

Tony Tuley

From: Charlie Cruise <charlie.cruise@surreycc.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 February 2016 15:42
To: tony.tuley@ntlworld.com
Cc: Jane.Smith@molevalley.gov.uk; Louisa Calam
Subject: Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan - consultation

Dear Mr Tuley,

Thank you for giving Surrey County Council, as Highway Authority, the opportunity to comment on the proposed Ashtead Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Generally we are supportive of the plan you have put forward, and are pleased with the inclusion of sustainable transport initiatives. I have outlined our detailed feedback below:

- p.12: The suggested policy AS-H1 is a good idea to increase connectivity between The Murreys and Agates Lane/ Skinners Lane footpath no.46. However it would be subject to a suitable safe crossing point on Agates Lane being provided for pedestrians. The County Highway Authority (CHA) would not want to encourage this crossing otherwise. Kerb build outs with vehicle priority may be required, which would be subject to Road Safety Audits. At this time, prior to this work being carried out, the CHA are concerned that this policy may not be achievable.
- p.15: The CHA would not necessarily support a policy to apply the same parking standards to every site across Ashtead. The different levels of parking provision are based on the sustainability of each site. A lower level of on-site parking provision would be acceptable in more sustainable locations, i.e. those close to public transport and walking/ cycling routes, than sites that are not.
- p.20: Improvements to bus service and train station facilities are a good idea, and would be a good use of CIL contributions. If these sustainable transport measures are put into the CIL schedule, it will help with allocating CIL money to improve the infrastructure. This will need inclusion within the CIL policy document.
- p.24: Policy AS-Inf2: Pedestrian Access - It is unclear how this policy will be implemented. Is it expected that this policy will be promoted by the MV LPA or by County Highway Authority? The CHA do not always comment on smaller applications so would not necessarily request this amendment through the planning process, and unless there is an obvious link for a pedestrian route, the CHA would not consider adopting individual small areas of land which would require dedication agreements and maintenance liabilities.
- p.25: In relation to pedestrian crossings, this would require SCC permission and expenditure, even if CIL funding was made available. It would need to be demonstrated to the CHA that there is a material need in terms of highway safety. There may be existing related schemes being worked on by SCC Highways, and it would be worth contacting Zena Curry and Anita Guy in order to get further information.
- p.27: It is agreed that installing Real Time Passenger Information at bus stops would be beneficial. The SCC passenger transport team are looking to increase RTPPI facilities where finance is available, so putting it on the CIL list is very much supported.
- p.27: As with the pedestrian crossing, improved signage would need Surrey approval and incur design costs.
- Improvements to pedestrian access - The principles of pedestrian safety and promoting walking are supported by the CHA. Footway widening would require carriageway narrowing and would be subject to Road Safety Audits to ensure the safety of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
-

Again I would reiterate that the CHA is supportive of the general principles put forward in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. If you have any questions on any of the above, or require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me. If you would like to arrange a meeting to discuss the transport elements of the Neighbourhood Plan in greater detail, we would be happy to attend.

Kind regards,

Charlie Cruise
Assistant Transport Development Planning Officer
Transport Development Planning
Surrey County Council
Tel: 02082132861