

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

**\*THE REIGATE SOCIETY  
\*TRANSPORT SUB - COMMITTEE**

\*

**\*REPORT No. 22**

Tpt. Workshop **17.03. 2011**

**\*POPULATION GROWTH and SUPPRESSION of TRAFFIC on the A23 and A25.**

\*

**\*( 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 housing in the more rural or coastal environments 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 both Bus and Rail services receive direct financial support from Central or Local Government.

\*3.3 Limousines, cars and vans are allocated to individuals for official, business or personal use; some others receive assistance with their travel costs.

**\*IT IS SUGGESTED**

**\*There is no point or advantage to be gained by the expenditure of scarce public capital and limited maintenance budget funds on highway A class road schemes specifically designed to suppress subsidised logistic vehicular traffic.**

\*

\*3.4 One of the transport problems is that of obstructed Urban Principal Roads, with a delayed through traffic flow, encouraging Vehicles to divert to minor Roads or housing estates streets of inadequate construction. Such traffic flow results in increased damage to the Highway, pollution and the risk of accident.

\*3.5 Recent solutions have involved the provision of adequate alternative through traffic routes that carry long distance logistic haul traffic well clear of the Urban residential environment but with access to industry and retail outlets.

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

\*3.6 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 ways

\*3.7 Individuals subjected to unemployment, inflation and rising fuel costs may already be discouraged from unnecessary travel. But what of the future expanded populations, the effect of full employment and the reoccupation of the currently empty office blocks.

**\*The Society is concerned that inadequate logistic and through traffic transport facilities may have a negative economic impact for Retail, Service and Exporting industries**

\*

#### **\*4.0 RISKS and TRANSPORT SUPPRESSION (up to 40% has been suggested) ;-**

\*

\*4.1 Traffic delay reduces productive time for plant, transport, staff, customers and result higher costs, loss of competitiveness and 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 result in further inflation and a lack of employment opportunity.

\*

#### **\*5.0 QUESTIONS that the Society wish to ask;-**

\*

\*5.1 What alternative Logistic through routes have been identified to replace the Suppressed routes through Redhill and what traffic flow transfer is anticipated to these alternative routes?

\*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 Will the removal of Roundabouts and installation of a traffic signals cause a delay to both local and through traffic? What is the total cost estimate of the Scheme? Is there a payback or positive return on the sum invested?

\*5.5 What is the projected extra traffic flow diverted through Reigate;-

\*a. After the introduction of the proposed Redhill logistic Suppression scheme?

\*b. After completion of the housing development programme within the LEP Area?

\*c. Are there any other relief road proposals under consideration?

\*5.6. Should a Relief Road scheme be provided for Redhill and or Reigate at some date in the future will the traffic suppression scheme for Redhill be necessary?

\*

#### **\*6.0 QUESTIONS for Future consideration when information becomes available from the Districts and LEP's;-**

\*6.1 What is the present and future projected number of housing units and population within

\*a. Our revised Surrey LEP including Croydon, Brighton and West Sussex?

\*b. Kent, E. Sussex and Greater Essex. LEP.

\*c. Other adjacent LEP's?

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*J.M.Chittenden

\*For and on behalf of the Reigate Society,

\*

\*