Please find a comprehensive response to all points.

**Upper Chobham Road – Ravenscote School**

In response to a petition from parents raising concerns about safety when crossing Upper Chobham Road near the gate to Ravenscote School and requesting the introduction of a controlled pedestrian crossing, Surrey Heath Local Committee agreed traffic calming measures should be introduced at the location.  These consisted of a raised table at the uncontrolled crossing point used by parents and a pair of speed cushions on either approach to the table to help further reduce vehicles speeds.  (As part of the scheme, speed cushions were also introduced either side of a pedestrian refuge on Old Bisley Road where parents and children also cross on route and to and from school).  Since the traffic calming measures were introduced in August 2019, parents have continued to campaign for the introduction of a signal controlled crossing on Upper Chobham Road.

The traffic calming measures were introduced because they were identified as an appropriate solution to the concerns raised by parents by helping reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety at the crossing point.   Such measures have been widely used near other schools across the county and have proved effective in addressing similar concerns.

Following completion of the traffic calming measures, a safety audit was undertaken on the scheme and was attended by specialist road safety officers from Surrey Police as well as officers from the county council’s Road Safety, Safer Travel and Area Highway Teams.  The site visit for the audit took place when children were leaving school so pedestrian and driver behaviour could be observed.  The safety audit did not identify any concerns with the traffic calming introduced and it was observed that vehicle speeds were generally very low.   This was due not only to the impact of the traffic calming but also because of the parking taking place and the high levels of pedestrian activity.  It was also observed that parents and children were able to cross the road relatively easily with drivers stopping to allow them to do so.  The officers present were therefore of the opinion that the introduction of a signalised crossing would offer little if any additional benefit.  The only concern identified during the safety audit was that several young children crossed the carriageway from the school to the western footway unaccompanied (i.e. to meet parents / carers waiting on the western side of the carriageway / in the adjacent St Francis Church car park) putting them at increased risk of conflict when crossing.  This would equally be the case even if there were a signalised crossing at the location.  Our safer travel team therefore raised this issue with the school.

Whilst parents remain keen to see a signal controlled crossing introduced,  there is no demand for pedestrians to cross at the location outside of the very short periods of time at the start and end of the school day.  As such, if a signalised crossing were introduced at significant cost it would remain unused for most of the day.

Previously, a school crossing patrol officer (lollipop person) operated at the location.  Unfortunately, the school have struggled to recruit a replacement.  However, a school crossing patrol officer would be the most cost effective and appropriate way of helping parents and children cross at this type of location where there is only a demand at the start and end of the school day.   Our Safer Travel Team have therefore been supporting the school in trying to find a replacement and we have indicated we would be happy for a group of concerned parents to operate on a rota basis (this has been done elsewhere in Surrey).

Further to the general information above,a number of specific issues have been raised repeatedly by parents in recent correspondence.  These are listed below together with comments in response to each issue to help clarify the situation.

**Installation of Ducts**

When the traffic calming measures were constructed, we took the opportunity to install ducts under the road surface.  This means that if a controlled crossing were introduced at the location in the future that the required cabling could be drawn through these ducts without the need to dig up the road surface.  Installing the ducts only resulted in a relatively small additional cost so it made sense to include them even if they may not get used.

The Divisional County Councillor referred to wiring being installed, rather than ducts, in some information he posted about the scheme.  This was a simple mistake in the wording used but it appears to have caused confusion, with some parents expecting electric cables to be installed.  This is unfortunate since the key point, in terms of minimising any future disruption or costs, is that the ducts were installed.

**Red Coloured Surfacing**

The information posted by the Divisional County Councillor also referred to red coloured road surfacing being applied to the road table, and this was considered as part of the scheme.  However, when Surrey Police and our Road Safety Team were consulted about the scheme they raised concerns that the red coloured surfacing could have an adverse impact on safety.  This is because the use of coloured surfacing at uncontrolled pedestrian crossing points at other locations has led to some pedestrians mistakenly thinking they have priority over vehicles.  As a result, there have been incidences of pedestrians stepping out in front of vehicles and expecting them to stop.  In response to the concerns raised, the red coloured surfacing was therefore omitted from the scheme.

Some parents expressed disappointment when the red coloured surfacing was not installed.  However, scheme designs are reviewed and improved through the design process.  As such, whilst information is provided in good faith to the community about the initial proposal, changes can and do take place.

**Refurbishment of other existing signal controlled pedestrian crossings**

Concerns have been raised about other existing signal controlled pedestrian crossings being refurbished in the local area, and it has been suggested the work was unnecessary and that the funding should have been spent on installing a new crossing in Upper Chobham Road.

Traffic signal equipment has a limited lifespan and needs to be replaced periodically.  Our traffic signals team therefore refurbish existing signal-controlled junctions and pedestrian crossings as part of a rolling maintenance programme.  This planned works helps improve the reliability of signalised crossings and junctions as well as reducing future maintenance costs.  This work is funded from a maintenance budget which could not be used to help fund the installation of a new crossing.

**Provision of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities near Schools**

On a number of occasions parents have made reference to other schools having either a zebra or signalised crossing on roads near them, arguing this means a crossing should also be provided on Upper Chobham Road and implying that road safety near Ravenscote School is not being treated with the same priority as at other locations.  However, we do not automatically introduce particular types of pedestrian crossings or road safety measures outside all schools.  The circumstances at each location will often be very different.  Each individual location is therefore considered on its own merits and the relevant factors are assessed to determine whether measures should be introduced and what type of measures would be most appropriate.  There are many schools which do not have either a zebra crossing or a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing located near them.

Kind regards

**Matt Furniss**

**Cabinet Member for Highways**