

Table 4, 16, 18 & 21.

**RS.- REPORT No. 19 Ref:- Reigate & Banstead DMSA DPD
REIGATE SOCIETY (RS) TRANSPORT/ LOGISTICS COMMITTEE (06.01. 2011)**

The RS previously submitted REPORTS No. 1 to 7 may have been considered and some problems have been listed. But the proposed Transport / Logistic Action does not appear to extend beyond **Traffic Suppression, Expenditure on the removal of landscaped Roundabouts and the dual carriageway in Redhill.**

The Society's Discussion arguments are that the **"ORBIT REPORT"** for Trunk Roads has been ignored by all and that the population expansion is to proceed without proper consideration being given to transport logistics and the needs to travel to work other than by Bus backed up by a substantial expenditure on the suppression of traffic on the main through A class routes.

The suitability and capacity of the alternative through traffic routes have not been investigated and that these alternative North / South routes include Linkfield lane and Street, Chart lane, Park lane, routes within adjacent Local Authority Districts and the Reigate High Street gyratory system.

There are no detailed proposals for the design or funding of park and ride and off street parking needed if traffic is to be suppressed on the A23 & A25. or of a replacement Bypass for the Reigate Relief Road scheme cancelled when found to be inadequate having been overtaken by traffic growth.

In addition the Transport / Logistic Committee of the Society considers that the seriously obstructed Cycle lanes are hazardous and do not encourage use.

Our LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (LEP) comprised of West Sussex and E. Surrey together with the adjacent LEP of Kent, E. Sussex and Greater Essex; and all other future LEP's to the West have their own development proposals for the rapidly growing population with housing needs and projected Transport flows along and across the line of the North Downs. This generated traffic flow will pass through the BOROUGH and present a major LOGISTIC PROBLEM that needs a long term transport plan if the proposed scale of housing expansion is to take place.

With this large population growth scheduled for our and adjacent areas and the need to travel within the London / Brighton and Sussex Coast development corridor we fail to understand how a **Logistic Suppression** scheme can be implemented without first providing for adequate and safe through traffic Road and Rail facilities.

This is of particular interest now that Government departments are encouraging growth in an attempt to reduce unemployment and increase low cost, low carbon exports needed for balanced trade.

It is also noted that Electric cars and the motor industry are to be encouraged with a subsidy and off street site parking restrictions are to be relaxed.

One large Oil Company is completing its third GAS TO OIL processing plant.

Extract from RS REPORT No 12 LOGISTICS para 5.0 SCHEME DESIGN :-

In considering **Traffic Logistic Suppression** it is suggested that;- Care needs to be taken to ensure that the proposals are not counter productive.

[a] Will Traffic held or required to wait at the periphery of a suppression area, or on alternative routes cause or increase air / noise pollution ?

[b] Will the suppression scheme have a higher carbon footprint than the previous system.?

[c] Will the new scheme result in or cause a loss of Business or Employment ?

[d] Will the proposal cause the overloading of rail or other road traffic routes ?

[e] Will the scheme have a higher annual maintenance cost and or energy demand ?

[f] What is the cost / benefit of the proposal ?. Is it value for money ?

[g] What alternative transport systems will be made available ? How will they be funded ?

[h] Does the schemes show a return on the cost of Finance ?

[i] What effect will there be on Health and Safety and other Road Safety issues ?

[j] Is the overall scheme sustainable in the longer term?

.
REPORTS (attached for information) No 15 Logistics; No 16 A23 Earlswood Cross Roads;
No. 17 Redhill Airport ; No. 18 Suppression of Urban Transport.

For and on behalf of the Reigate Society,