

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2021****LEAD OFFICER: JESS LEE, PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER****SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM LOCAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS****DIVISION: ALL****1. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson:**

In response to the petition for a pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane near to Triangle Stores presented to the Local Committee at its December 2020 Meeting it was stated:

*Existing safety regulations do not permit the installation of a push button pedestrian crossing where the existing pedestrian island is located. Existing safety regulations state that crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions (the uncontrolled junction in this instance being Station Road). This will give drivers an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a crossing and to brake safely, in order not to hit a pedestrian using the crossing. A minimum distance of 20m is suggested for a control pedestrian crossing.*

Can an explanation as to how the controlled pedestrian crossings in South Street outside Waitrose, in Flint Hill close to Ridgeway Road, and in Horsham Road close to South Street and St Paul's Road West were authorised and installed given that this requirement was not met in relation to these controlled crossings. Furthermore, if these crossings could be installed within 20m of road junctions, why is it considered a problem for the proposed crossing on Chalkpit Lane as surely the same mitigating factors will apply?

**Response:**

The controlled pedestrian crossings in South Street and Junction Road outside Waitrose do not need to be located away from the junction because the crossing on Junction Road only shows a "green man" and allows pedestrians to cross when the pedestrian crossing on South Street outside Waitrose is on a red signal and has stopped traffic. This prevents drivers from turning into Junction Road from South Street colliding with pedestrians using the crossing on Junction Road. The controlled pedestrian crossing on South Street doesn't need to be located away from the junction because South Street is a one-way road, with good forward visibility of the pedestrian crossing. Also because of the one-way road, traffic can only turn right out of Junction Road and therefore drivers turning out of Junction Road do not drive across the pedestrian crossing on South Street.

The minimum distance of 20m set out within existing safety regulations is measured from the position of the driver waiting at the give-way line. Therefore, those drivers turning right out of Ridgeway Road and St. Paul's Road West are a sufficient distance away for drivers to have an adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of these crossings and brake safely. In comparison any driver turning left out of Station Road, would not

## ITEM 4b

have adequate opportunity to appreciate the existence of a pedestrian crossing where pedestrians currently cross Chalkpit Lane at the pedestrian island, to brake safely. Drivers turning left out of Station Road would also be concentrating on traffic approaching from their right, rather than looking left to see if the pedestrian crossing is on a red signal before turning left.

It is appreciated that parents, residents, business owners and community partners of Dorking Safe Streets and many others want a safe, controlled pedestrian crossing to be installed on Chalkpit Lane. However, any such crossing will need to follow existing safety regulations to ensure that any crossing can be used safely and does not increase the risk of accidents.

### **2. Question submitted by Mrs Hazel Watson**

When Boxhill School made a request for a 20mph speed limit outside the school a speed survey was carried out to see if traffic speeds outside the school met the criteria for a 20mph speed limit. The result of the speed survey showed that the criteria for a 20mph speed limit were met at this point and the potential speed limit reduction was added to the ITS List.

County Highways has now stated: *“The road is approximately 1.9km long, with a section through Mickleham village and also a long section that is far more open and rural in nature. The speed survey on Old London Road was located in the Village centre and, although that complied with the “Setting Local Speed Limits” Policy for that short section, the survey data could not be extrapolated to support a change in speed limit on the more rural section of the road. Further speed surveys and a feasibility study are required to determine if it is possible and affordable to reduce the speed limit on the whole of the road, and also what additional engineering measures could be needed.”*

Can an explanation be given as to why the required number of speed surveys to reduce the speed limit through Mickleham were not carried out when the initial speed survey outside Boxhill School was carried out and can an explanation be given as to why it was not a waste of money to carry out a single speed survey when it should have been clearly known that the requested reduced speed limit could not be implemented as a result of the single speed survey that was carried out?

### **Response:**

The B2209 Old London Road, Mickleham is a B-Class road travelling north to south through Mickleham village, connecting to the A24 at Mickleham in the north with the A24 at Westhumble in the south. The northern section of the B2209 Old London Road runs through the built up area of Mickleham village, with a high density of development and on street parking which help to narrow the road for an approximate distance of 400m. The southern section of the road becomes more rural in nature as there are fewer properties. An existing 30mph speed limit is in place on the B2209 London Road, Mickleham from its most northern point, at its junction with the A24, to its junction with Headley Lane. To the south of Headley Lane a 40mph speed limit is in place, to its junction with the A24 at Burford Bridge.

In May 2016 the Headmaster of Boxhill School wrote to the Chief Executive of Surrey County Council expressing concern about the safety of the students crossing the B2209 Old London Road outside Boxhill School due to the School being a split

site, and requested the introduction of a 20mph speed limit and traffic calming. At this time funding was available to carry out speed surveys, therefore a speed survey was carried out outside the school where the pupils cross the B2209 Old London Road in order to travel between the school and their boarding houses, to measure average mean speeds. The results of the survey recorded the following average mean speeds;

Northbound – 19.6mph  
Southbound – 18.7mph

The results of the survey showed very good compliance with the existing 30mph speed limit. A review of the recorded personal injury collisions on Old London Road, Mickleham was also carried out, which showed that over the most recent 3 year period for which data was available at that time (1st April 2013 to 31st March 2016) there were no reported collisions involving personal injury in the 30mph speed limit section of the B2209 Old London Road.

The information from the speed survey that was carried out provided evidence that the majority of drivers travelling past the school, where pupils cross in order to reach their boarding houses, were travelling well within the 30mph speed limit and often below 20mph, in comparison to other sites within Mole Valley. This information coupled with the assessment of the personal injury collisions, provided evidence that additional measures (not necessarily a reduced speed limit and traffic calming) in order to address the concerns regarding children crossing the B2209 London Road outside the school, could not be prioritised above other schemes on the ITS list.

### **3. Question submitted by Cllr Rosemary Dickson**

Would it be possible to move the white stop line outside the History Museum in Leatherhead back a bit? It is alarming to wait there while very large vehicles turn left to continue down Gimcrack Hill/Dorking Road.

#### **Response:**

The History Museum in Leatherhead is on the B2033 Church Street at the signal-controlled junction with the B2122 The Crescent and the D2885 Church Street in Leatherhead.

The white stop line on the B2033 Church Street at this signal-controlled junction, would have been installed as part of the works to install the traffic lights. Whenever any new infrastructure is installed on the public highway, such as new crossings, traffic calming or traffic lights, extensive design work is carried out. These designs go through a two-stage safety audit process prior to work starting, and one safety audit once work is complete. The installation of the traffic lights and therefore the white stop line would have gone through this rigorous design and safety audit process to ensure that there was enough room for vehicles of all sizes to turn safely at this junction.

It is appreciated that it can feel daunting when waiting at any stop line when larger vehicles turn, and sometimes drivers may choose to hang back from stop lines for this reason. The work involved to move a stop line back would include more than moving the existing white stop line. It would also require the loop cables under the surface of the road, which detect that a vehicle is waiting at the stop line, to be

## ITEM 4b

relocated and the traffic light being moved further away from the junction and on to a much narrower section of footway. This would also have to go through careful design and safety audits.

An assessment of the personal injury collisions that have occurred at this junction over the most recent 5 year period has been carried out, this information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there has been no personal injury collisions at this set of traffic signals over the most recent 5 year period for which data is available (from 01/10/17 to 30/09/2020).

For the above reasons, this proposal is not currently prioritised for further investigation, and there are no plans to relocate the existing white lines at the traffic signals on Church Street, Leatherhead.

### **4. Question submitted by Mr Stephen Cooksey**

Over the last year an increasing number of cars have used the grass verge in front of Wicks on Vincent Lane as a regular parking space. This has two consequences – the once grassed verge is now a sea of mud and there is a road safety problem resulting from cars parked on the verge but unable to access the road because of cars parked on the road driving along the pavement and accessing the road at a 90 degree angle when a space to do so is available. Local residents have complained about both of these problems and asked me to investigate what can be done to prevent verge parking at this location in the future.

### **Response:**

The A25 Vincent Lane, Dorking is part of the one-way system around Dorking town centre. On street parking is present and heavily used alongside the existing wide highway verge outside of the Wickes store. However, the bell mouth of the road entrance to Wickes, and the gap in the on-street parking bays in Vincent Lane opposite the junction with Norfolk Road, provides an opportunity for drivers to enter and exit the grass verge in order to park. The bell mouth of the road is required to enable larger vehicles such as fire engines to turn out of Norfolk Road on to Vincent Lane.

An assessment of the personal injury collisions that have occurred along this section of the A24 Vincent Lane over the most recent 3-year period has been carried out. This information is provided by Surrey Police and shows that there has been one personal injury collision, resulting in a slight injury, along this section of Vincent Lane over the most recent 3-year period for which data is available (from 01/10/17 to 30/09/2020). However, this collision was not caused by drivers manoeuvring for parking on the grass verge.

However, it is appreciated that residents are concerned about the safety of drivers pulling on and away from the grass verge. Further investigations are needed to determine what measures could be feasibly introduced to deter parking on the grass verge. Part of this assessment would include investigating the location of existing underground utility plant, that could be affected by some suggested measures such as bollards. The views expressed about the parking on Vincent Lane on the verge will be taken into consideration.

Once these investigations are completed, this will be discussed with the local County Councillor to see if this is locally prioritised.

## 5. Question submitted by Hazel Watson

At the Informal Local Committee held on 10 February 2021 the Members of the Local Committee were asked to make a very significant spending recommendation relating to potential highways schemes that are to be progressed over the next three years. In being asked to make this significant spending recommendation the project scoring model which ranked the projects that were under consideration was not provided to Members and Members were asked to take the accuracy of the model and the scoring within the model on trust.

After the Local Committee Meeting the scoring model which ranked the projects was provided to Members for their review so that they could verify the accuracy of the model, the scoring of the potential projects, and thus the accuracy of the ranking of the projects that Members had considered for progression.

In relation to the potential controlled crossing at Chalkpit Lane, the model shows the following scores which were used to rank the project.

Support Travel Plan	Score 0
Parking Management	Score 0
Encourage Walking	Score 1
Encourage Cycling	Score 0
Support Safe Routes to School	Score 0

On the basis that this scoring was presented to Members of the Local Committee as accurate, can this scoring please be justified to the Local Committee taking into account the knowledge held by Highways Officers following the 2016 site visit to assess this potential project attended by Anne-Marie Hannam which was held at the time children walk to school, the petition that the Chair of Governors of St Martins School presented to the Local Committee, and the recent petition and presentation that was presented by Dorking Safer Streets to the Local Committee?

In particular, can the justification cover why the "Support Travel Plan" was scored as "0" when this project supports the travel plan of St Martins' School, why "Parking Management" was scored as "0" when fewer cars at the school at drop off and pick up times would significantly improve parking management around the school, why "Encourage Walking" was scored as "1" when the scheme will significantly add to the number of children who will walk to school, why "Encourage Cycling" was scored as "0" when this potential project is strongly supported by Dorking Cycling groups as a key link needed on the cross town routes, and why "Support Safe Routes to Schools" was scored as "0" given that this potential project has the strong support of both St Martins and Ashcombe Schools to secure a safe walking route to these schools.

If the scoring cannot be justified based on the knowledge that exists within County Highways, as explained in this Question, will all projects that were considered for funding be reassessed and rescored to ensure the accuracy of the data upon which the significant spending decision was made and will the re-scored project prioritisation schedule be brought back to the next Informal Committee for reconsideration as the recommendation that was approved on 10 February 2021 will have been shown to have been made based on erroneous data presented to Members?

**Response:**

We appreciate that a petition was submitted by the Chair of Governors at St. Martin's School and that Dorking Safe Streets presented an excellent petition to the Mole Valley Local Committee requesting a new pedestrian crossing on Chalkpit Lane. This request is on the ITS list and I appreciate that it is disappointing to you that this scheme is not currently suggested for the local committee forward programme.

We suggest prioritisation on the forward programme based on the CASEE scoring matrix. The prioritisation score in 2020 for this scheme was 75. We have since had some consideration on the possible location of the requested crossing and consider that it could have an effect on the access to the local shops. As a result of this the prioritisation score was changed to 55, due to the impact that this could have on the access to the shops and resultant impact on passing trade.

The schemes that are suggested on the forward programme have a CASEE scoring over 190 and are those schemes that would make the biggest difference in improving road safety.

We appreciate that you have specific concerns about the scoring for the Chalkpit scheme and please see below how these scores could affect the overall priority:

**Support Travel Plan Score 0                      This supports the Travel Plan to St Martins School – please also explain why the school travel plan has been discounted.**

There is already a pedestrian crossing facility in the form of a pedestrian island to assist pedestrians to cross Chalkpit Lane. A formal push button crossing, although an improvement for pedestrians if it is feasible to install it in a safe location, would support those already walking to the schools. If this score was increased to 1 to reflect this, as it is a subjective score, then the overall score for Chalkpit Lane would increase to 70.

**Parking Management Score 0                      Explain why a zero score given the parking management issues around the school (many less cars at school drop off and pick up time)**

Any pedestrian facility in the form of a push button crossing would restrict parking on Chalkpit Lane in the near vicinity of the shops, it would also be likely to impact on the access to the parking facilities in front of the shops. There is no evidence to suggest that the installation of a push button crossing at this location would have a significant direct impact on parking outside the school.

**Encourage Walking Score 1                      Explain score, noting the number of existing and additional school children who would walk to school using the Chalkpit Lane crossing**

There is already a pedestrian crossing facility in the form of a pedestrian island to assist pedestrians to cross Chalkpit Lane at this location. Other pedestrians choose to cross Chalkpit Lane away from this existing pedestrian crossing facility at the junction with Parkway, where there are no pedestrian crossing facilities. There is no evidence to suggest that these pedestrians would change their existing walking route to use a new pedestrian crossing facility.

**Encourage Cycling      Score 0      Explain given the Dorking Cycling Groups support this scheme as a key cycling link across town assisting cyclists across major roads**

There is currently no cycle route in the vicinity of the proposed push button pedestrian crossing that would benefit from it. This pedestrian crossing would therefore not be a toucan crossing to facilitate use by cyclists.

**Support Safe Routes to School      Score 0      Explain given that the main purpose is to secure a safe walking route to both St Martins and Ashcombe Schools**

There are 2 locations where pedestrians cross Chalkpit Lane on their route to schools. One of the locations is where the pedestrian island is located and other pedestrians cross where there is no facility. Any new push button crossing would not support a safe route to school for those children crossing at the junction with Parkway. The existing pedestrian island works well, with drivers frequently stopping to enable pedestrians to cross.

The scoring matrix is intended as a guidance for members to help prioritise the forward programme for the capital ITS funding, that is delegated to the local committee. We appreciate that you are disappointed that the proposed Chalkpit Lane scheme has not currently prioritised above the other schemes put forward for the local committee to approve.

Although we appreciate that you are disappointed in the subjective CASEE scoring, we have increased the score to take account of your suggestion about supporting the School Travel Plan. However, this increases the score to 70 which is still below the level for prioritisation for funding from the forward programme.

Until this project could be prioritised by the local committee alternative ways forward could be sought, as we have discussed.

This page is intentionally left blank