

# Supplementary Agenda

**We welcome you to**  
**Runnymede Local Committee**  
Your Councillors, Your Community  
and the Issues that Matter to You

## Supplementary Agenda

- Public petitions and written questions with officer responses.
- Briefing note from Cabinet Member for Highways



## Venue

**Location:** The Council  
Chamber, Civic  
Centre, Station  
Road, Addlestone  
KT15 2AH

**Date:** Monday, 27  
November 2017

**Time:** 6.30 pm



## **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

- 4 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION** (Pages 1 - 4)
- To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 65. An officer response will be provided to each petition.
- 5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS** (Pages 5 - 8)
- To receive and answer any questions from Surrey County Council electors within the area in accordance with Standing Order 66.
- 8 ADDRESS FROM CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS [FOR INFORMATION]** (Pages 9 - 14)
- Colin Kemp, Surrey County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways will address the Committee.

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**

**LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)**

**DATE: 27 NOVEMBER 2017**

**LEAD OFFICER: CARYS WALKER – PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: PETITIONS SUBMITTED**

**DIVISIONS: ADDLESTONE**



**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To receive two petitions submitted for consideration by the Local Committee objecting to the proposed closure of Weystone Road (Item 10 on the agenda)

- Residents of Runnymede and Elmbridge boroughs who live locally to the junction. (94 signatories)
- Residents from Portmore Quays and Bridge Road (36 signatures)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to agree that:**

- (i) That both petitions are heard by the Local Committee at the 27 November meeting and that the feedback from residents is considered when the Committee contemplates its decision.

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

To address the issues raised by the residents in a considered and timely manner and to respond effectively.

**1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 1.1 Two petitions have been submitted to the Local Committee by the deadline of 14 days before the meeting. The Highways Officer has been advised of the content of the petitions and has reflected residents' views as part of his report which is to form item 10 on the agenda.
- 1.2 The divisional member from Weybridge and the chairman of the Elmbridge Local Committee were advised of the receipt of the petitions in addition to their Runnymede counterparts.

**2. Petition 1 – Residents of Runnymede and Elmbridge Boroughs**

- 2.1 The petition is worded as follows:  
“We the undersigned do not support the proposal to close Weystone Road to through traffic.
  - This proposal will not reduce traffic congestion. It will increase congestion across the entrance of our road.
  - This proposal will not improve traffic safety, it will force us to merge from a short slip road into fast moving traffic on the A317 Weybridge Road.
  - This proposal will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles to reach us during busy traffic periods.
  - This proposal will make it more difficult for us to get to and from our homes.
- 2.2 The petition was received by the Partnership Committee Officer having been delivered to the Highways department in Mellow Road, Guildford.

**3. Petition 2 – Residents of Portmore Quays**

- 3.1 The petition is worded as follows:  
“We, the residents and owners of Portmore Quays, Weybridge, object most strongly to the proposed denying of through passage to vehicles between Addlestone Road and Weybridge Road along Weystone Road. This is an adopted road for which we all contribute through our council tax for the maintenance. To turn it, in effect, into a private access road for the benefit of the few would be wholly unfair. We have a constitutional right to use it often and the denial of its use in the future for its intended purpose would not only be unfair but also very inconvenient. It is a useful means of access to our houses from various directions and helps considerably to relieve congestion on Weybridge Road, Addlestone Road, Church Street and Weybridge town centre when used for this purpose. With regards to the dangerousness of this usage, I would like to be made aware of the accident record leading to your conclusion in this regards as I am unaware of incidents caused by the usage of the road itself. Weystone Road is never congested –indeed in my experience it only ever serves a single car at a time.

The notion of “rat runs” is a term seemingly developed by residents of roads attempting to up the value and prestige of their properties by denying the established use of such roads by others. If Weystone Road is a “rat-run” then most roads in the country, including Old Wharf Way in front of our houses could be deemed to be in this category- a ridiculous notion.”

“We, Bridge Road, Weybridge owners and residents wish to add our objection to the [above]

- I do not believe it will achieve the stated aim of reducing congestion, in fact it will increase congestion as genuine residents of Weybridge like myself will be forced to use the main road which is already congested.
- I do not believe there is a safety issue with this junction that necessitates the closure of Weystone Road
- Other measures, for example use of paint on the road and improved signage could achieve the same aim
- Weystone Road is not a ‘rat-run’. Far from it, it is a legitimate road, used by local residents to access many homes like mine on Bridge Road, Old Wharf Way and others.
- Closure of Weystone Road will benefit the few, not the many- is this a fair and reasonable way to spend council funds in times of austerity?
- This is a low priority scheme- there are many other more deserving schemes that would benefit safety and traffic flow in Weybridge- why not focus Council resources on the bigger projects that will make a real improvement to people’s lives- rather than this project that will benefit few, many home owners of Weystone Road and inconvenience many.

The consultation process itself seems totally clandestine. I would have thought the council would have the decency to write to affected residents rather than burying the consultation on the website.

I reiterate, I strongly object to this proposal and would like to see a proper analysis and assessment undertaken to really understand how detrimental this would be if this scheme were implemented in its current form.”

#### 4. Officer response

- 4.1 The public have been consulted about a proposal to close Weystone Road at its junction with Weybridge Road and Hamm Court. The scheme was proposed after the junction was identified as having a poor safety record and was considered by the Runnymede Road Safety Working Group at its meeting in April 2015.
- 4.2 The majority of responses to the consultation have been opposed to the proposal and 2 petitions against the scheme have been received from local residents.
- 4.3 Since a significant increase in personal injury collisions at the junction in 2014 the safety record at the junction has improved.

## ITEM 4

- 4.4 It is therefore recommended that the proposed closure is not implemented at this time.

Please refer to the full report which can be accessed using the link under section 4.

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| <b>4. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:</b> |
|------------------------------|

- 4.1 Responses to both petitions received will be provided at the next meeting of the Committee on 27 November 2017.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Carys Walker 01483 517530

**Sources/background papers:**

Weystone Road: Proposed closure report: Item 10

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=198&MId=5473>

---



**Runnymede Local Committee**

**Date: 27 November 2017**

**ITEM 5: Written Public Questions and Responses**

**Question 1: from Ms Marie Ennis, Royal Holloway and Bedford College.**

In recent years, the university has instigated measures, including Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras to manage parking on campus. This means that limited available parking on campus can be provided for those who need it most (e.g. students travelling distance, people with mobility issues). Any vehicle appropriately taxed and insured may park in residential streets in Egham and Englefield Green. This is causing inconvenience to local residents and is a situation that we believe can be addressed by the establishment of controlled parking zones.

**Our question to the committee is:**

Would Surrey County Council consider establishing a working group with the university to help manage parking more effectively in and around the Egham and Englefield Green area to look at this issue?

**Officer response:**

Thank you for updating the committee about the measures taken by the university to manage student parking within the campus.

In the past we have carried out several consultations with residents in Englefield Green about parking. There has never been a clear consensus for residents parking so we have not taken this forward.

However, your local county councillor Marisa Heath and a member of our parking team would be happy to meet you to discuss the issues and options available. Please be aware that we have very limited funds for parking consultations and this will influence the options.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Runnymede Local Committee**

**Date: 27 November 2017**

**ITEM 5: Written Public Questions and Responses**

The following questions have been submitted by residents regarding concerns about parking congestion on Herndon Close in Englefield Green. An officer response has been supplied overleaf for the Local Committee to consider.

**Q2 Helen Attride**

I am a resident of Herndon Close and have a number of concerns regarding lack of parking for Herndon Close residents. This has led to access issues i.e. non collection of waste and a genuine worry that emergency vehicles might be hindered. Recently, a house opposite Herndon Close Road has its back garden brick wall taken down to build 2 parking spaces at the rear of the property, taking away 2 parking spaces for Herndon residents and visitors.

*Please can the Local Committee consider instigating a controlled parking zone for this area?*

**Q3 Todd Stephenson**

*Will the concerns of residents of Herndon Close regarding be addressed in the next Runnymede parking review?*

**Q4 Thomas Wells**

One concern regarding the demolishing of the wall between Denham Road and Herndon Close is that no-one was claiming ownership. I have supplied Land Registry documents to the Partnership Committee Officer which suggest that the ownership is with Surrey County Council.

*Please can the Local Committee confirm ownership of this boundary wall?*

**Q5 Steve Palmer**

*What is the status of the crossover application of 58 Denham Road into Herndon Close?*

## ITEM 5

### **Officer response:**

Thank you for your questions to the Local Committee.

Both your county councillor Marisa Heath and the Deputy Leader of the Council, John Furey have taken a personal interest in the issue of parking congestion around Herndon Close and have been working with officers who have visited the site to see what action can be taken.

At the request of Mr Furey, this area will be featured as a priority in the next Runnymede Parking Review which is due to take place next summer and recommendations are expected to be presented to the committee for decision in September 2018.

Any decisions regarding parking that are made by the committee at this meeting will need to follow a statutory process in which residents will be consulted on any proposals before any measures can be implemented. Your county councillor will be kept informed of progress throughout this process.

With regards to the alterations carried out by home owners on Denham Road to establish a drive to the rear of their property, officers from both the borough and county councils have been in touch to advise them of the permissions that they need to obtain for work of this nature. At the time of writing, an application has been received by the county council for the cross-over and this is awaiting assessment. Officers in the Highways Information Team are investigating the legal ownership of the boundary wall and, as this will involve consulting original documents that are currently archived, this is something that they are unable to confirm at the present time. Any legal implications will however be considered alongside the application for the dropped kerb.

Runnymede Local Committee  
27<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
Highways Briefing Note  
for Colin Kemp



# Introduction:

(from Medium Term Financial Plan):

## Challenges and Opportunities

Our challenges include: financial uncertainty, managing one of the busiest networks in the country and the wear and tear and congestion that results, high levels of customer expectation, a depreciating network and skills and supply chain shortages. Our opportunities centre on securing longer term funding and best value from our supply chain, whilst working with our partners to achieve greater efficiencies. Our five-year business plan (2016-21) sets out how we will work to deliver our services in the context of the challenges we face and how we will exploit opportunities to deliver maximum value.

## Key Actions

We will prioritise five actions for 2017/18 to support achievement of the council's three corporate goals:

1. Continue to implement our 5 year business plan, asset management strategy and performance framework to ensure the successful delivery of our strategic outcomes
2. Keep our roads safe by repairing defects within agreed timescales
3. Improve and renew priority pavements, particularly to support vulnerable users
4. Resurface and treat roads to ensure the resilience of our highway network
5. Support economic prosperity with an infrastructure investment programme and by delivering flood alleviation schemes

## Our budget



\* other functions include Local Schemes, Bridges, other structures and Traffic Signals

From the 2017/18 central budgets for Runnymede:

£235k has been budgeted for **resurfacing of roads**,  
£87k for **pavement works** and  
£20k on **Structures**

Since 2013/14 (4 years) for Runnymede:

The following has been invested centrally on the highway network in Runnymede:

£4,617 million on **resurfacing roads**  
£464k on Local Structural Repair (LSR)  
£297k on **pothole filling**  
£305k on **pavements**  
and £485k on **Structures**

## Horizon 2

### Roads - £235k

2017/18

#### Road Major Maintenance Scheme: A328 St Judes Road, Egham (Middle Hill Roundabout).

4 Road Surface Treatment Schemes: D3065 Grange Road, New Haw; D3096 Liberty Lane, Addlestone; D3108 Marley Close, Addlestone and D3182 Spring Rise, Egham.

### Pavements - £51k

5 Schemes where funding to be used to extend the life of pavements with preventative treatments.

D3059 Acacia Drive/ Close, Addlestone; D3005 Almnors Road, Chertsey; D3025 College Avenue, Egham; D3027 Little Green Lane, Chertsey and D3099 Orchard Way, Addlestone.

### Structures - £20k

A318 Byfleet Road, New Haw (assessment of New Haw Canal Bridge) and D3002 St Anns Road, Chertsey (assessment of Hamperstone Bridge).

Assessment of both structures is programmed to be undertaken by March 2018. These assessments will determine the extent of repairs and or strengthening that may be required to each of the structures.

### Traffic Signals - £12k

Traffic signal upgrade on A317 Eastworth Road, Chertsey (near Free Prae Road)

### Drainage - £80k (estimated)

D3161 South Avenue, Egham – improvements along whole road following last year's investigations.

Improvements are currently at design stage. Once the design is complete we will need to get the scheme priced and undertake consultation with the Environment Agency on our design proposals. Until construction costs are known and we have Environment Agency views on the proposals we can't confirm if the scheme can proceed this financial year, at best works will not proceed before March 2018 and carry on to the new financial year.

A317 St Peters Way, Addlestone – Investigation and refurbishment of drainage system (soakways and gullies) along central reservation to alleviate flooding.

Works are now complete and the soakaway system was successfully cleaned and the condition of below ground system recorded. The system should now function as originally constructed to take water off the highway.

### Safety Barriers - £90k

D3005 Almnors Road, Chertsey and two locations on C10 Chobham Lane, Longcross.

Design works are progressing and site investigations are programmed to be carried during November 2017. This will determine the location of underground utility cables and pipes etc. and

## ITEM 8

ensure the barriers can be installed in the designed position. New safety barriers will then be installed by March 2018.

## **Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) scheme - £5.88 million**

A30/A308 Runnymede Roundabout improvements (including all approaches)

## **Capital Safety Works**

Includes jet patching and the “Capital Safety Budget” works on the 4a & 4b SPN.

## **Road Safety Schemes**

A317 Woburn Hill, Addlestone – queues ahead warning sign; A317 Addlestone Moor Roundabout, Addlestone – markings on the road and some lane markings; B385 Woodham Lane junction with Pinewood Avenue - additional electronic sign and addition traffic light head; A317 Weybridge Road junction with Weystone Road – closure of Weystone Road; D3182 Matl Hill and North Street, Egham – several crossing points and A320 Guildford Road, Chertsey (junction with Green Lane) – anti-skid surface on the southbound A320 approach to the northern mini roundabout.

## **Street Lights**

Runnymede was in phase 3 of the Part Night Lighting programme that commenced March 2017. As detailed in the Cabinet Report, the roads have been selected based on them being part of the residential road network.

## **Grass cutting**

The borough council cuts grass on behalf of Surrey County Council. This year we are funding grass cutting to cover the area of 41.4million square-metres (county-wide) – that’s the area of 615 Wembley stadiums or three times the entire urban area of Guildford.

## **Trees**

We have cut down 73 dangerous trees in Runnymede since April 2017.

## **Drains**

There is a comprehensive gully cleaning programme. We’ve already cleaned 58,304 gullies (county-wide) since April and will have completed 169,969 by the end of this financial year.

## **Defects**

Since April we have repaired 51,110 dangerous defects, 2,872 of which were in Runnymede.

In the last financial year we spent £93k on repairing dangerous defects in Runnymede.

## **Parking**

The borough council manages on-street parking in Runnymede. There are opportunities to generate additional income from on street parking. These monies can be reinvested in the Runnymede highways network.

## What happens to potholes?

Extract from the website

*“Our highway safety inspection procedure is provided as guidance and standards for our inspectors, and helps to ensure a consistent interpretation of defects on nearly 5000 kilometres of road, over 6000 kilometres of footway, and more than 800 of cycleway. Operating to the frequencies, standards and response times set out in this document mean that we are able to maintain the highway network to a reasonable standard, commensurate with available funding, and successfully defend against the majority of third party claims for damage or injury.”*

- Members of the public are encouraged to report potholes and other defects to us and can do so by various means including online and via the Contact Centre. Reports to the Contact Centre will be logged via the website
- Our preferred route is via the ‘Report It’ option on the SCC website. Using this allows us to capture all information required to investigate and is the lowest cost option.
- Customers can view existing pothole reports on the map and then choose whether to continue with their report.
- Initial figures show more customers are choosing to end their session at this point thereby reducing the number of duplicate reports
- The website updates overnight and new reports will display the following day. Also existing reports will update with status changes.
- Once a report is submitted a Public Safety Inspector will visit within 5 working days to assess the defect against the Inspection policy.
- The classification will depend where on the road/footway they are and the size.

As a general rule potholes are assessed as:

P2 and aim to repair within 5 working days if

Carriageway if they are >40mm deep & >150mm diameter

Cycle way >25mm & >75mm diameter

Footway >20mm & >100mm diameter

P3 repairs within 28 days if they are approaching the above size with the likelihood of getting worse in the short term.

- If it’s not possible to repair within 5 working days then the defect will be made safe, either by guarding or a temporary fill and a follow up permanent repair within 20 working days
- If an email address is provided customers will receive automated status updates through the life of their report.
- During periods of extreme weather for example snow or flooding, when resources are directed elsewhere, these timescales may slip but updates will be provided on the website
- Future developments of the website include the option to sign up to receive alerts for potholes reported by others

ITEM 8

| Highest risk<br>Priority 1   | Medium risk<br>Priority 2   | Low risk<br>Priority 3   | Priority 4<br>(May be displeasing to the eye but not considered a safety issue)  |
|--|---|--|--|
| What happens to this pothole?  |   |  |  |
| Make safe within 2 hours   | Make safe or repair within 5 working days   | Repair within 20 working days  | We do not usually repair these potholes  |
| Individual or multiple potholes with very high risk of interaction with vehicles or pedestrians and likely to result in serious or fatal consequence | Individual defect greater than 40mm in depth and 150mm in diameter (Cycle lanes 25mm depth and 75mm diameter) | Individual defect greater than 30mm in depth and 150mm in diameter (Cycle lanes 20mm depth and 75mm diameter). | Individual or multiple defects less than 30mm in depth or less than 40mm but unlikely to worsen (20mm in cycle lanes). |
|   |                              |                              |                                     |