*

*

*THE REIGATE SOCIETY

***TRANSPORT SUB - COMMITTEE**

*

*REPORT No. 13. TRANSPORT - LOGISTICS 24/08/2010

*

***1.0 OBJECTIVE;-(in conjunction with Report Nos. 1 to 12)**

*

*1.1 To think the Unthinkable in considering the long term need for a reduced carbon economy associated with the declining supply and increasing costs of fuel.

*1.2 To review past transport logistic growth associated with an increasing population.

*1.3 To consider the options available, review possible solutions in an environment where the objective is one of maintaining living standards and employment whilst reducing carbon demand in a low cost competing export lead economy.

*

***2.0 HISTORY**;-

*

*2.1 After 1945 Coal fired { to raise steam or generate a gas supply} commercial vehicles were scrapped and replaced by vehicles powered by the internal combustion engine.

*A few people had access to automobiles, some being partially funded by an essential or casual user mileage based car allowance. Marked vans were also provided for business employees.

*Petrol was rationed and travel claims / payments were not permitted for Home to the Work place journeys.

*The majority travelled by cycle, M/c, bus, or train and where the journey to work took up too much time, it was the normal practice for lodgings [digs] to be taken.

*

*2.2 During the 1950's pressure was building for access to personal car transport .

*Corporations and later Public services bought or leased and allocated one or more vehicles to employees.

*For many reasons long distance commuting by road became a chosen method of transport, this commuting traffic grew rapidly causing congestion in the many town and village communities along the route that had been chosen.

***To meet this demand Road Improvement and Bypass systems were built and added to Schemes that had been provided during the 1930`s population expansion in the outer London Boroughs and at other locations.**

*

*2.3 In the 1970's Self employed specialists working from a home base secured the right to business travel from the home to the work place.

*

*2.4 The introduction of the tax on the value of car benefits seems to have led to a one off pay increase designed to cover some or all the costs of travel by these allocated, bought or leased vehicles.

*

*2.5 There is little doubt that rising fuel costs will make long distance car or van commuting expensive, but subsidised traffic may still create problems for resident communities.

*

*

*2.6 Many solutions to this problem are being discussed, some are practical but some are restrictive, expensive, polluting, energy consuming, increase industrial transport costs and may present a problem when attempts are made to reduce the number of those without employment.

*

***2.7 Is personal travel being subsidised by Business Corporations and Government departments and is this compatible with long term policy objectives ?**

*

*

***3.0 SUSTAINABILITY.**

*3.1 With an increasing population sustainability becomes a major problem in that extra resources are needed if living standards are to be maintained.

*Everything from housing ,water, sewerage, food , heating, lighting, through to work places, schools, recreation and retail facilities. All require transport of some form and this transport consumes energy that adds to the carbon footprint. How is this overall Carbon production to be contained or reduced. Some maintain that growth is essential and that more people are required to increase manufacturing output.

*

*3.1.1 Assuming an increasing population will require personal low cost transport for journeys of between 4 and 30 + miles and the support of an Industrial Road / Rail distribution logistic network.

***Are the present Objectives realistic, logical and achievable given the growth and export targets that have been set or are needed for economic viability ?**

*

***4.0 TRANSPORT SUPPRESSION OPTIONS;-**

*

*4.1 Objective to eliminate or reduce long distance commuting by turning the clock back and selecting an acceptable level within the **paragraph 2.0 Historical** listings above

*

*4.2 To introduce automobiles with a limited Horse Power, or range, Electric perhaps, and to require that all cars be privately owned, registered and insured. This may help to reduce the demand for casual journeys with a low need.

*

*4.3 To ensure that new housing schemes and communities are provided with their own transport system, with the provision of all necessary Road and Rail access improvements, off street parking, work places, and social infrastructure rather than rely on travel to another overloaded local community system.

*

*4.4 To suppress the existing Road transport flow, [without curtailing the car subsidy mentioned above], by reducing carriageway capacity and introducing traffic signal and other control systems.

*

*4.5 By the application of an increasing **Work Place Parking Levy**

*

*4.6 By inflating or raising the cost price of fuel

*

*

***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 pollution ?

*[b] Will the suppression scheme have a higher carbon footprint than the previous system and if so is the carbon tax on it own considered to be an adequate solution.?

*[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?
*

***6.0 REIGATE and REDHILL TRANSPORT HUBS ;-**

*

*6.1 The Reigate Society has been pressing for more than a decade for the amelioration of HGV Logistic traffic in the High Street -ie. The provision of something similar to a living Street-. The accepted Relief Road Design was subsequently cancelled on the grounds that it lacked capacity.
*

*6.2 In the case of Redhill Town centre a relief road was provided c. 1975 and the High St. and Station Road were given over to pedestrians. It is now proposed to use that A23 relief Road as a living street and suppress the traffic flow without any viable alternative other than the A217 through Woodhatch and the Reigate High Street This High St. route carries both the A25 and A217 traffic flows and now it is proposed by implication that it carry most of the diverted A23 traffic as well.
*

*6.3 Is it correct to say that the target for the reduction of peak transport flow on the A25 and A23 in Redhill is approximately 40% ?
*

***7.0** In view of the previous undertakings, copies attached, we request a review of the CORE STRATEGY Transport - Logistic scheme for REIGATE, REDHILL and other alternative but related traffic routes.
*Please find enclosed for information the Ring Roads, Parking, and Park and Ride solutions adopted by another conurbation faced with a substantial population expansion.
*

*For and on behalf of the Reigate Society Transport Sub- Committee,
*
*
*
*
*

*John Chittenden.
*
*
*
*
*
*
*