

## **Compton PC Traffic Committee Report for Meeting on 18 July 2018**

### **1. Down Lane**

Nothing further to report.

### **2. AQMA - Traffic Pollution**

**2.1** GBC have until mid-2019 to come up with an action plan to reduce the level of pollution in the AQMA.

**2.2** They are commissioning a specialised traffic study in the AQMA next week which provide a breakdown of the type of vehicle using the Street. I queried why so soon after the road reopened as traffic might not be back to normal and the reply was that to leave it any later would be right in the middle of the school holidays.

**2.3** The NO2 readings in the AQMA for May (which was while the bridge was shut) were higher than both January and April. This does not make sense and the June figures, which should be available shortly, are awaited with great interest.

**2.4** GBC, the new consultant and SCC will be meeting in the next two weeks to discuss the way forward.

### **3. Average Speed Cameras**

Anne Milton raised this subject with SCC's head of Highways and the following is the response:

"Thank you for your email and for forwarding Compton Parish Council's email regarding the possibility of installing average speed cameras in The Street, Compton. This issue has previously been raised by the County Councillor and investigated by the 'Road Safety and Active Travel' Team and the police. Please see below comments that have already been stated.

It is not possible to easily estimate the future on going costs of individual sites. Although the physical equipment maintenance costs may be possible to estimate, it is impossible to know how many offences there are likely to be, and how many of the offences will be eligible for speed awareness courses, or will require the time and effort required to create court files for example. Irrespective of the additional resources to service additional camera sites there is a very clear principle that permanent safety camera enforcement is only introduced at sites that have suffered a serious history of collisions and only after engineering solutions have been considered first. This principle helps maintain public support for speed camera enforcement, and ensures that resources (police and court time) are prioritised at the sites that need the most attention (irrespective of the cost).

In summary it would be hard to justify committing on going resources to processing offences and maintaining equipment at this site in comparison to many other sites across Surrey which have greater speeding issues and levels of casualties.

You might be interested to know that recently new signs, road markings and a vehicle activated sign were introduced in The Street as part of the traffic calming measures in Compton.

I hope you find the above helpful in responding to Ken Miller from the Parish Council.

Regards

Jason Russell - Executive Director, | Highways, Transport & Environment Directorate”.

Matt Furniss reported that he had received a similar response from the Police and suggested that “they do not want to do this at any level”.

The email from Jason Russell states that it is not possible to estimate ongoing costs but our VAS results give a clear indication of the high percentage of people speeding and the level to which they speed, so working out potential income and costs from this data must be relatively straightforward.

I would also question the comparison with other areas. Certainly in terms of accidents, the B3000 probably does not rate amongst the top accident ‘hot spots’ in Guildford but in terms of the numbers of speeding vehicles in a residential area, it must be one of the highest.

For these reasons and the fact that the AQMA is not mentioned in the email, I think we should fight on.

Ken Miller

14 July 2018