

Supplementary Agenda

6.30 pm

Monday, 23 July 2018

Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames

TW18 1XB



Items

- Member questions and responses
- Public questions and responses

Attending the Joint Committee meeting

Your Partnership and Committee Officer is here to help.

Email: gregory.yeoman@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01483 517530 (text or phone)

Website: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/people-and-community/get-involved/your-local-area/spelthorne>



Follow @SpelthorneJC on Twitter

- 6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS** (Pages 3 - 4)
- To receive any written questions from members under Standing Order 13. The deadline for members' questions is 12 noon four working days before the meeting.
- 7 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS** (Pages 5 - 10)
- To answer any questions from residents or businesses within Spelthorne borough area in accordance with Standing Order 14.2. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Partnership Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

DATE: 23 JULY 2018

ITEM 6 – WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS



Question 1

From Cllr Ian Beardsmore (Sunbury Common)

A lot of traffic-monitoring equipment (cameras and counters) have appeared on the roads around Sunbury Cross.

- 1a) Has this been instigated by Surrey and why are they collecting this data now?
- 1b) If not instigated by Surrey who has it been instigated by and why are they collecting this data now?
- 2) What is the scope and range of the data being collected?

Officer response

- 1a) Surrey County Council were not responsible for this Traffic Survey.
- 1b) Streetwise were commissioned by Amey Consulting to conduct these traffic surveys. The equipment was installed on the 4th July 2018. The cameras were removed on the 11th July 2018 and the Automatic Traffic Counter equipment (tubes across the road) was removed on the 19th July 2018.

At the time of presenting this response ready for Committee, it has not been possible to confirm the purpose for these traffic surveys. Traffic survey providers are not legally bound to divulge the reasons for their data collection to the Local Authority.

- 2) The cameras at Sunbury Cross would have been capable of recording the movement of vehicles around the roundabout. The ATC on the roundabout would have been capable of recording the volume, speed, and classification of vehicles.

Traffic surveys are designed to be anonymous. The processing of data is defined by the Data Protection Act 1998 and as from May 2018, the European General Data Protection Regulations 2018 (GDPR). The GDPR requires consent in order to use an individual's personal data, including vehicle registration plates. Therefore, it is illegal for organisations to divulge vehicle registration plate data within the survey results.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**



JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

DATE: 23 JULY 2018

ITEM 7 – WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1

From Mr John Hirsh, Hon. Vice-chairman, Lower Sunbury Residents' Association

When commenting on applications for residential developments, will the CHA accept, as a default principle, that their position in relation to on-street parking is contingent upon Spelthorne's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance being observed; most especially where the standards relate to new flatted developments outside town centres which should never be designed in such densities as to rely on vehicles being parked on the street in the first place?

Officer response

Spelthorne's Parking Standards are a guidance document that has been adopted by Spelthorne Borough Council for both their own use as well as to inform developers. It does not carry the same weight as the Local Plan and the policies within it. There is no legal requirement for SCC as Highway Authority to consider SPG's when assessing planning applications.

SCC's role as County Highway Authority is to ensure that development proposals do not have any adverse impacts on highway safety, capacity or sustainability objectives.

In the same way as Spelthorne Borough Council, SCC is guided by national planning policy the NPPF which states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'. It is rare that a lack of parking provision in relation to a development proposal could be considered to have severe impact on highway safety. Coupled with this, the sustainability objectives set out in the NPPF must be considered and adhered to, it would therefore be difficult to insist on additional parking at the same time being able to meet these national planning objectives.

There are situations where additional on street parking can result in amenity issues but this falls outside the remit of the County Highway Authority and should be considered by Spelthorne Borough Council as local planning authority.

Where the County Highway Authority do have potential concerns about parking levels, they will request that the applicant carry out parking surveys and implement parking restrictions if necessary. This can include restricting new residents from being issued parking permits for any local parking permit scheme. This would need

to be secured at the planning stage through a S106 agreement to ensure that all future occupiers of the development site are incorporated. Spelthorne Borough Council as Local Planning Authority could also apply such restrictions where amenity issues have been identified.

In summary the County Highway Authority does not rigidly apply Spelthorne's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance whilst assessing applications and can only object to development proposals on parking grounds if it would result in a 'severe' highway safety impact.

Question 2

From Mr Brian Catt

Will the committee support a stronger representation to SCC Highways to move the entry points to the 20mph area north up The Avenue and Green Street in Sunbury, to ensure these areas are better protected from the increasingly dangerous and discourteous driving, before the serious accident they now require to happen to act occurs, as it self-evidently must in an area of such obviously compromised safety, through the knowing neglect of SCC Highways?

Officer response

Committee receives a large number of requests for schemes to make improvements to the road network. Unfortunately the demand for maintenance and improvement works far outstrips the available budget, and so it is impossible to address every concern.

There is no current proposal to extend the current 20mph Zone to include either Green Street or The Avenue. Both have been added to the list of requests we receive for schemes for prioritisation at a later date. The criteria used to assess requests for improvements to the highway network are in accordance with the Local Transport Plan objectives to reduce congestion and to improve accessibility, road safety and the environment. Ultimately it is Committee's prerogative to agree which requests to prioritise for inclusion in the Spelthorne Joint Programme of Works 2019-20, and to allocate its funding accordingly.

From a technical point of view, investment in road safety measures is recommended to be prioritised for locations where there is the greatest potential benefit in terms of helping to reduce the number of casualties. We monitor casualties in partnership with Surrey Police across the county and there are thousands of road traffic collisions every year that result in an injury, the vast majority of which are caused by human error. We focus our road safety resources on those sites where there are patterns of casualties, because we can then be reasonably confident of identifying whether an engineering intervention might help reduce the frequency of casualties at a particular site. We then prioritise investment in those sites with the highest frequency of casualties, where we believe an engineering intervention would be beneficial.

The below tables show the personal injury collisions along Green Street and The Avenue for the last 3 full years and part of 2018 where data is available, giving the

period between 1st January 2015 and 31 May 2018. For Green Street, during this period there are 24 recorded personal injury collisions, 14 had a severity of 'slight', 9 'serious' and 1 fatality. When the police attend personal injury collisions they assess and log the contributory factors that lead to the collision. The tables below also show the contributory factors for collisions during the assessment period. Some collisions have a number of factors attributed to them, which means there are more contributory factors than there are collisions. Please note that for Green Street the vast majority of collisions occurred in the two-way section.

GREEN STREET Latest 3 year and year to date collisions (01/01/2015 to 31/05/2018)			
YEAR	SLIGHT	SERIOUS	FATAL
2015	6	1	0
2016	3	4	0
2017	4	2	1
2018	1	2	0
TOTAL	14	9	1

GREEN STREET Collision contributory factors (01/01/2015 to 31/05/2018)	
Factor	Number
Failed to look properly	8
Failed to judge other person's path or speed	6
Poor turn or manoeuvre	3
Loss of control	1
Slippery road	1
Distraction in vehicle	2
Following too close	1
Dazzling sun	1
Aggressive Driving	1
Dangerous action in carriageway	1
Stationary or parked vehicle	1
Road Layout	2
Crossed road masked by stationary vehicle	1
Careless/reckless/in a hurry	1
Driver using mobile phone	1
Deposit on road	1

Inexperienced or learner/driver	2
Tyres illegal, defective or under inflated	1
Vehicle door opened or closed negligently	1

THE AVENUE Latest 3 year and year to date collisions (01/01/2015 to 31/05/2018)			
YEAR	SLIGHT	SERIOUS	FATAL
2015	3	0	0
2016	1	0	0
2017	4	0	0
2018	1		
TOTAL	10	0	0

THE AVENUE Collision contributory factors (01/01/2015 to 31/05/2018)	
Factor	Number
Inexperience of driving on left	1
Failed to look properly	3
Travelling too fast for conditions	2
Animal or object in carriageway	1
Disobeyed automatic traffic signal	1
Failed to signal/misleading signal	1
Failed to judge other persons path or speed	5
Impaired by alcohol	1
Exceeding speed limit	1

As well as looking at casualty data to help make recommendations for investment in road safety improvements, we also use data collected from Speed Surveys.

We test traffic speeds using a mean average measured over a 7 day (24 hour) period. In practice some drivers exceed the mean average speed, and these are balanced by other drivers choosing speeds less than the mean average. For a 20mph limit or zone we accept a mean average speed of 24mph or less as satisfactory, in accordance with National Guidelines.

Regarding traffic speeds along Thames Street, we surveyed speeds before and after the introduction of the 20mph Zone. The results were reported to the Joint Committee in January 2017 - please see here:

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=502&MId=5465&Ver=4> (Item 11, Annex D).

Committee may recall from the results of the speed surveys that at all eight sites where we surveyed speeds mean average traffic speeds measured after the scheme was completed were reduced compared to the speeds before implementation of the scheme. At all but one site the mean average was less than 24mph. The site with the mean average speed of slightly greater than 24mph was the entrance to the 20mph Zone from the west, and can easily be accounted for by drivers drifting in from the 30mph limit.

We tested the speeds on The Avenue in 2016 and the average speed was 30 mph northbound and 30 mph southbound. We tested speeds on the one-way section of Green Street in 2016 and the average speed was 19mph. We have no up to date speed survey data for the two-way section of Green Street, which is where the vast majority of the collisions in Green Street have occurred.

In order to comply with the SCC policy for the introduction of 20mph speed limits/zones, the average speed should be 24mph or less, therefore it would not be possible to extend the 20mph Zone to include The Avenue by signing alone. It may be possible to extend the 20mph Zone into the one-way section of French Street by signing alone, although as speeds in this section are already low, reducing the speed limit to 20mph is unlikely to make any significant difference to driver behaviour.

When average speeds are greater than 24mph, creating or extending a 20mph Zone is not simply a case of changing the signs. We must first ensure that drivers' speeds would be commensurate with the new 20mph speed limit. Changing signs alone has been demonstrated to have very little effect on driver behaviour.

Current policy, which has been developed with reference to national policy and the approach of the Association of Chief Police Officers, dictates that speed limits should be self-enforcing. As such significant traffic calming measures would be needed along The Avenue and the two-way section of Green Street, to encourage compliance with a 20mph limit.

For example in Thames Street we surveyed speeds as part of the design process for the 20mph Zone that was introduced a couple of years ago, and in consultation with Surrey Police we designed and installed three additional road tables to ensure the new 20mph zone would be self-enforcing. The scheme in Thames Street cost over £75,000, so any decision to extend the 20mph on The Avenue or the two-way section of Green Street could not be taken lightly – it must be weighed up alongside other priorities when considering best value for Spelthorne residents.

Were Committee to allocate funding from a future highways budget, with consideration of all schemes and available funding, the first step would be to conduct a feasibility study to investigate the existing conditions and identify potential measures that may be appropriate. For example the siting of traffic calming features would need to consider the impacts on adjacent junctions and vehicular accesses. It would also be required to undertake statutory consultation should a scheme be

progressed, as we are not permitted to install traffic calming on the public highway without following the legally required processes.

Of course vehicles should be driven safely and responsibly. The contributory factors listed above show that drivers' behaviour is the main cause of the casualties. Surrey County Council does not have enforcement powers to manage driver behaviour, but concerns may be raised to Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team, who are responsible for enforcement, including speeding. Residents may be interested in the Drive Smart initiative, which has the aims of reducing road casualties, tackling anti-social driving and making the county's roads safer and less stressful for everyone. The below websites include information on reporting concerns, enforcement, education and Community Speed Watch initiatives.

<http://www.drivesmartsurrey.org.uk/i-am-worried-about-the-safety/>

<http://www.surrey.police.uk/contact-us/report-online/report-anti-social-behaviour-and-driving/>

Ultimately it is up to Committee to decide whether or not to allocate funding to extend the existing 20mph Zone in Lower Sunbury, taking into account the potential benefits and costs. If Committee were to be favourable the earliest a feasibility study could start would be next Financial Year 2019-20.