

EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF RESIDENTS COMMITTEE - 14 JUNE 2017**7:30 pm – 10:50 pm**

Councillors Andrea Craig (Chair), Phil Doyle (Vice-Chair), Rowena Bass*, Paul Bedforth, Jack Cheetham, Ian George, Liz Green, Sheila Griffin*, Terry Paton, Hilary Gander*, Mike Head, Rachel Reid*, Lorraine Rolfe, Thay Thayalan, Margaret Thompson and Jon Tolley.

* Absent

29. Surbiton Crescent Traffic Management Order and Traffic Assessment Appendix A

Members considered a report and supplementary recommendations on the formal objections to the Experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO-P236) and the outcomes of a traffic assessment for the trial traffic restrictions of Surbiton Crescent. It was noted that the Surbiton Crescent route was a key component of the ongoing Go Cycle Programme as it formed part of both the Surbiton to Kingston and Kingston to Tolworth routes and also facilitated a connection to the Portsmouth Road scheme.

Members noted that a trial scheme to restrict traffic using Surbiton Crescent as a through-route was put in place in September 2016. The purpose of the scheme was to reduce traffic volumes sufficiently to allow cyclists to safely share the road with the remaining traffic. The trial subsequently allowed an assessment of the actual traffic impacts of the scheme to be undertaken. The trial restrictions were introduced under an Experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO) that came into effect on 22 August 2016 (the Experimental Order).

The supplementary material circulated updated the recommendations listed on page A1 of the agenda. Members noted that the Council's Monitoring Officer had advised that the original recommendations set out in the report be open ended in nature for reasons relating to the Pre-Election Period ('Purdah') restrictions in place prior to the Parliamentary Election which took place on 8 June 2017.

A number of members of the public addressed the Committee and raised the following issues regarding the scheme:

- Safety impacts of the scheme;
- Perceived danger to children crossing nearby roads around Surbiton
- High School and concern expressed from parents;
- Safety regarding the increased traffic on nearby roads as a result of the scheme, in particular on Maple Road and Surbiton Road;
- Fines were excessive and unfairly issued;
- Signage for temporary scheme was not adequate ;
- Money could be used elsewhere in the Council such as for projects associated with Housing demand;
- Scheme claimed to increase pollution in surrounding roads moving it from one area to another area and affecting health;
- Residents who had paid penalty charges for contravening the Experimental TMO should receive a refund, together with interest and an apology
- Lack of further consultation before the scheme be made permanent.

By way of response it was explained that all Go Cycle schemes were designed with safety as a priority. An initial safety audit was carried out prior to the scheme being implemented and a full independent Safety Audit would be undertaken prior to any scheme being permanently installed.

In terms of traffic levels, the traffic assessment showed no significant change in overall levels of traffic and congestion and therefore there is no reason to conclude there has been any significant increase in pollution. Traffic flows in residential side roads has not increased and the majority of traffic that used to use Surbiton Crescent has diverted to Surbiton Road and the northern end of Maple Road. Traffic signal timings on these roads had been amended to ensure that congestion did not increase.

It was explained that the Council does not carry out before and after air quality measurements for schemes of this nature. Instead air quality across the borough is measured through fixed site monitoring stations. However, the traffic assessment shows no increase in traffic congestion and this information can be used a proxy to draw conclusions on air quality. As such, there was no evidence to indicate increased air pollution. It was also noted that the long term objective of the Go Cycle programme is to improve air quality by facilitating more journeys to be made by cycling and walking.

It was noted that the main entrance to Surbiton High School was in Surbiton Crescent where reduced traffic volumes and speeds as a result of the trial scheme had improved the safety of crossing points. In terms of safety on the two roads affected by increased traffic (Maple Road and Surbiton Road) the crossing points already had controlled 'green man' signals.

Officers acknowledged that there had been a higher than expected level of contraventions. It was explained that officers had no fixed expectation of what contraventions levels would be prior to the scheme's implementation as there were no comparable enforcement locations in the borough. It was emphasised that the scheme was not a money-making exercise but was part of the Borough's Go Cycle programme, which supports the London Mayor's transport strategy.

Some Councillors expressed concern with the implementation of the trial scheme and argued that the level of fines issued showed that the scheme had been poorly orchestrated. Questions were raised as to why the significant number of warning letters issued and potential contraventions in the early stages of the trial did not raise concern that signage was inadequate. In addition it was argued that a safety audit should be completed before any scheme be made permanent.

By way of response it explained that the officers consider the traffic signage erected to give effect to the Experimental TMO complied with all the relevant procedural requirements. If however it was decided to make the Scheme permanent, officers would work with consultants to see what improvements could be made in terms of the number, illumination and direction of the signage. In terms of the safety audit it was explained that this had already been completed, and should a permanent scheme be implemented a further safety audit would be undertaken in line with established and agreed procedure.

An amendment was moved and seconded to replace recommendations (3) and (4), as set out in the supplementary material, with the following wording:

- 3) *to delay decision to the next available Residents Committee after a proper consultation is conducted, an inclusion of a safety audit and updated detailed designs with proposals for improved signage;*
- 4) *this Committee recommends to Council that all fines for the first time vehicle restrictions be suspended and all first time fines should be refunded.*

Voting:

For: Councillors Green, Rolfe, Thompson, Thayalan, Tolley (5)

Against: Councillors Craig, Cheetham, Doyle, Bedforth, Head, George, Paton (7)

The amendment was **lost**.

A further amendment to recommendation (4) was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed that the Opposition Spokesperson be consulted before any design or construction variations were made by the Director of Place.

The Committee moved to the vote on the recommendations outlined in the supplementary material, subject to the amended recommendation (4) which formed the substantive motion.

Resolved that –

1. The formal objections received in response to the publication of the Experimental Traffic Management Order (TMO-P236) as set out in paragraphs 19-22 be noted;
2. The results of the Surbiton Crescent trial traffic restrictions assessment, as set out in paragraph 8-13 be noted;
3. A Traffic Management Order be made to give permanent effect to the Surbiton Crescent trial traffic restrictions contained in TMO P-236 ; and
4. The Director of Place be authorised to make design or construction variations to the above scheme in consultation with the Resident Services Portfolio Holder or any successor portfolio holder and the Opposition Spokesperson.

Voting:

For: Councillors Craig, Cheetham, Doyle, Bedfordth, Head, George, Paton (7)
Against: Councillors Green, Thayalan, Tolley (3)
Abstention: Councillors Rolfe, Thompson (2)