



## APPENDIX B: Priority Rating & SCC Comments

<u>Priority Rating</u>	<u>Suggestion</u>	<u>SCC Comments</u>	
1	<p><b>20. Waterway Road</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Widen the existing footway to provide a shared use path (as per ongoing SCC design ideas), taking land from the railway embankment.</p>	Scheme being developed to accommodate concerns	
1	<p><b>16. The Gyratory Traffic System - Randalls Road, Bull Hill, Station Road</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> Other than the Station Road section described in Section 17 below, we can see no way of making safe on-road provision for cyclists in this one way system. Fortunately, current proposals by MVDC to improve the Red House Grounds offer a vital opportunity to provide some safer off-road routes for cyclists through the Grounds. For these to be of value, good facilities for crossing to and from the Grounds must also be developed. The current re-development of the Bull Hotel site offers the chance to complete the route between the Grounds and North Street by widening the pavement frontage for shared pedestrian/cyclist use. In addition the existing pedestrian crossing would need to be converted to a Toucan.</p>	See Section 17	LTP,L/H Signing Report & MV Parks

3	<p><b>21. Guildford Rd/ Waterway Road / Bridge Street / Mill Lane / Leisure Centre Junction</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> Construct a toucan crossing over Waterway Road, and an off-road (2 way) cycle lane in front of the Waterworks building and along the east side of Guildford Road, and into the Leisure Centre access road.</p>	<p>Scheme being developed to accommodate concerns</p>	LTP
4	<p><b>17. Station Road - Waterway Road to Station Traffic Lights</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide kerb build-outs and improved road markings across the Industrial Estate entrance.</li> <li>• Construct a cycle lane along Station Road, following demolition of old Station building, giving extra road space (note that there is a planning consent to demolish the old railway embankment between this point and the Industrial Estate entrance)</li> <li>• Paint a cycle lane across the left filter lane for the use of cyclists going straight ahead to the Station</li> <li>• Extend the existing cycle lane around the corner into Randalls Road.</li> <li>• A route through the Industrial Estate to Randalls Road should also be considered.</li> </ul>	<p>A scheme is currently being designed for the segregation of cyclists around the system, in accordance with the suggested improvements made by the Cycle Forum. It is envisaged that the draft detailed drawings be presented to the MVCF for further comment once received. Some issues have not been considered such as the route through the Industrial Estate to Randalls Road. Once again, a decision by MVCF on the priority of this route should be made. The issue of cycling through the Red House grounds is currently being progressed, as stated by MVCF in conjunction with Surrey County Council. The issue of linkage with North Street will be presented as part of any redevelopment of the Bull Hill Hotel site.</p>	LTP & MVCF

APPENDIX A: Priority Rating & SCC Comments  
September 2001

4	<p><b>18. Station to Town Centre and Waterway Road via Red House Grounds</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a cycle crossing to/from Station Approach and the Red House Grounds. Widen the footpath alongside the railway embankment for shared use (or make separate cyclist and pedestrian provision) and change the steps at the south end to a ramp (as per ongoing SCC design ideas).</li> <li>• Provide a Toucan crossing across Station Road to the West side of Waterway Road.</li> <li>• Designate as a shared pedestrian/cyclist route the path along the edge of the south car park, leading to the existing crossing over Station Road. Widen the footpath on the Bull Hotel frontage to allow shared use, and provide a safe route into North Street.</li> <li>• There is a narrow footpath by the side of the Hotel leading to Belmont Road. Land might be available when the site is developed to allow this to be widened to form a cycle path.</li> </ul>	<p>See Section 17</p>	LTP
6	<p><b>12. Linden Pit Footpath</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Widen the footpath (using SCC owned land on the north-west side) and legalise its use by cyclists.</p>	<p>This is an extremely sensible Safe Routes to School option, providing that the legal and width requirements can be met. Prioritisation of available funding to be decided. Some educational and research of usage to be undertaken by County Highway Services Mole Valley (CHSMV) Safe Routes to School officer.</p>	LTP & CHSMV

6	<p><b>24. Lower Road - Cobham Road, Fetcham to Church Road, Bookham</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing section of shared use path near Howard of Effingham School provides a safer route for younger pupils and slower cyclists. Further sections could only be provided intermittently and would therefore be of little value.</li> <li>• It is therefore important that the road is properly and quickly repaired along its entire length to provide safe conditions for all cyclists along this popular route.</li> <li>• The speed table just west of Bookham crossroads should have the channel along its edge widen to allow cyclists to ride in it.</li> <li>• The square table at the crossroads should be reconstructed to remove the double set of upstands.</li> <li>• The entire road should be signed to warn drivers that it is a popular cycle route. Measure suggested in Chapter 2 Section 5 above should be considered.</li> </ul>	<p>The road surface on this section of road is subject to a resurfacing in 2001/02 financial year.</p>	<p>Mainten- ance</p>
8	<p><b>7. Barnett Wood Lane - South-West of the M25</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> We can see no way of making this section of road significantly safer for the many cyclists (particularly those from Therfield School) who use it. The proposed separate route, as suggested by the Therfield parents group, should be considered.</p>	<p>Proposals from the Leatherhead area movement study for cycling facilities on for both Barnett Wood Lane and Kingston Road to Therfield and All Saints Schools. Options for providing a safe segregated cycle route currently being progressed. Initial design to be presented to cycle forum for comment. Funding to be obtained from Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>LTP</p>

8	<b>8. Plough Roundabout</b>  <b>Suggestion:</b> This roundabout needs to be made safer for all users, including cyclists, pedestrians and vehicle drivers. Removing the parking spaces would have the most beneficial effect.	Highlighted in the Leatherhead movement study report as for improvement. Feasibility work ongoing. Initial designs to be presented to Cycle Forum for comment. This route is recognised as providing a critical section of the North Leatherhead cycle network, both as part of the safe routes to school initiative and for regular cyclists.	LTP
10	<b>13. Linden Pit Footpath Bridge</b>  <b>Suggestion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legalise use by cyclists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be considered alongside point 12. Land ownership issues to be investigated and priority assigned. Existing usage to be monitored during school term.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erect “Cyclist Dismount” signs either end of the bridge and slope;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install drop kerbs for access.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• put a gully along the edge of the slope to allow cyclists to wheel their bikes up it; improve visibility at the bottom of the slope; and</li> <li>• provide a drop kerb on to St Johns Close.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires signage improvements.</li> </ul>	CHSMV
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install Gully ramps to assist cyclists with wheeling up and down bridge.</li> </ul>		CHSMV
11	<b>1. Wells to Craddocks Avenue</b>  <b>Suggestion:</b> Widen this section of the path and legalise its use by cyclists. Also provide formalised points where cyclists can rejoin The Wells Road and Craddocks Ave at each end.	There is available width at this location. Land ownership may be an issue. Could be considered in conjunction with Epsom and Ewell if considered a priority.	CHSMV

11	<p><b>15. Randalls Road - Cleeve Road to River Lane</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road widening is seen as the only complete solution, but as this is unlikely to be possible, proper permanent repairs to the potholes are essential.</li> <li>• Provide a pedestrian phase to the traffic lights at Cleeve Road.</li> </ul>	Potholes should be dealt with by routine maintenance. Land ownership issues could be investigated with a view to providing a widened segregated facility. To be considered against other priorities	
13	<p><b>25. Guildford Rd, Bookham - Lower Shott to Hawkwood Rise</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (as per SCC design ideas) :Provide a new cycle path through wide wooded verge on south side of Guildford Road;</li> <li>• Provide a Toucan crossing adjacent to Hawkwood Rise</li> </ul>	A scheme improving this section will be presented to the MVDC for their comments.	Mainten- ance
14	<p><b>26. Guildford Rd - Hawkwood Rise to Effingham</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> The north side pavement should be widened and converted to dual cyclist/pedestrian use.</p>	Consideration of expansion of the (25) improvements towards Effingham needs to be considered in conjunction with priorities. Improvements to the existing footpath to Effingham School between the school and the Lorne are currently underway.	ROW
14	<p><b>22. Gimcrack Hill - Downs Lane to Church Road</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put yellow lines on Gimcrack Hill to restrict/ prevent parking;</li> <li>• Install road tables; the suggested locations are one adjacent to the 30mph sign (south of Downs Lane) and the other between Downs Lane and Thorncroft Drive; these would also provide informal crossing points.</li> </ul>	A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to extend yellow lines in Gimcrack Hill will be advertised shortly. The installation of traffic calming on Gimcrack Hill needs to be assessed in terms of priority against other cycle improvement proposals.	

14	<p><b>28. River Lane - Fetcham to Randalls Road via the Splash</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Suggestions:</b> The kerb from the Fetcham end of The Splash should be lowered to provide smooth access;</li> <li>• Similarly, access to the two footbridges should be made level;</li> <li>• The path north of the river should be resurfaced with cinders or similar material (not asphalt).</li> </ul>	<p>This could prove a relatively straightforward suggestion to implement. What priority is it given by Mole Valley Cycle Forum? To surface in planings or limestone dust is not a problem providing the underlying surface is adequate</p>	
17	<p><b>2. Ashtead Station to Barnett Wood Lane</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Widen this footpath by about a metre and designate it a shared segregated route, using a painted white line to segregate pedestrians and cyclists. Alternatively, widen the path that runs parallel to the railway towards Woodfield and let cyclists use this. It is slightly longer, but is less used by pedestrians. Either of these is likely to encourage more commuters to cycle to the station, easing (albeit to a small extent) both the congestion and parking problems that the area suffers from.</p>	<p>If this situation can be legally acceptable and agreed as a valid proposal by local members, then it is merely a matter of prioritisation. (ROW 98002).</p>	ROW - T8002
18	<p><b>10. Kingston Road – Dilston Road Roundabout</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Consider some other form of junction, or find alternative routes for cyclists.</p>	<p>No other junction design possible without increasing traffic volumes am peak by 60% (Modelling estimates for A.T.S control indicates 1200m queue lengths). All aspects of cycle approach being considered as part of feasibility study. Proposals to be placed with MVCF for consultation.</p>	LTP

18	<p><b>3. Craddocks Avenue Chicane</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Either carry out extensive improvements to bring the chicane bypasses up to standard, or remove them altogether. Cars are happy to follow cyclists through other restricted width sections along the road, so why not at the chicanes? It would also help to slow traffic and so improve safety.</p>	<p>There is currently no intention to remove the existing chicane bypasses. Cyclists can choose to use the bypasses or remain on the carriageway.</p>	
20	<p><b>9. Kingston Road - Railway Bridge Section</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> Replace the ghost island by double white lines and add cycle lanes along either kerbline. It is accepted that the footpath on the west side is also badly in need of widening, which may mean that a cycle lane can only be provided in one direction; if this is the case we suggest that it be northbound. Add “no stopping” restrictions on the schools side of the bridge.</p>	<p>Recommendations of audit report currently being considered as part of Therfield School feasibility study. Completed design to be presented as part of consultation.</p>	LTP
20	<p><b>14. Linden Pit Bridge to Leatherhead Town Centre</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Paint a cycle lane along Epsom Road between Leret Way and Garlands Road .</p>	<p>Requires signage improvements. Alongside points 12 and 13, the issue of signing and footpath improvements to be considered as 'whole Package' for improvement if considered high enough priority. Available width of Epsom Road is limited. Potential for segregated cycle track due to wide footways / verges. Area improvements to be considered in conjunction with Garlands Road / Copthorne Road traffic calming.</p>	CHSMV LTP

20	<p><b>19. Church Street - Bridge Street Link</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Designate a 2 way cycle link when the area is upgraded.</p>	<p>Further development of Leatherhead town centre will prevent a change to the existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), which restricts cycle access. Cyclists will still be required to dismount and walk through the town centre.</p>	Phase2?
20	<p><b>19A. The High Street</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Allow cyclists to use the High Street certain times, for example during non-business hours. We do not believe that this would be unsafe for pedestrians using the High Street, as pedestrian flows would not particularly high.</p>	<p>Traffic is currently excluded from the High Street at all times. Some vehicles choose to enter illegally. Cyclists are required to dismount at all times. The current TRO is under review with the possibility of legalising access for some vehicles at certain times.</p>	
20	<p><b>19B. Town Centre Parking</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Ensure that the redevelopment includes cycle parking facilities which are suitably located, of a modern type (ie Sheffield stands) and of sufficient quantity. The Forum should be consulted on the detail of this.</p>	<p>Cycle parking – Whilst the Forum will not be consulted on the detail of the cycle stand proposals, advice is sought on where exactly MVCF would wish to see improvements?</p>	MVCF
20	<p><b>23. Thorncroft Bridge to Leisure Centre</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> Create an official cycle path from Thorncroft Drive to the Guilford Road. This would simply require a new hard surface to the existing public footpath through the field (MVDC owned) at the side of the Leisure Centre.</p>	<p>It is an intention to provide an upgraded link between the cycle path on Gimcrack Hill with the leisure centre. Change of legal status will be required to upgrade the existing footpath to a cycle path, or permissive path status obtained from MVDC. This section of route currently becomes exceptionally waterlogged in winter.</p>	L/H Signing Report & CHSMV

20	<p><b>27. Meadowside to Church Road, Bookham</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> This use should be legalised by converting the footpath to a bridleway.</p>	<p>Conversion from a footpath into a cycle path is required. To be considered against other priorities to informally improve the condition of the footpath should not cause significant difficulties.</p>	ROW - F/Path 133 & CHSMV
27	<p><b>29. Mill Lane to Cannon Grove</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Widen the path to allow for dual cyclist/pedestrian use.</p>	<p>Land ownership to accommodate widening may be a problem here. A full investigation of available widths and ownership would need to be made prior to establishing likely costs. Once again, an assessment of the priority needs to be made.</p>	
28	<p><b>11. Kingston Road – The Star PH to M25 Junction 9</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erect “road bends ahead” warning signs to the north and repair the verges;</li> <li>• erect higher parapets, extend the existing parapets (as was done on Linden Pit footbridge) or erect “cyclist dismount” signs on the bridge;</li> <li>• amend the barrier and add drop kerbs on the south side; and</li> <li>• complete the signing of the entire route from Leatherhead Station to the Star PH.</li> </ul>	<p>Signing of route to be completed shortly. Link towards Kingston to be undertaken by Royal Borough of Kingston (RBK). Funding of parapet raising to be considered as part of overall priorities. Remainder of route from Station to STAR to be considered amongst other priorities.</p>	LTP
29	<p><b>4. Barnett Wood Lane Humps</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Re-level the sunken inlets and widen the drainage channels to a minimum base width of 1m so that cyclists can ride <u>in</u> them.</p>	<p>It is not the policy of Surrey County Council (SCC) to widen the drainage channels. Any instances of sunken gullies to be identified and dealt with through routine maintenance. Some ramp angles also require adjustment to reduce severity.</p>	CHSMV – Maintenance

30	<p><b>5. Barnett Wood Lane - North-East of Harriots Lane</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Provide signing or road markings to emphasise to drivers that this is a major cycling route. This could either be standard lamp post mounted signs, or preferably large warning signs painted in the road, as recently installed in Somerset. Also consider improvements to the mini-roundabout – or add advanced cycle give-way lines?</p>	<p>Design is currently ongoing to facilitate cycle access between Harriots Lane and Plough Roundabout. Remaining sections to be considered later if priority. All designs for the scheme to be sent to Mole Valley Cycle Forum (MVCF) for consultation and comments.</p>	LTP
31	<p><b>6. Ashtead Station Parking</b></p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> Ideally provide covered cycle parking for a total of at least 60 cycles at the level crossing end of the two platforms in full view of passers by and covered by the platform CCTV system. Publicise the availability of these facilities and the benefits of cycling to the station. As an interim, add CCTV coverage to the cage.</p>	<p>Perhaps a representative of the MVDC could approach Railtrack / Govia to discuss requirements. Funding for improvements to be considered on priority basis. SCC currently, still in negotiation with Railtrack regarding Dorking Stations. Action difficult to obtain at present due to re – franchising excuses. Suggest finished report be sent to Station Manager.</p>	Railtrack MVCF
32	<p><b>30. Cycle Routes In the Fetcham and Bookham Areas That Just Require Signing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bookham to Cobham &amp; Ripley (via Bookham Common and Downside)</li> <li>• Bookham Station to Fetcham (via Meadowside, Eastwick Drive, Spring Grove, Kennel Lane, Cock Lane)</li> <li>• Bookham Church to Fetcham (via Lower Road, Eastwick Pk Av, Spring Grove, Kennel Lane, Cock Lane.)</li> </ul>	<p>A scheme would be put in place to provide the route signing suggested. Consideration of the scheme priority needs to be made.</p>	