

Supplementary Agenda

6.30 pm

Monday, 16 December 2019

Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames

TW18 1XB



Items

- Petitions and officers' responses
- Written Public questions

Attending the Joint Committee meeting

Your Partnership and Committee Officer is here to help.

Email: carys.walker@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01932 794081 (text or phone)

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



Follow [@SpelthorneJC](https://twitter.com/SpelthorneJC) on Twitter

6 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES

(Pages 3 - 6)

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 14.1. Notice must be given in writing or by email to the Community Partnership and Committee Officer at least 14 days before the meeting. Alternatively, the petition can be submitted on-line through Surrey County Council's or Spelthorne Borough Council's e-petitions website as long as the minimum number of signatures has been reached 14 days before the meeting.

8 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(Pages 7 - 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.



SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: **16 December, 2019**
 SUBJECT: **Road Safety Outside Schools – Chennestone Primary School**
 DIVISION: **Sunbury –On-Thames**

PETITION DETAILS:

A petition with 225 confirmed signatures has been submitted to the Joint Committee for Spelthorne. The petitioner is nine year old Rosie Gurney from Chennestone Primary School, Sunbury – On – Thames.

The letter accompanying the petition states:

Dear Sir or Madam

I am nine years old and I go to Chennestone Primary School in Sunbury

I strongly believe that there should be either a Zebra Crossing or a Lollipop Lady on the Avenue by Manor Lane. Because it is too dangerous to cross as car speed down this road. In the past two years at least two children have been seriously injured trying to cross the avenue.

I only live 300 meters from the school gate and because I care for the environment I would not like my mum to drive me to and from school. I want to walk with my brother and fiends in a group. But whenever I ask my Mum or Dad they say it is too dangerous to walk to school without an adult. They say the only way to walk on my own or in a group is if there is a lollipop lady or Zebra Crossing.

Why would it be a benefit to spend money on, as it would save the ambulance and money.

Rosie Gurney

RESPONSE:

The county council would like to encourage safe walking and cycling to school, as this is better for the health of children, and reduces congestion and pollution. The perceived danger to children on the school journey, especial in the vicinity of a school, can prove to be a barrier to more walking and cycling. This then results in more car journeys and more congestion.

At school drop off and pick up times the roads in the vicinity of schools are especially busy and there is usually a high level of vehicle, pedestrian, and cyclist activity. This causes slower vehicle speeds and congestion and very often leads to frustration from residents and motorists at the apparent chaos caused by parents and children arriving or leaving the school. Therefore the county council have developed a “Road Safety Outside Schools” policy which sets out how we will investigate and respond to such issues. The aim is to reduce the risk of collisions, and to make the road feel safer in order to improve the attractiveness of walking and cycling to and from schools.

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety/outside-schools>

Surrey County Councils Safer Travel Team will investigate Rosie’s concerns using the Road Safety Outside Schools Policy. The process includes a site visit which will look at the physical highway features on the two roads mentioned in Rosie’s letter, The Avenue and Manor Lane, and the roads in the vicinity of Chennestone Primary School. A brief analysis of road collision data recorded by the police shows that in the last five years to the end of 2018 there have been four collisions resulting in slight injury at this junction, but none of these involved a pedestrian. The last collision at this site took place in October 2016. There hasn’t been any pedestrian casualties at this junction over the last 20 years. Summary data on personal injury collisions can be viewed on www.crashmap.co.uk.

The site visit will include the police, highways engineers and parking colleagues and representatives from the school. During this visit they will look at the highway infrastructure and road user behaviour to see if there are any improvements that can be made. Any highway improvements would be subject to funding being available. This same process will be used to see if a school crossing patrol could provide a solution. However there are a number of sites across the county where it is proving difficult to recruit school crossing patrols as there hasn’t been any applications to take up the role.

The Safer Travel Team will also consult with the school to assess what road safety education and training they carry out in order to try to make the journey to school safer and more sustainable to see if there are any further initiatives that they could consider.

RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (i) *Agree that the Road Safety Outside Schools assessment will be undertaken and the results reported to a future meeting of the Joint Committee.*

Contact Officer: Rebecca Harrison – Safer Travel Team Leader – Road Safety & Active Travel Team 01483 517515



JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

DATE: **16th DECEMBER 2019**
SUBJECT: **Church Street and Vicarage Road, Staines**
DIVISION: **Staines**

PETITION DETAILS:

A petition with 76 signatures has been submitted to the Joint Committee for Spelthorne. The lead petitioner is Peter Bower of the Staines Village Residents' and Traders' Association (SVRTA).

The petition states:

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to widen and make safe, especially for disabled and elderly users, the pedestrian pavement at the junction of Church Street and Vicarage Road, Staines and in so doing incorporate traffic calming measures to reduce the speed of traffic at this junction.

Further detail provided with the petition reads as follows:

This petition addresses two issues which might be dealt with by one solution.

The first is that the pavement on Church Street at the junction with Vicarage Road is very narrow and needs widening. At its narrowest, immediately outside The Bells public house, it is less than 70cm making it unsafe for the disabled and elderly and wheelchair and pushchair users. Also those exiting The Bells do so almost straight onto the highway.

The second issue is the speed at which traffic often passes through this junction. There is a 20mph speed limit but this is rarely observed, especially in the rush hour when Church Street can become very busy with traffic seeking to avoid traffic congestion in the middle of Staines. A widening of the pavement and consequent narrowing of the road could, if appropriately designed, reduce the speed at which traffic negotiates this junction.

RESPONSE:

Back in 2013-14 the (then) Local Committee for Spelthorne promoted a scheme in Staines Village in response to very similar concerns expressed by the SVRTA at the time. This scheme was developed in consultation with the SVRTA and the Divisional Member and resulted in:

- A new build-out by the entrance to the Lammas Recreation Ground
- A new double yellow line passing place in the section of Church Street adjacent to the Lammas Recreation Ground
- New road markings to enhance up the 20mph Zone.

It is highly unlikely that a significant number of drivers are moving through the very narrow section of Church Street leading between Wraysbury Road and Vicarage Road at speeds higher than 20mph. Committee would need to commission traffic surveys to confirm this. It will feel fast for pedestrians because the footways and the carriageway are both very narrow. The only way the footways could be widened would be to consider either a reduction in on-street parking or a one-way system, or both. Both these options were discussed with the SVRTA in the context of the previous scheme, but were not favoured. The most effective way to encourage drivers to slow down would be road humps, but these could be very unpopular with residents due to concerns about noise and vibration.

In terms of priority, there are no casualties on record for the junction of Church Street and Vicarage Road; the police casualty record dates back 20 years, and is available online at www.crashmap.co.uk. A scheme at this location could not be justified on road safety grounds, although in deciding how to respond Committee should consider the limited accessibility for pedestrians as highlighted by the petitioners.

Any funding for a scheme at this location would need to come from the Joint Committee's budgets.

RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (ii) *Decide whether or not to add this site to Committee's prioritisation list for possible future Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes).*

Contact Officer: Nick Healey, Area Highway Manager



SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE – 16 December, 2019

AGENDA ITEM 8

WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: Submitted by Mr Andrew McLuskey

“Given the steadfast refusal of officers or members of the committee to give satisfactory answers to the questions I raised regarding Stanwell Quarry at the July and September meetings of the Committee can I now be given an answer as to why this stonewalling has occurred?”

Officer response:

We acknowledge the questions that you have raised to the two earlier Joint Committees and the deep concerns that you have on the impact of the community of Stanwell. Many of these concerns are shared by both the Borough and County councils as has been stated in previous responses to you.

However, it is important to recognise the limits of influence that the Joint Committee and its respective councils have on the issues you raise. Heathrow expansion and the Esso pipeline project (an issue about which you have also raised concerns) are large, complex programmes of national interest, the outcomes of which will be determined by processes within central government. Whilst local authorities are consulted on such projects and can lobby for certain outcomes, they do not possess the prerogative to determine the ultimate decision. Nor do they have the power to compel private companies to allow them access to their assets such as in the case of the requested visit to the Cemex site. Therefore, whilst this action remains open on the Joint Committee decision tracker, a recommendation has been put forward to close this as the Committee has carried out all the actions that it undertook to do within its purview. The recommendation goes on to suggest that the issue is revisited as part of the Forward Programme for 2020/21.

We are unable to accept your view that officers have not been forthcoming in addressing your concerns and would actually assert that the opposite is true.

Alongside providing you with formal written responses, officers have attended Committee to discuss this topic publically and in detail, and have in addition, made themselves available to enter into private, detailed correspondence with you outside of this. If however, you have any specific instances of any named officers or committee members undertaking their roles in a way that is anything less than exemplary, we would be happy to signpost you to the correct procedure with which you can register your grievance.

Question 2: Submitted by Mrs Caroline Nichols

Spelthorne Joint Committee meeting in March 2019 approved a feasibility report for traffic calming and extension of the 20MPH zone in French Street. Six months later, in mid-September, Surrey Highways sent a circular letter with diagram to households in French Street, but not to the surrounding roads, inviting comment. The letter included no deadline for reply but stated 'It is anticipated that the scheme will be constructed early 2020'. Some residents did not see the letter. One resident secured the repositioning of a set of the speed cushions and the plan was finalised but without reissuing street letters to residents to show the change. A final formal notice to comment was issued on 25th October through the standard channels of the local newspaper, email to local councillors and three notices on lamp posts inviting comments by 22nd November. I raised a concern ten days before the closing date which was rejected on the grounds that there was no time left to modify the scheme.

Is Spelthorne Joint Committee satisfied that residents were sufficiently informed early enough in the process for their considered views and objections to be taken into account?

Officer response:

The French Street 20mph Zone extension project is intended to be an incremental element of a Lower-Sunbury-wide 20mph Zone type treatment. This area wide treatment is listed on Committee's prioritisation list of future improvement schemes, but the current level of budget provision would not allow the entire area to be treated all at once. Therefore Committee has been promoting elements of the wider scheme as the opportunity allows. At the present time we are moving forwards with two elements – French Street and the Green Street / Church Street one-way triangle. A few years ago Committee enhanced and formalised the 20mph Zone in Thames Street. The consultation was designed to cater for the French Street element, and so residents fronting on to the scheme were consulted. This consultation was successful; the question itself cites one resident's representation, which resulted in a tweak to the design for the scheme.

Question 3: Submitted By Mrs Caroline Nichols

www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne

Surrey County Council has submitted Sunbury Adult Education Centre to the Spelthorne Local Plan for inclusion in the housing allocations. Why does SCC want to close the centre and what is the expected closure date?

Officer response:

There are no intentions known at this time to close the Adult Education Centre. Property works closely with all District & Boroughs to look at potential opportunities for closer collaboration working under the umbrella of the One Public Estate, which examines the ability to provide Public Services in a more joined up approach. Any future review of the locality will ensure service requirements, such as Adult Education, are met and are looked at on a place-shaping basis.

This page is intentionally left blank