

# Supplementary Agenda

3.00 pm

Monday, 30 November 2020

Virtual meeting



## Items

- Petitions
- Written Members' Questions
- Written Public Questions

## Attending the Joint Committee meeting

Your Partnership and Committee Officer is here to help.

*Email:* [carys.walker@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto: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

- 5 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES** (Pages 3 - 16)
- 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.
- 7 WRITTEN MEMBERS QUESTIONS** (Pages 17 - 20)
- 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.
- 8 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS** (Pages 21 - 22)
- 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 30 November, 2020**

### **AGENDA ITEM 5**

#### **PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES.**

##### **PETITION 1.**

A petition with 2,517 signatures has been received relating to the section of Clockhouse Lane that crosses both the London to Staines railway line and the county boundary between Ashford and Bedfont Lakes. The petition has been signed by 798 residents of Surrey. The lead petitioner is Simon Jay. The petition reads as follows:

##### **Petition Title:**

*Bedfont Lakes bridge needs improvements before fatalities not after*

##### **Petition statement:**

*This is a petition to get a pedestrian/cycle bridge built onto the bridge over Clock House Lane (B3003). Leading to Bedfont Lakes....*

*Yesterday my son was nearly knocked off his bike by a car and it is only a matter of time before a serious incident or fatality happens on this bridge...is it really true that two fatalities need to happen before a pedestrian bridge will be built?*

*If you have ever tried to cross this bridge on foot, running or cycling you know the serious dangers/risks it offers all its users, young and old.*

*The bridge is a main access point to Bedfont Lakes. The bridge has a constant flow of traffic which has increased heavily over the years. Many local people now avoid the bridge due to poor access/dangers.*

##### **RESPONSE:**

The B3003 Clockhouse Lane crosses the London to Staines railway line at the boundary between Surrey and the London Borough of Hounslow. A bridge carries the carriageway over the railway line. However, there are no

pedestrian facilities at all for nearly 300m between the entrance to the small-holdings site on the Surrey side of the bridge, and the entrance to Princes Lakes on the Hounslow side. The narrowing carriageway combined with the gradients approaching the brow of the bridge make the site hostile for cyclists.

Over a number of years, the local community has expressed concern about the lack of a safe and accessible route for pedestrians and cyclists to travel between Ashford and Bedfont Lakes.

The Police's records of road traffic collisions resulting in a casualty suggests that despite the obvious problems for pedestrians and cyclists, the bridge actually has a reasonable casualty history. This record is available to members of the public at [www.crashmap.co.uk](http://www.crashmap.co.uk), and goes back to 1999. There was a fatal incident in 2001, as well as slight casualties in 2002, 2008, 2013 and 2014. There have been no casualties on the bridge for the past six years. This frequency of casualties is low compared to other sites nearby.

From an accessibility point of view, the lack of pedestrian and cycle facilities is a considerable barrier for people using these modes of transport. In 2011 in partnership with the London Borough of Hounslow, Surrey County Council's (then) Local Committee for Spelthorne commissioned a feasibility study with Mouchel to explore options to provide new pedestrian and cycle facilities. The feasibility report was published in August 2012 and is available on request. The report considered four different options and estimated indicative costs. A traffic management option – reduction to a single lane with traffic signals – was estimated to be the most economical at an indicative cost of £420,000.

Three different bridge solutions were explored with indicative costs ranging from £1.1M to £1.4M. These indicative costs would need to be adjusted for budgeting purposes to take account of:

- Inflation from 2012 to the date of construction.
- Utility diversions.
- Design and supervision fees.
- Costs associated with any formal processes that would be required, for example land acquisition.
- Works to the approach embankments to join the existing footways to the modified / new bridge.

Taking all these adjustments into account it is likely that if the project were to commence today, we would need to budget somewhere in the range £2M to £4M. The wide range in this estimate reflects the uncertainties and risks that would need to be ironed out during detailed design of any scheme. The Mouchel feasibility study was commissioned on the understanding of a 50:50 split of any project funding between Surrey County Council and the London Borough of Hounslow. This level of funding for new infrastructure would ordinarily be provided by the Government, either directly via the

Department for Transport in the context of a specific initiative, or via the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership. At the present time there are no Government initiatives for which this scheme would score highly in terms of priority. Funding from the Local Enterprise Partnership is only being released for schemes that facilitate either significant housing or economic development. Unfortunately, this scheme does not score highly in this regard either.

What this means is that for the foreseeable future, the only way that this scheme could be delivered would be using local funding – that is funding from Spelthorne Borough Council, Surrey County Council, and the London Borough of Hounslow. The Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council has indicated that Spelthorne Borough Council would consider a request for part funding for this scheme from Spelthorne Borough Council's CIL fund. Surrey County Council's capital funding for Highways and Transport schemes is focussed on maintaining our existing Highway network asset. A senior London Borough of Hounslow officer has indicated that they are unlikely to be able to provide funding at this level for this scheme for the foreseeable future.

What this means is that a project to construct a new or modified bridge is unlikely to be affordable for the foreseeable future.

The traffic management solution suggested by Mouchel – reduction to single file and traffic signal control – could not be implemented over the full 300m gap in the existing footway provision. This distance is too great to operate safely on a permanent basis and would cause substantial congestion in Ashford and at the Clockhouse roundabout.

It may be feasible to deliver a traffic management-based solution based on a one-way system that does not require expensive works on the approach embankments and would have less of an impact in terms of congestion. This would involve reducing Clockhouse Lane to a single lane and also making the road one-way northbound. The southbound side of the road could then be reallocated for pedestrian and cycle use. If Committee were favourable to a scheme of this nature, then it could be explored further as part of a new feasibility study.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (i) Decide whether or not to add a new feasibility study for a one-way system-based solution in Clockhouse Lane to its prioritisation list, for potential future funding.

### **Contact Officer:**

Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

---

## **PETITION 2.**

### **PETITION DETAILS:**

A petition with 2,901 signatures has been received relating to the junction of Long Lane and Bedfont Road, Stanwell. The petition has been signed by 222 residents of Surrey. The lead petitioner is Samuel Philpott. The petition reads as follows:

Road safety changes, Long Lane, Stanwell (SCC Cllr R.Evans)  
Petition statement:

On New Year's Eve 2019 3 lives were taken and the fourth in critical care. This is due to a road traffic collision on the junction from long lane/Bedfont road. If there is anything to help the future, we need to look into positivities and a way forward to make the area a safer place. The junction is known for being a dangerous part of the crossover between Stanwell and Heathrow with lorries and busses passing regularly. We need your help to stop this.

### **RESPONSE:**

#### **Road safety**

The council currently receives funding to be used specifically to reduce road casualties. In partnership with Surrey Police road collisions are monitored across the county. 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. Given the number of existing sites where there are patterns of casualties, when considering investment in road safety we are obliged to prioritise those sites with the greatest frequency of casualties, ahead of those sites with a lesser frequency of casualties.

Surrey Police shares data on collisions where an injury has been recorded. The police record likely factors that may have contributed to a collision resulting in injury. Collision data may be viewed on the publicly accessible website Crash Map.

<http://www.crashmap.co.uk/>

When monitoring road casualties, it is standard practice to review data from the most recent three-year period. This enables patterns to be identified and sites to be compared. Available data for the most recent three-year period records the following:

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne)

- 31 December 2019; vehicle emerging from Long Lane collided with vehicle travelling on Bedfont Road; three fatal injuries; recorded factor of 'Junction overshoot'
- 3 November 2018; vehicle turning right from Long Lane collided with vehicle travelling on Bedfont Road; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Failed to judge other persons path or speed'
- 29 January 2018; vehicle travelling from Long Lane collided with vehicle travelling on Bedfont Road; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Loss of control'

The location and collision history were discussed at the most recent meeting of the road safety partnership of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police. The partnership discusses road safety issues across the borough. These are regular meetings between Surrey Highways and Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. Locations with a poor safety record are identified by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted locations where it is thought that there may be a traffic problem. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns.

Speed surveys will be undertaken to determine actual vehicle speeds, which will allow appropriate assessment of the speed limit. Other potential measures discussed include alterations to the junction. It must be noted that the progression of any measures will be considered alongside other locations where measures may address a history of collisions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (ii) *Note that the location and collision history have been discussed at the road safety partnership of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police and that investigative measures are ongoing.*

### **Contact Officer:**

Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

---

### **PETITION 3.**

#### **PETITION DETAILS:**

A petition with 145 signatures has been received relating to Laleham Road, Staines upon Thames. The lead petitioner is Mr Thomas Byrne. The petition reads as follows:

#### **Road safety improvements to Laleham Road (Commercial Road and Wheatsheaf Lane)**

##### **Petition statement:**

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to improve road condition and pedestrian safety on Laleham Road. Between South Street and Carlyle Road there have been 11 incidents resulting in a casualty in the last 3 years, including 3 serious casualties. This does not include damage to parked cars. It is clear that the current 30 mph limit is not followed. This increase in traffic volume & speed combined with the high number of parked cars highlights the need for an additional crossing point to be provided. There are no designated pedestrian crossing points between Park Avenue & Wheatsheaf Lane, a distance of some 600 metres. There are multiple potholes, dips, rises, and broken pieces of road. These have been either patched up or ignored. This results in vehicles weaving across the road to avoid the dips or an increase in vibrations/noise from HGVs. In summary, we would like the council to: -

- Reduce the speed of the traffic on Laleham Road, be that through increased signage, policing of the limit or reduction in limit.
- Install a crossing point for the elderly, between Carlyle Road and Wheatseaf Lane.
- Address the overall condition of the road, especially between Ruskin Road and Wheatsheaf Lane.

#### **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The B376 Laleham Road, Staines is a 'B' – classified urban two-way single carriageway road, approximately 1 mile in length. It forms part of the B376, which runs from Shepperton to Staines and is part of Surrey County Councils Priority Route Network 3. The section of Laleham Road in question (from South Street to Wheatsheaf lane) is approximately 0.8 miles in length and is subject to a 30mph speed limit.

The road has a continuous system of street lighting. The residential properties that border the section of Laleham Road in question have off-street parking and are generally set back from the carriageway by an average of about 3.5 metres. There is a continuous footway on both sides of the carriageway except for a section of 136m on the north west side from the Staines Riverside Club.

- **Road Safety – Collisions Involving Personal Injury 01/01/17 – 30/08/20**

The council currently receives funding to be used specifically to reduce road casualties. In partnership with Surrey Police road collisions are monitored across the county. 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. Given the number of existing sites where there are patterns of casualties, when considering investment in road safety we are obliged to prioritise those sites with the greatest frequency of casualties, ahead of those sites with a lesser frequency of casualties.

Surrey Police shares data on collisions where an injury has been recorded. The police record likely factors that may have contributed to a collision resulting in injury. Collision data may be viewed on the publicly accessible website Crash Map.

<http://www.crashmap.co.uk/>

When monitoring road casualties, it is standard practice to review data from the most recent three-year period. This enables patterns to be identified and sites to be compared. Available data between 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 to 31 August 2020 records the following:

- 09 August 2020; vehicle 1 reversing out of a side road onto Laleham Road, vehicle 2 has braked hard causing cyclist to swerve and fall to the left on to the footway; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Failed to judge other persons path or speed'
- 07 August 2020; Cyclist rode bike into kerb and fell off injuring his ribs, 102 metres from Gresham Road; one casualty; serious injury; recorded factor of 'Careless/Reckless/In a hurry'
- 17 January 2019; vehicle turning north west from Richmond Road onto Laleham Road collided with cyclist also turning north west; one casualty; serious injury; recorded factor of 'Failed to look properly'

- 13 December 2019; pedestrian crossing Guildford Road junction and was hit by vehicle 1; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Unknown'
- 23 June 2018; pedestrian walking along Laleham Road, vehicle clipped the pedestrian on the right-hand side; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of Careless/reckless in a hurry'
- 13 June 2018; vehicle one waiting at junction of Laleham Road and Guildford Street has been hit by vehicle two; one casualty; slight injury; No recorded factor as Police did not attend the scene
- 13 May 2018; vehicle travelling south on Laleham Road the driver has failed to comply with the height restriction and has collided with the bridge; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Disobeyed double white line'
- 14 July 2018; vehicle1 travelling along Laleham Road towards Staines, motorcycle travelling towards Laleham near to Richmond Road, Vehicle 3 in convoy with motorcycle. Vehicle 1 has turned right across the path of the motorcycle and both have collided; two casualties; serious injury; recorded factor of 'failed to look properly'
- 6 September 2018; vehicle one turning right onto Laleham Road from Gresham Road has misjudged speed or distance of vehicle two travelling south on Laleham Road and pulled out and collided with vehicle two; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Failed to look properly' and 'Careless/reckless in a hurry'
- 11 January 2017; vehicle one travelling south east on Laleham Road, vehicle two emerging from Commercial Road, turning right onto Laleham Road, as he exited the junction vehicle one braked heavily sending a seated passenger on the bus forwards causing severe injuries; one casualty; severe injury; recorded factor of 'Careless/reckless in a hurry' and 'Disobeyed Give Way signs and markings'
- 24 February 2017; pedestrian crossing at pedestrian crossing when a vehicle coming towards her has braked causing the vehicle to skid and collide with vehicle; One casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Poor turn or manoeuvre'
- 28 February 2017; 50 metres south of Commercial Road, on Laleham Road, a pedestrian has walked out onto the road, vehicle 1 swerved but pedestrian hit her foot on the car; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Failed to look properly'

- 23 July 2017; vehicle 1 stopped to turn right from Laleham Road to Commercial Road, vehicle two stopped behind vehicle 1, vehicle 3 failed to stop and collided with vehicle 2, causing vehicle 2 to collide with vehicle 1; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Following too close' and 'Careless/reckless in a hurry'
- 5 September 2017; vehicle (motorbike) travelling on Laleham Road, collided with vehicle emerging from Wheatsheaf lane; one casualty; slight injury; recorded factor of 'Careless/reckless in a hurry'

Four of the collisions involved pedestrians, 8 were at junctions. Excess speed was not recorded by the Police as a possible factor in any of the 14 recorded collisions.

The location and collision history of Laleham Road Staines was last discussed at the most recent meeting of the road safety partnership of Surrey County Council and Surrey Police, in November 2020. These are regular meetings between Surrey Highways and Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team to discuss road safety issues across the borough. Locations with a poor safety record are identified by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted locations where it is thought that there may be a traffic problem. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns. Surrey County Council's Road Safety Team are promoting a scheme on Laleham Road to address the collision history.

- **The petitioner requests reduce the speed of the traffic on Laleham Road, be that through increased signage, policing of the limit or reduction in limit.**

By reference to Surrey County Council's Setting Local Speed Limits Policy, it is highly unlikely that a reduction in speed limit would be successful without significant supporting engineering measures. Simply changing the posted speed limit is likely to lead to mass defiance by drivers.

Speed limits are set in accordance with Surrey's speed limit policy, which also sets out the process for assessing speed limits. Experience shows that changing to a lower speed limit on its own will not necessarily be successful in reducing the speed of traffic by very much if the prevailing mean speeds are much higher than the proposed lower speed limit.

If a speed limit is set too low and is ignored, then this could result in the majority of drivers criminalising themselves and could bring the system of speed limits into disrepute. There should be no

expectation that the police would be able to provide regular enforcement if a speed limit is set too low as this could result in an unreasonable additional demand on police resources. It is also important to set reasonable speed limits to ensure consistency across the country. The Setting Local Speed Limits Policy can be found here;

[https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0011/28748/Setting-Local-Speed-Limits-Policy-FINAL-APPROVED-VERSION\\_accessible.pdf](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/28748/Setting-Local-Speed-Limits-Policy-FINAL-APPROVED-VERSION_accessible.pdf)

Surrey County Council and Surrey Police have joined together to create local speed management plans for each of Surrey's 11 Boroughs and Districts.

These plans list those stretches of road where speeding vehicles are a prime issue either because of a history of collisions or because of concerns raised by residents. The aim of each plan is to ensure that the roads with the worst speeding problems are identified and prioritised. Laleham Road was last investigated by Surrey County Councils Speed Management Plan in 2016. Speed surveys were undertaken, the average speed was recorded at 29mph. As this showed a good compliance with the 30mph speed limit, no further action was taken.

As the petitioner raised concerns over vehicle speeds, Surrey Police conducted a speed survey on Laleham Road (between South Street and Wheatsheaf Lane) from the 9th September 2020 to 25th September 2020. The data showed the average speeds to be 34mph. Consequently, Laleham Road was raised at the most recent Speed Management Plan Meeting in November 2020, where it was decided to include the road for enforcement by Surrey Police.

Speeding is essentially a Police enforcement issue as driving in excess of the posted speed limit is a criminal offence for which the Police, as the sole highway enforcement agency, have powers to deal with offenders who unashamedly flout the law, quickly and effectively.

Where there are significant community concerns over speeding and road safety, an option for local residents is to take part in a 'Community Speed Watch'. Community Speed Watch is an initiative by Surrey Police. This consists of local residents taking part in a visible speed data collection. Surrey Police provide local volunteers with equipment and training to be able to monitor vehicle speeds and note the registration details of speeding vehicles. Surrey Police then issue letters to the keepers of vehicles who have been detected speeding to provide a warning against speeding at that location. Further police action may then

be taken against motorists who are detected speeding several times or excessively over the posted speed limit.

For further information on Drive SMART visit the dedicated website:

[https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0005/208931/Surrey\\_DriveSMARTRoadSafetyStrategyver5.pdf](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/208931/Surrey_DriveSMARTRoadSafetyStrategyver5.pdf)

### **Speed Management Measures**

- **Signs.** Surrey County Council is directed by the legislation of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. The 30mph limit is indicated to drivers by the system of street lighting in the road, as described in Sections 124 and 125 of the Highway Code. It is not permitted to use additional signs or markings. Therefore, it is not possible to install additional speed limit signs or markings.
- **Speed Cameras.** Static speed cameras are only introduced at sites where there has been a continuing history of collisions, where speeds have been measured and found to be excessive, and only after other highway engineering solutions have been considered first. Therefore, we will be monitoring the effect on casualties of the proposed improvements in the hope that these will reduce the number of collisions before considering whether any other improvements would be worthwhile in the future.
- **Vehicle Activated Signs.** These signs activate if an approaching vehicle is detected to be exceeding a pre-set speed in an area. The speed limit or a warning message will illuminate on the sign to remind the driver/rider to slow down. A study conducted by TRL for the UK Department for Transport, one of the conclusions was that Vehicle Activated Signs appear to be very effective in reducing speeds; in particular, they are capable of reducing the number of drivers who exceed the speed limit and who contribute disproportionately to the accident risk, without the need for enforcement such as safety cameras.

On request from County Councillor Sinead Mooney, the option for Vehicle Activated Signs has been explored. Two locations along Laleham Road within the area in question have been identified and signs will be installed before the end of this financial year.

- **The petitioner requests a crossing point for the elderly between Carlyle Road and Wheatsheaf Lane.** Officers have visited the location and explored the options for a crossing point in the form of a pedestrian refuge island. A site has been identified between Carlyle Road and Wheatsheaf Lane and when funding is available it will be progressed.

A possible source of funding could be identified through the Government's Emergency Active Travel Fund. This emergency

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne)

fund tasked Highway Authorities to develop and deliver schemes to promote active travel (cycling and walking). Tranche two funding has recently been announced, and one of the schemes Surrey County Council hope to fund is for Gresham Road. It may be possible to include the installation of a pedestrian refuge island between Carlyle Road and Wheatsheaf Lane as part of this scheme.

However, If funding cannot be secured through the Active Travel Programme, the Committee must decide if they want to prioritise Laleham Road for a pedestrian crossing, the first step would be to undertake a feasibility study to establish the existing conditions and behaviours to enable the development of suitable measures.

- **The petitioner requests that Surrey County Council address the overall condition of the road, especially between Ruskin Road and Wheatsheaf Lane.** The Local County Councillor, Sinead Mooney has funded a local structural repair scheme for this financial year. This involves large scale patching of a specific area on a road. The limits are from outside 185 Staines Road to the junction with Hereford Close, however subject to approval and funding, we will be looking to extend the said limits to Carlyle Road.

Surrey County Council does not repair all highway defects as a matter of routine, but only those that are large enough to be considered Safety Defects. It is the depth of a defect, rather than its area that determine whether it is considered to be a Safety Defect. Any defect less than 40mm deep on the road, and 20mm on the pavement is not considered to be a Safety Defect, regardless of the area of the defect.

To maintain the network safe for public use we have defined Safety Defects in line with the National Code of Practice for Highway Maintenance

<http://www.ukroadsliaisongroup.org/en/UKRLG-and-boards/uk-roads-board/wellmaintained-highways.cfm>.

This ensures that Surrey County Council's approach to Highway maintenance is consistent with Highway Authorities elsewhere in the UK. We have found that our definitions of Safety Defects to be defensible in court when challenged through insurance claims. Whenever we become aware of a Safety Defect either through our routine inspections or via correspondence from residents, we endeavour to make repairs within timescales commensurate with the risk.

There is a link below to our Highways Safety Defect Matrix & Inspection Regime which gives further explanation on how we aim to keep the highway network safe through regular safety inspections, using a team of qualified inspectors.

[www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne)

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roads-and-transport-policies-plans-and-consultations/roads-and-transport-policies-and-plans/highway-safety-inspections-standards-and-procedures>

In response to this petition the Highways Team have undertaken an ad hoc inspection of Laleham Road, and three safety defects were identified within the area in question and have now been repaired.

We do welcome reports from residents and road users of potential safety defects, as this helps us to keep the network safe, and please do contact us again if you see defects on the road which meet with our intervention criteria explained above.

In the meantime, we will continue to keep Laleham Road in a safe condition through our regular programme of Highway Inspections and repair of safety defects.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (iii) Note for Information Only
- 

**Contact Officer:**

Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

---

This page is intentionally left blank



## SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE – date 30 November 2020

### AGENDA ITEM 7

#### WRITTEN MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

All of the following were submitted by Cllr Sue Doran.

1. *Could we know the availability of front line appliances within the Borough of Spelthorne for each day shift (07.00 hrs to 19.00 hrs) and each night shift (19.00 hrs to 07.00hrs) from 1st July 2020 to the present day especially in view of the cuts in Fire and Rescue Services to Spelthorne and the increasing numbers of fire crew that are resigning and moving to other areas in particular London.*

Surrey Fire and Rescue Service provide a response service based upon risk and demand at a county level. The Service's approach to measuring performance is consistent with that used by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) which measures the average response times across the county, not by individual area. Therefore, the Service does not measure daily response times in the way requested.

Fire engines are moving around the county using differing fire stations as deployment locations all of the time. The dynamic nature of the response services required, which changes on the basis of risk at any time, means that fire station 'grounds' or areas perceived to be responded to by a given fire engine or fire station, only exist for the purpose of delivering Community Resilience activities.

The average response times over a 24-hour period since Surrey Fire and Rescue Service introduced the first Phase of the Making Surrey Safer Plan on the 1 April 2020 is 7 minutes and 13 seconds, which is within the performance target of a first frontline appliance to critical incidents within 10 minutes.

Average front line appliance availability from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020

Weekday Days	Weekend Days	Nights
21	22	21
Minimum is 20	Minimum is 20	Minimum is 16

The average frontline appliance availability has also exceeded the minimum set out in the Making Surrey Safer Plan over a 24-hour period.

*2. Could we be told what would happen if an incident happened in Spelthorne when the fire crews and appliances are at an incident outside of Spelthorne? For example, when the recent fire occurred in Woking this required 5/6 fire appliances and crew to attend. This must surely have left other areas without fire appliances and crews and where would the appliance and crew come from if there was an incident in the areas whose crews are outside of their allotted area.*

The Service's fire engines are moving around the county using differing fire stations as deployment locations all of the time. They use the Dynamic Cover Tool which allows them to assess risk in the community, brought about by incidents, fire engine movements, etc. and align resources appropriately throughout Surrey. It also allows the Service to move resources based on where risk is, at that moment. Where required, the Service can also request resources from neighbouring fire and rescue services, as part of their mutual aid agreements. Mutual aid is common practice within the emergency services and something that is regularly reciprocated.

We always aim to meet our fire engine availability targets and response times.

*3. Under what circumstances would Surrey County Council consider rescinding their 2020 cuts. Would it require residents to lose their lives due to inadequate numbers of appliances and crew? I understand that these cuts were made to cut costs but the Fire Service is supposed to be an "emergency service" ready to respond at all times, which inevitably will mean that some of the time they are not out on a "shout". We are constantly being told that the cuts are possible due to the increase in fire safety education but this does not allow for freaks of nature for which no-one can be educated. How can you prepare for such incidents?*

[The Making Surrey Safer plan](#) makes changes that HMICFRS have been clear the Service need to do. The HMICFRS outlined in their initial inspection in 2018 that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service was not efficient enough and was not doing enough prevention and protection activities. As a result, the Service have realigned resources so that they can provide better fire cover during the day when they are busier and focus on preventing incidents from happening in the first place. There was no mandate to make financial cuts – that is not what the plan is about.

The Service looked at response data from the last five years, risk data and local and national statistics to help inform their planning and have built in capacity to ensure they can always deal with emergencies effectively, including simultaneous incidents.

The plan has been scrutinised and assured by the National Fire Chiefs Council, reviewed by HMICFRS, externally verified by Cadcorp (data specialist) and independently given full assurance by Brunel University London. Brunel University London have also given further assurance for Phase 2 separately, in light of recent findings such as the Grenfell Tower enquiry and the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Service are confident that they have designed the optimum service model for response, prevention and protection in order to keep people safe.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE – date 30 November 2020**

### **AGENDA ITEM 8**

#### **WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

All of the following were submitted by Mr Andrew McLuskey.

##### **Question 1:**

*Given that the recent report by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity strongly recommends, inter alia, protection of habitats (including those of lakes and rivers) and also making more space for nature in built up areas - will the Committee give urgent consideration to ensuring the rapid implementation of the hugely delayed plan for a Stanwell Nature Reserve?*

##### **Question 2**

*Is there a date yet for the planned site meeting at the Stanwell Woods site with Cemex and interested parties in respect of the planned Nature Reserve?*

##### **Officer response for both of the above questions:**

As has been previously stated in answers to your earlier questions on this subject, it is important to recognise the limits of influence that the Joint Committee and its respective councils have on the issues you raise. 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.

However, we continue to foster a good working relationship with CEMEX in order to bring about the site visit that has been twice been cancelled due to the national lockdowns. We continue to work to fix a date on this and hope that it will cast light on how this project is being progressed. As we anticipate the end of the current lockdown period, we will be looking to carry out a visit before the Christmas break.

**Question 3:**

*'In the light of Surrey County Council's announcement of a £100 million Community Fund, will the Committee seek an allocation sufficient to allow the addition of long hoped for projects (such as the rebuilding of the West Lodge) to the current plans for a Nature Reserve in Stanwell?'*

Officer response:

Your Fund Surrey was launched on 16 November and was designed to give financial backing to projects that will enhance their local area.

As a local government organisation, the Joint Committee is not eligible to apply for funding as projects must be submitted by residents and community groups.

Ideas are currently being invited from the community for development. Your area Partnership Committee Officer, Carys Walker would be happy to speak with you outside of the meeting about developing your idea or alternatively, why not find out more by visiting [www.surreycc.gov.uk/yourfund](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/yourfund).