worried by an average speed of 30.1mph then?! Silence! There have also been two serious accidents since 2016 and zero efforts to calm the traffic since. It's dangerous, antisocial and illegal.

Problem 2). The Road Surface. It is in short, appalling, especially section from 30mph signage to Majestic roundabout. I have had a channel re-

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

worked outside my house on 3 occasions in the last 2.5 years, due to excessive house vibrations and there is widespread delamination with the road heading back to its base concrete. Cllr Tim Hall heralded the inclusion of By Pass in top section of the 5m Winter Repairs Fund (in April 2018), which has now been spent and as far as I can tell, there are no future plans for the road. It handles over 5 million vehicles a year including plenty of haulage. It is poorly signposted (ref: calming) and the road markings are virtually non-existent. Why is Randalls Road ahead of By Pass for attention?! Why did entire stretch of Oxshott Road get fixed, when parts of it were perfectly acceptable? Similarly, the B2122 (The Crescent), how can that possibly receive an entire resurface and repaint when it handles slow moving transit and was in way better condition to By Pass prior to the work. The latter handles speeding haulage and 5m+ journeys a year.

The amplified problem.

- If you have an excellent road surface, then whilst speeding is unacceptable, it will not detrimentally affect the lives of the local residents, i.e. their houses will not vibrate and the noises will be slightly reduced.
- If you have excellent speeding compliance, then the need for a good road surface becomes less critical, because people's houses are less likely to vibrate, noise pollution is less and yes.....the environment becomes safer.
- If you allow speeding at the levels the road currently supports, on a sub-standard road surface, which those responsible for are actively allowing, then the surface will deteriorate quicker, the noise pollution levels will remain high, as will the danger levels, for both drivers and pedestrians. Loads of schools nearby.

After that background....which needs to be shared with all those in attendance, two simple questions.

- 1) What are the plans to address the currently failings of the road surface.
- 2) What are the plans to tackle the chronic and factual speeding violations that occurs within the 30mph sections? Read this as calming efforts.

The two questions are linked. The residents are not asking for the speed limit to be changed. They are asking for it to be respected and as a gesture of interest by the authorities, better road calming efforts would go some way towards appeasing them. By that we mean, improved road side signage, e.g. KILL YOUR SPEED and using similar sentiments on road signage (paint) to encourage same.

Whilst appreciating budgetary constraints, no thoughtful or responsible person can argue that the Road does not have problems based in fact. A small investment (sign + paint) could also make the failing infrastructure last a little longer, helping those constraints/pressures.

Response:

The A245 By-Pass Road, Leatherhead is a main A class road connecting junction 9 of the M25, to the roundabout junction with the A245 Kingston Road, which leads into Leatherhead town centre. There is an existing 40mph speed limit on the A245 By-Pass Road between junction 9 of the M25 and the start of the residential properties, where the speed limit changes to 30mph. The existing 40mph section on the A245 By-Pass road is approximately 250m in length. The existing 30mph section is approximately 170m in length.

Following concerns raised by Mr Favell in 2015 regarding vehicle speeds within the 30mph section of the A245 By-Pass Road, a speed survey was carried out in October 2015, which recorded the following mean average vehicle speeds;

Eastbound – 31.3mph  
Westbound – 30.1mph

The above results show good compliance with the existing speed limits on these sections of the A245 By-Pass Road.

It is acknowledged that having received the raw data of the speed survey that was carried out, residents continue to be concerned about vehicle speeds on the A245 By-Pass Road. Due to his concerns regarding the number of drivers exceeding the speed limit, Mr Favell has contacted the Ombudsman. Having reviewed the information provided by Mr Favell the Ombudsman declined to investigate. Mr Favell has also contacted Surrey Police, regarding his concerns about vehicle speeds on the 30mph section of the A245 By-Pass Road, Leatherhead. Having looked at the results of the speed survey and the personal injury collision history on this road, Surrey Police have confirmed that this road is not a priority for Police enforcement.

A review has been carried out of the personal injury collisions that have occurred within the 30mph section of the A245 Bypass Road between 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018 (the most recent 3 year period for which data is available). During this period there has been 1 collision resulting in serious personal injury, however Surrey Police did not record vehicle speed as a contributory factor in this collision.

It is appreciated that residents continue to be concerned about vehicle speeds on the A245 By-Pass Road, and that they would like additional road signs and markings to be installed to try to reduce the number of drivers exceeding the existing speed limit within the 30mph section.

Surrey County Council receives a vast number of requests from residents for measures to be introduced on roads throughout Mole Valley, to try to get drivers to respect the existing speed limits. Residents often request additional signs and road markings to further highlight to drivers the existing speed limit. However, Surrey County Council are only permitted to install signs and road markings on the public highway if they are contained within the Traffic Signs

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Regulations and General Directions 2016 document. There is no sign or road marking stating “KILL YOUR SPEED” or similar within this document, therefore Surrey County Council are unable to install such signs or road markings.

The word SLOW is contained within the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 document, however existing guidance is that the use of these markings are most effective when used in conjunction with a warning sign, so that drivers are told why they need to slow down. There are no warning signs within the existing 30mph section on the A245 By-pass Road, because none are required from a road safety perspective. Also Surrey County Council is currently carrying out a programme of decluttering in line with Department of Transport guidelines. This is to ensure that road users are not distracted from important information by unnecessary signs, to reduce visual intrusion and to minimise maintenance costs. For this reason all requests for new signs are very carefully considered, and there are no plans to install any warning signs within the 30mph section of the A245 By-pass Road.

The existing 30mph signs at the start of the 30mph speed limit are the correct signs to tell drivers that they need to slow down to 30mph. Under existing guidance from the Department for Transport, Surrey County Council is not permitted to install the word SLOW in conjunction with the existing 30mph signs. One of the existing lit 30mph signs has been removed because the post had rusted, the South East Area Team is currently progressing the replacement of this post and sign with the contractor, Skanska.

The A245 Randalls Road and the A245 By-Pass Road were nominated by County Councillor Tim Hall for inclusion in the Severe Weather Recovery Programme for resurfacing. The B2122 The Crescent was nominated by the Surrey County Council's Maintenance Engineer for Mole Valley for inclusion in the Severe Weather Recovery Programme for resurfacing. The list of roads under consideration for the limited funding available can be viewed at the following location on Surrey County Council's website;

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>

Surrey Highways is facing continued pressure on budgets and not all schemes can be progressed immediately so we have to prioritise. Funding was made available in this financial year to carry out urgent work resulting from rapid deterioration caused by severe weather in 2018. Any roads that require major maintenance (full reconstruction not just the top surface layer) would not have been funded through the Severe Weather Recovery Programme. The A245 By-Pass Road was assessed to see if it could be funded through the Severe Weather Recovery Programme following Councillor Tim Hall's nomination for its inclusion. However, it was assessed as requiring major maintenance, therefore it wasn't suitable for funding from this programme. The A245 By-Pass Road has been added to the list of roads across the county that require major maintenance. However Surrey County

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Council is working against a backdrop of increased demand for resurfacing works to be carried out against reductions in funding. Therefore in order to maximise funding from central government, Surrey prioritises schemes on its planned maintenance programme in accordance with best practice guidance on asset management. At present the A245 By-Pass Road is not a high priority for major maintenance when compared to many other roads across the county, therefore there is no funding available at this time to carry out major maintenance work on this road. However, the A245 By-Pass Road will continue to be inspected for individual safety defects, and repairs arranged as appropriate.

**Question from Louise Buckland**

True and effective partnership working takes time and commitment from practitioners. In what way does the 58% cut to Mole Valley Children's Centre budget help to improve partnership working, information sharing and ultimately improve outcomes for families?

**Response:**

The proposal to remodel our children's centre offer has not been taken lightly, we are facing significant challenges to meet the needs of the most vulnerable children and families whilst managing very challenging financial decisions. The proposed model seeks to ensure there is a main centre in locations where there is evidence of families who are most effected by deprivation. We recognise however not all families needing support necessarily live in these communities which is why the proposal also includes the use of satellite centres, use of community venues and outreach workers. We are also working closely with partner agencies and the voluntary and community sector to look at how we collectively identify families in need of support and meet their needs together.

**Question from Helen Sutherland**

Surrey has suggested in their family resilience consultation that volunteers can replace the services offered by the children's centres' experienced and highly qualified staff. Does this committee agree that this is not only an insult to the professionalism of the staff in centres but has significant safeguarding implications and will not promote early identification of need?

**Response:**

The proposal to build on the use of volunteers reflects the fantastic examples of where this already happens in a number of children's centres across the county. In no way is this intended to devalue our skilled children's centres staff, quite the opposite, we want the children's centre staff to be able to apply their skills to the vulnerable families who can benefit from their experience the most. The role of volunteers is an important part of service delivery in our children centres already and does not compromise safeguarding, the county



council's proposal recognises the added value of volunteers and sets out the intention to support and encourage centres to build on this.

**Question from Katherine Stanger**

Alongside the vast majority of local parents, my family has benefited significantly from the support and services offered by Dorking Children's Centre. As a Governor there, I am acutely aware of the crucial role played by the highly trained and motivated staff, who consistently provide help and support for families when they are at their most vulnerable.

My understanding is that Surrey will be making a 35% cut in the budget for Children's Centres across Surrey, but that in Mole Valley the new funding formula will mean that the cuts are in the order of 50-60%. This severe reduction in funding is not made clear in the consultation. It will inordinately change the level of service that can be provided. How can local people make a considered response to the proposal when they do not have all the information available? Why has Surrey not been more transparent about the extent of the devastating cuts that they will be imposing on Mole Valley families?

**Response:**

The consultation clearly sets out the locations where we propose main centres to be located in the future that will be supported by the use of satellite centres community venues and outreach workers. It is important that the public are consulted on what the future model looks like and how it may impact on them which is why the consultation provides everyone the opportunity to comment on the outcome should the budget proposals go forward rather than focus on the details of complex financial arrangements. The children's centres in Mole Valley have been actively engaged in developing the proposal in partnership with the County Council based on a potential reduction of up to 35% and the proposals put forward for consultation affecting Mole Valley reflect this.

**Question from Donna Harwood-Duffy**

The children's centre on Goodwyns Road in Dorking is bursting at the seams, not only as a staff base, but also with other providers such as health using our site to offer services to families. With Leatherhead Children's Centre closing, and fewer services being run from the West Street site, the demand from partners for the use of the building will increase. Will Surrey County Council commit to improving the facility at Goodwyns Road to better meet the needs of targeted families and to support improved ongoing partnership working?

**Response:**

It is not anticipated that the closure of the Leatherhead Children's Centre will increase the demand for partners to use the Children's Centre on Goodwyns

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Road in Dorking. The provider of the children's centre in Mole Valley will be required to provide an outreach service for families and make use of community venues where necessary. This approach will be developed alongside partner agencies with the opportunity to share venues wherever possible.

### **Question from Ron Billard**

In the Surrey Cycling Strategy 2014-2026

([https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/29979/Surrey-Cycling-Strategy.pdf](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0009/29979/Surrey-Cycling-Strategy.pdf)) the following statements are made:

1. 6.1 Principles for infrastructure design and delivery (page 14) states: Continuous ... Cyclists going straight on should have priority at side roads where this can be safely accommodated
2. 6.2 Possible infrastructure solutions (page 15) confirms this: Bicycle priority at side roads ... One of the drawbacks of cycle paths on the pavement is the need to give way at side roads and junctions. Therefore priority for bicycles going straight on should be considered where it can be safely accommodated.

In some cases it may not be possible where visibility is limited.

Furthermore the Sustrans Handbook for cycle-friendly design manual on Core principles for routes used by cyclists states that they should:

- be continuous and recognisable
- enable cyclists to maintain momentum

Taking these National and County guidelines into account, would SCC please remove all the give way signs on the cycle track between Dorking and Leatherhead with the exception of West Humble Street. They should be replaced by give way signs on all the side roads and paths where they join the cycle track. This will show, in accordance with SCC strategy, that cyclists have priority on the A24 cycle track (which is in effect part of the main highway). There are no adverse visibility issues at these locations, during daylight or at night. Furthermore speeds on the A24 are now well managed owing to the average speed camera system now in place, hence vehicles turning off the main highway no longer present a hazard.

The volume of cycle traffic on this route far exceeds the crossing vehicular traffic given that these crossings typically only serve a couple of properties.

Motorists complain about cyclists using the main carriageway and this lack of continuity is a typical reason why cyclists don't use the cycle track.

### **Response:**

The A24 between Dorking and Leatherhead is a dual carriageway road, with a shared footway/cycleway along its entire length. There is an existing 40mph

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)



speed limit on the southern section of the A24 between its junction with the A25 Reigate Road and Pixham Lane. This section is within the urban area of Dorking. North of the junction with Pixham Lane, the speed limit increases from 40mph to 50mph, this section is more rural in nature.

The existing shared footway/cycleway crosses a number of side road junctions between Dorking and Leatherhead. When the shared footway/cycleway was installed, more than 10 years ago, three road safety audits would have been carried out. Two of the road safety audits would have been carried out during the design stage, and one once the construction of the footway/cycleway had been completed. During all three of these road safety audits, the safety of all road users would have been considered.

The shared footway/cycleway between Dorking and Leatherhead aligns with Surrey County Council's existing cycle strategy, in that priority for cyclists at side road junctions is given where this can be safely accommodated. As a result not all of the side road junctions require cyclists to give-way.

It is appreciated that there are no adverse visibility issues at the junctions, however this is not the only safety issue that needs to be considered. Although some sections of the existing 50mph speed limit is covered by average speed cameras, it is not safe to create a situation where drivers may have to give-way, and therefore stop, on a road with a 50mph speed limit. This could potentially increase the likelihood of shunt collisions between vehicles. At some side roads, because the number of cyclists is greater than the traffic turning into these side roads, the potential for vehicles having to stop on the main carriageway of the A24 to give-way to cyclists is therefore greater. Also because the number of vehicles turning into these side roads is low, the number of times that cyclists will have to give way to vehicles leaving the A24 will also be low.

Road safety concerns would have been considered during the road safety audit process, when the shared footway/cycleway was designed and constructed and those safety concerns remain. Therefore there are no plans to remove any of the existing give-way markings on the shared footway/cycleway on the A24 between Dorking and Leatherhead.

#### **Questions from John Meudell:**

1. Could members explain why officers, along with the MVLC Task Group, have yet to contact Dorking Town Forum to discuss both "lessons learnt" from the Dorking Sustainable Transport Project or future projects and transport needs in the Dorking area?

And, furthermore, explain why it is that MVLC members did not actively seek to determine why it was that DTF brought its complaint to Coast to Capital, rather than allow MVLC members or officers to speculate in the paper in question?

Response:

In developing future transport schemes and improvements we do endeavour to engage with key partners and seek the views of residents. It was disappointing therefore that the Dorking Town Forum Centre determined a need to make a formal complaint to the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership. Members were aware of the complaint and the complaint has been properly dealt with.

In creating a framework to consider future transport projects, the Local Committee asked that a Dorking Major Task Group be established. A meeting of the Task Group was held on 10th September 2018 and another meeting is planned for the New Year. Areas considered by the Task Group included the Access for All funding nominations (focussing on Dorking Deepdene Station), the Dorking Transport Study and the Dorking Sustainable Transport Package (Phase 1). This Task Group will ensure that elected Members are sighted on key issues, enabling elected Members to effectively develop and scrutinise a programme of future schemes and improvements.

The Dorking Town Centre Forum has been asked to participate in a meeting with Great Western Railway, Network Rail, along with Officers from the Borough and County Council to consider the Dorking Deepdene Access for All Bid. The meeting is scheduled for 10th January. Great Western Railway has nominated this station as third priority from their whole network, with the winning bids likely to be announced in April 2019.

The Dorking Town Centre Forum was asked to participate in the Dorking Transport Study stakeholder meeting held on 26th November 2018. Several members of the Forum attended, when the conclusions of the study were presented. The Mole Valley Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme is being updated in line with the conclusions of this study. The Forward Programme and Dorking Transport Study will be subject to a formal presentation to the Local Committee in March 2019.

The county council continues to involve the Dorking Town Forum in various work and at the point when key stakeholder input is needed. This is consistent with the involvement of other key stakeholders and our approach across the county. The aim is to enable the Forum and other stakeholders to positively contribute to the successful development and delivery of projects in the Dorking area that aim to benefit residents, whilst balancing the needs of all stakeholder groups.

**Question from John M**

What is the current potential to widen the pavement on Randalls Road. A245 between Randalls Way and Cleeve Road using the overgrown highways land backing Parr Close. Using s106 funding from Beechcroft and any other available funding eg CIL where £35k is known to be held by Rod Shaw MVDC for Leatherhead local projects and thus a larger amount of CIL maybe

held centrally? It would be helpful if MVDC Prosperity /Transform Leatherhead team and Rod Shaw in Place are consulted please.

Response:

Surrey County Council don't have any plans currently to widen the footway on Randalls Road but your suggested proposals have been noted. The Transform Leatherhead Team, working with Surrey County Council, are going to be reviewing all sustainable routes and potential improvements in line with the Transform Leatherhead programme. The Transform Leatherhead Team are currently working with WSP on the traffic modelling which will review options for improvements to the gyratory network in line with the proposed development projects within the town centre. Once Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council understand the results of the modelling, sustainable connections and improvements will be reviewed and proposed as these all connect to the public highway network.

Third party funding streams will be extremely important and the Transform Leatherhead Team are working closely with Planning Policy at MVDC who deal with the CIL process to obtain cabinet approval for funding and collecting CIL. The Major Schemes team at Surrey County Council deal with larger third party funding pots and putting together business cases to obtain funding, for example, from the DFT and LEP. Partnership working is extremely important with key stakeholders.

**Question from Ockley Parish Council:**

2020 Consultancy were commissioned by Ockley Parish Council to undertake a feasibility study to establish the current issues with road safety and identify the most suitable improvements within the village of Ockley, Surrey.

The costings for the highest priority recommendations are as follows:

1. New 40 mph speed limit located along A29 on both approaches to village (page 8 of the report) £10,000 to £15,000.
2. Gateway treatment at 30 mph terminals along A29 (page 8 of the report) £4,000.
3. Install two Vehicle Activated Signs (page 13 of the report) cost dependent on type of sign purchased – in the region of £10,000 per sign.
4. Widen existing footway where sufficient width (page 13 of the report) cost dependent on wide range of factors – approximately £15,000 to £20,000.

Parish councillors are in agreement with the four measures being highest priority / most effective against cost.

Will the Local Committee and Highways Officers consider the findings of the Ockley Village Road Safety Feasibility Study and work with the Parish Council to explore how funding can be obtained to implement the priority measures identified?

(The executive summary of the study is annexed to the questions, and the full report circulated to committee members separately).

Response:

It is acknowledged that Ockley Parish Council have carried out some extensive work with their consultants on road safety issues in Ockley Village. Officers have not had the opportunity to consider this report in detail as it was received on 5 December 2018. The A29 Stane Street runs through the centre of Ockley Village from the A24 at the Beare Green roundabout in the north to the Surrey/West Sussex boundary in the south.

The Parish Council, in broad terms, is requesting that:

- A new 40mph speed limit be implemented on both approaches to the village
- Gateway treatments are provided at the two existing 30mph terminal signs
- 2 Vehicle Activated Signs are installed
- The existing footway of Stane Street is widened

The South East Area Highway Team receives large numbers of requests for road safety measures on the public highway network, and has very limited funding for such measures. The requests that are received are prioritised and those that are deemed to be broadly feasible are added to the Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS) List of schemes for possible future funding. The schemes are prioritised using CASEE (Congestion, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Economy) scoring for members of the Mole Valley Local Committee to consider. Safety has the highest importance on the prioritisation for a scheme, and the first step is to establish the nature of any collisions that have occurred on the road. The Mole Valley Forward Programme of funded schemes is made up from schemes on the ITS list.

An investigation has been carried out into the collisions on the section of the A29 Stane Street detailed in the report commissioned by the Parish Council, between September 2015 and August 2018 (the last three years for which data is available). This is a section of the road approximately 2.5km long, from a point to the north of Coles Lane to a point to the south of Cathill Lane. The County Councils collision database holds information about collisions involving personal injury, but not damage only collisions. During that period there have been six collisions resulting in personal injury. In two of these collisions the casualties sustained serious injury, and in the remaining four collisions slight injuries were sustained. In one of the collisions involving slight injury the Police Officer attending the collision considered that exceeding the speed limit was a contributory factor in the collision. However speed was not considered to be a contributory factor in any of the other collisions.

Surrey County Council takes concerns about road safety seriously and road collisions across the county are continually monitored. The Road Safety

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)

Working Group (RSWG) consists of Road Safety experts from both Surrey Police and the County Council as well as engineers from Surrey Highways. This group considers locations that have clusters of personal injury collisions, or routes with high numbers of collisions, and where engineering or enforcement measures could reduce the risk of future collisions.

This road has not been considered at a RSWG because these collisions are not clustered in one location, and there is not a very high number of collisions compared to many other sites or routes across Surrey.

Surrey County Councils speed limit policy "Setting Local Speed Limits" advises that:

*"Reducing speeds successfully may reduce the likelihood and severity of collisions, and can help to encourage more walking and cycling. This can help to make communities more pleasant places to live, and can help sustain local shops and businesses. The desire for lower speeds has to be balanced against the need for reasonable journey times and the position of the road within the county council's Strategic Priority Network".*

An important principle of the policy is that lower speed limits are unlikely to be successful in managing speeds if they are set at a much lower level compared to the existing traffic speeds. Therefore the first stage is to conduct speed surveys to assess the existing vehicle speeds to see what new speed limit might be viable.

It is proposed to add the A29 Stane Street to the list of roads in Mole Valley where speed surveys have been requested. This is likely to require more than 2 survey locations at an approximate cost of £200 per survey, and is subject to funding availability. The results of these surveys will determine whether the speed limit in the A29 Stane Street can be reduced using signs alone in accordance with Surrey's Policy "Setting Local Speed Limits".

Subject to the results of the speed surveys it is proposed that a signs alone speed limit reduction on the A29 Stane Street is added to the Mole Valley ITS list for consideration for future funding. It is further proposed that a feasibility study into measures to address road safety concerns on the A29 Stane Street is added to the ITS list, to be prioritised against other requests, for consideration for future funding. The outcome of the potential feasibility study would determine the cost estimate of feasible options. This cost estimate would determine where potential funding opportunities would be sought.

Officers welcome the opportunity of collaborating with the Parish Council, and the Local County Councillor is in support of the Parish Council's aspirations.

### **Questions submitted by Cllr Elizabeth Daly (Bookham South)**

1. Parents in Groveside, Dowlans Road and adjoining streets in South Bookham are concerned about the safety of their children crossing between Groveside and Hawkwood Rise across Guildford Road to get to

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)



and from school. The crossing is on a bend close to the 40mph stretch between Great and Little Bookham, and many vehicles are travelling well above the 30mph speed limit. The nearest crossing between Brodrick Grove and Griffin Way is too far away and many vehicles coming out of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise are turning right onto the A246, which adds to the danger of the crossing. Is there anything that can be done to make this crossing point safer for pedestrians and cyclists, for example through traffic calming, better speed enforcement, warning notices, a pedestrian crossing or traffic island?

Response:

The A246 Guildford Road is a main A-Class road that connects Leatherhead in the east to Guildford in the west. The A246 Guildford Road runs through Bookham and the section between the junctions of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise is street lit and within the existing 30mph speed limit.

There is currently no crossing on the A246 Guildford Road between the junctions of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise. The existing 30mph speed limit on the A246 Guildford Road starts approximately 200m west of the junction with Groveside. The existing 30mph terminal signs are yellow backed, lit and clearly visible. There is also a yellow backed "School" warning sign and junction ahead warning sign on the approach to the junction with Groveside. The existing push button pedestrian crossing is located approximately 200m east of the junction with Groveside, next to the junctions with Brodrick Grove and Griffin Way.

A review has been carried out of the personal injury collisions that have occurred between the junctions of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise between 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018 (the most recent 3 year period for which data is available). During this period there has been 2 collisions resulting in slight personal injury, however neither collision involved pedestrians. No personal injury collisions have occurred at the existing push button pedestrian crossing over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available (from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015 and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2018).

The A246 Guildford Road is a main A-Class road that is heavily used by all class of traffic including the emergency services, it is therefore not possible to install traffic calming measures on this road.

Officers are not able to comment on the request for Police speed enforcement on the A246 Guildford Road because this is a matter for the Police and not Surrey County Council.

There are already school warning signs and junction ahead warning signs on this section of the A246 Guildford Road as well as clear 30mph speed limit signs. Surrey County Council is currently carrying out a programme of decluttering in line with Department of Transport guidelines. This is to ensure that road users are not distracted from important information by unnecessary signs, to reduce visual intrusion and to minimise maintenance costs. For this

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/molevalley)



reason all requests for new signs are very carefully considered, and there are no plans to install additional signs on this section of the A246 Guildford Road.

When designing a pedestrian crossing point a number of things need to be considered. These include visibility, proximity of side roads, existing bus stops, vehicle accesses to private properties, carriageway width and available footway width. For example when considering a pedestrian refuge island, best practice is that an island 2m wide is provided so that there is sufficient width for pushchair, and mobility scooter users, and sufficient carriageway width remains for large vehicles.

It is not immediately apparent where an additional pedestrian crossing could be provided on the A246 Guildford Road, between the junctions of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise. Therefore it would be necessary to carry out a feasibility design to see whether it would be technically possible to provide a pedestrian crossing, and what type of crossing this would be. It is proposed that initial design work to establish the feasibility of a proposed crossing on the A246 Guildford Road, between the junction of Groveside and Hawkwood Rise be added to the Integrated Transport Schemes List for consideration for future funding.

There are many more requests for schemes than there is funding available. Therefore it can take a considerable length of time for feasibility design work of this nature to be prioritised. It should also be noted that there is no available funding identified for the construction of a crossing at this location at this time. The cost of the construction of a crossing could be considerably more than the total annual budget for such schemes in the Mole Valley area.

2. What are the Council's latest intentions and progress in relation to a permanent replacement building for the Bookham Youth and Community Centre, and are any temporary alternative premises available for users?

Response:

Surrey County Council are evaluating the future of the Bookham Youth Centre site. The old building is beyond viable economic repair in the longer term and so we are looking at how we could use the site differently in the future to retain community provision in a new fit-for-purpose building. The current building will close from September 2019 and existing hall hire users will need to use other local halls and facilities from that point.

This page is intentionally left blank