

*
*
*
*
*

***THE REIGATE SOCIETY**

***TRANSPORT SUB - COMMITTEE**

*

***REPORT No. 18.1**

16.03. 2011

***The suggested SUPPRESSION of VEHICULAR TRAFFIC on the A25 and A23.**

*

***(The case for providing ALTERNATIVE TRAFFIC ROUTES before attempting to suppress through Traffic flows on main A class Roads).**

*

***1.0 Objective;-**

*To consider the risks and problems arising from Traffic Suppression schemes within Urban areas when planned Housing development, employment and other social schemes are needed to accommodate a rapidly growing population.

*

***2.0 General**

*2.1 It is understood that as a general rule a well **designed ROUNDABOUT with balanced Traffic Flow has greater Capacity than a Traffic Signal regulated cross road traffic suppression scheme.**

*

***3.0 Expanding Urban Environments and Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas;-**

*3.1 Rapidly growing populations within the new LEP and adjacent LEP's will need housing, work places, schools and Transport facilities. Recent surveys indicate that the high cost of housing in the inner and outer London fringe together with the desire for the more rural or coastal environment has resulted in growth in the number of those commuting to work by all the transport systems available.

*3.2 Transport systems are subsidised in that Rail and Bus receive direct financial support and some automobiles receive travel cost support or the allocation of cars or vans for official, personal or business use.

*

***IT IS SUGGESTED**

***There seems to be little point in spending scarce public capital and maintenance fund on schemes designed to suppress subsidised transport systems.**

*

*3.3 One of the transport problems is that of obstructed Urban Principal Roads, with a delayed through traffic flow, encouraging Vehicles to divert to minor or housing estates streets of inadequate construction that in turn results in damage, pollution and accidents.

*3.3 Recent solutions have involved the provision of adequate alternative through traffic routes that carry long distance logistic haul traffic well clear of the Urban environment but with access to industry and retail outlets.

***Examples are listed in Report No. 1.1**

*

*

*3.4 The Society supports the need to reduce long distance commuting, the provision of

*“park and ride schemes,“ “Company staff bus schemes” and the provision of safe cycle way routs

*3.5 Individuals subjected to unemployment, inflation and rising fuel costs may already be

discouraged from unnecessary travelling. But what of the future expanded populations.

*

***4.0 RISKS associated with up to 40% SUPPRESSION of Transport;-**

*

*4.1 Traffic delay can increase non productive time for plant, transport, staff ,customers and result higher costs and loss of profit. Retail customers may decide to go elsewhere rather than sit in a queue or spend time waiting for a parking space.

*4.2 The risk of industry being unable to compete in international trade and the continuing balance of payments problem may delay improvement in employment.

*

***5.0 QUESTIONS that Society would like to asked;-**

*

*5.1 Will the removal of Roundabouts and installation of a traffic signal cause delay?

*5.2 Will the scheme involve extra journey time and air pollution ?

*5.3 Will the scheme Increase journey distance within the suppressed traffic Hub area?

*5.4 What alternative Logistic through routes have been identified to replace the Suppressed routes through Redhill and what traffic flow transfer is anticipated to these routes?

*5.5 What is the projected extra traffic flow diverted through Reigate now and with the new population?

*5.6 What are the present projected number of housing units and anticipated population to be provided within

*a. Our revised Surrey LEP including Croydon,

*b. Kent E. Sussex and Greater Essex.

*c. Other adjacent LEP's to the North and West?

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*

*J.M.Chittenden

*For and on behalf of the Reigate Society,

*

*