

Agenda

Runnymede
Local Committee

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

Discussion

There will be an informal public question time in the Chamber at 2.00pm. Key points in the meeting:

- * Magna Carta 2015
- * Controlled Parking Zones consultation
- * Road safety and speed limit policy



Venue

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

Date: Monday, 24 February
2014

Time: 2.30 pm

You can get involved in the following ways

Get involved

Ask a question

If there is something you wish know about how your council works or what it is doing in your area, you can ask the local committee a question about it. Most local committees provide an opportunity to raise questions, informally, up to 30 minutes before the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, they will make arrangements for you to receive an answer either before or at the next formal meeting.

Write a question

You can also put your question to the local committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it a minimum of 4 working days in advance of the meeting.

When you arrive at the meeting let the committee officer (detailed below) know that you are there for the answer to your question. The committee chairman will decide exactly when your answer will be given and may invite you to ask a further question, if needed, at an appropriate time in the meeting.

Sign a petition

If you live, work or study in Surrey and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the local committee and ask it to consider taking action on your behalf. Petitions should have at least 30 signatures and should be submitted to the committee officer 2 weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given 3 minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Thank you for coming to the Local Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help. If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern please contact them through the channels below.

Email: sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01932 794081

Website: www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede



SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Chris Norman, Chertsey (Chairman)
 Mrs Yvonna Lay, Egham (Vice-Chairman)
 Mrs Mary Angell, Woodham and New Haw
 Mr Mel Few, Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water
 Mr John Furey, Addlestone
 Miss Marisa Heath, Englefield Green

Borough Council Appointed Members







Cllr Derek Cotty, Chertsey Meads
 Cllr Richard Edis, Chertsey St Ann's
 Cllr Alan Alderson, Egham Town
 Cllr Paul Tuley, Chertsey Meads
 Cllr Patrick Roberts, Englefield Green East
 Cllr J M Edwards, Chertsey South & Rowtown


Chief Executive
David McNulty

			
Chris Norman (Chairman) Chertsey	Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman) Egham	Mary Angell Woodham & New Haw	
			

John Furey Addlestone	Marisa Heath Englefield Green	Mel Few Foxhills, Thorpe & Virginia Water	
		<h1>S</h1> <p>Local Committee (RUNNYMEDE)</p> <p>County Councillors 2013-17</p>	

For councillor contact details, please contact Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk / 01932 794081)

			
Derek Cotty Chertsey Meads	Richard Edis Chertsey St Anns	Alan Alderson Egham Town	
			
Pat Roberts Englefield Green East	JM Edwards Chertsey South and Row Town	Paul Tuley Chertsey Meads	

		 <p>Local Committee RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH</p>
		<p>Borough Council Co-optees 2013-14</p>

For councillor contact details, please contact Sylvia Carter, Community Partnership and Committee Officer (sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk / 01932 794081)

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language please either call Sylvia Carter on 01932 794081 or write to the Community Partnerships Team at Surrey County Council, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone, KT15 2AH or sylvia.carter@surreycc.gov.uk

This is a meeting in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact us using the above contact details.

Use of social media and recording at council meetings

Reporting on meetings via social media

Anyone attending a council meeting in the public seating area is welcome to report on the proceedings, making use of social media (e.g. to tweet or blog), provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for those visiting the building so please ask at reception for details.

Members taking part in a council meeting may also use social media. However, members are reminded that they must take account of all information presented before making a decision and should actively listen and be courteous to others, particularly witnesses providing evidence.

Webcasting

In line with our commitment to openness and transparency, we webcast County Council, Cabinet and Planning & Regulatory Committee meetings as well as the Surrey Police and Crime Panel. These webcasts are available live and for six months after each meeting at www.surreycc.gov.uk/webcasts.

Generally, the public seating areas are not covered by the webcast. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating areas, then the public is deemed to be consenting to being filmed by the Council and to the possible use of these images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

We also webcast some select and local committee meetings where there is expected to be significant public interest in the discussion.

Requests for recording meetings

Members of the public are permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings provided that this does not disturb the business of the meeting and there is sufficient space. If you wish to film a particular meeting, please liaise with the council

officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can give their consent and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Filming should be limited to the formal meeting area and not extend to those in the public seating area.

The Chairman will make the final decision in all matters of dispute in regard to the use of social media and filming in a committee meeting.

Using Mobile Technology

You may use mobile technology provided that it does not interfere with the PA or induction loop system. As a courtesy to others and to avoid disruption to the meeting, all mobile technology should be on silent mode during meetings.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 1 - 4)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting as a true record. A copy of the minutes will be available in the room for half an hour prior to the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 PETITIONS & LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order 65.

Two petitions have been received.

- a) The first is from residents in Limes Road and the surrounding area of Egham where proposed Controlled Parking Zones have been consulted upon. The petition states "We the undersigned are totally opposed to the Controlled Parking Zone in our area."

A letter of representation has been received on the same topic - Consultation on Parking Controls in Englefield Green – signed by fifteen residents of Alexandra Road.

The letter strongly opposes the proposal to proceed with parking controls.

A report at Item ?? makes recommendations following the Controlled Parking Zones consultation.

- b) A petition to be presented by the Tite Hill Speedwatch group states "We the undersigned are petitioning Surrey County Council to improve pedestrian and road safety on Tite Hill by building a pedestrian crossing/speed table over Tite Hill from the footpath on Kingswood Rise to the footpath which leads to Middle Hill." There are 102 signatories from Englefield Green.

5 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To receive and answer any questions from Surrey County Council electors within the area in accordance with Standing Order 66.

6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

To receive any written questions from Members under Standing Order 47.

7 ROAD SAFETY POLICY UPDATE [FOR COMMENT]

(Pages 5 - 28)

Mr Duncan Knox will outline the proposed changes to the Surrey County Council speed limit policy and road safety near schools, and seek comments from the Local Committee, prior to the policy being submitted to the Cabinet in the Spring.

8 CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE CONSULTATIONS IN EGHAM/ENGLEFIELD GREEN [FOR DECISION]

(Pages 29 - 38)

Mr Peter Wells of Surrey County Council's Parking Team, will present the results of the resident consultation in November 2013 for three areas in Egham and Englefield Green, and recommendations on what should happen next.

9 MAGNA CARTA 2015 [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 39 - 46)

Mr Peter Milton, Surrey County Council's Head of Culture, will present this information report on plans to celebrate the 2015 anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta at Runnymede.

10 OPERATION HORIZON: 5 YEAR CARRIAGEWAY MAINTENANCE PLAN [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 47 - 66)

Mr Keith Scott of Surrey Highways will outline progress with Year 1 of Operation Horizon in Runnymede, and plans for the prioritised roads in Year 2 and subsequent years of the programme.

11 HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT [FOR INFORMATION]

(Pages 67 - 74)

Mr Andrew Milne (Area Highways Manager) will update members on progress with the current year's programme and budget expenditure to date.

12 LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE

(Pages 75 - 82)

This report provides information about expenditure on member allocations in the last quarter in Runnymede.

13 FORWARD PLAN [FOR DECISION]

The Committee is asked to agree the following items for the next meeting of the Local Committee on 9 June 2014:

- * Response to Tite Hill petition
- * Youth: Local Prevention Framework contract for 2014-15 (Decision)
- * Egham Major Schemes: consultation results and business case

- * Local Transport Strategy (Decision)
- * Stonehill Road, Foxhills: safety review
- * Highways Update
- * Community Safety in Runnymede
- * Member allocations – annual summary

14 CONSULTATIONS IN RUNNYMEDE [INFORMATION ONLY]

There is no report for this item.

Runnymede Borough Council and Surrey County Council have published jointly commissioned Masterplans for Egham and Chertsey, produced by independent consultations GVA, setting out possible opportunities to redevelop sites and improve the urban environment. The consultation period ran until 23 February – see www.runnymede.gov.uk for details and published responses.

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede LOCAL COMMITTEE
held at 2.30 pm on 2 December 2013
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Chris Norman (Chairman)
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mrs Mary Angell
- * Mr Mel Few
- * Mr John Furey
- Miss Marisa Heath

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Derek Cotty
- * Cllr Richard Edis
- * Cllr Alan Alderson
- * Cllr Paul Tuley
- * Cllr Patrick Roberts
- * Cllr J M Edwards

* In attendance

1/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Miss Marisa Heath.

2/13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2013 were agreed and signed.

3/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

4/13 PETITIONS [Item 4]

PETITION RESPONSE – MARINA CLOSE

The Committee considered the report and added some additional points.

The Local Committee agreed that

i) they noted the petition response, and

ii) they suggested that residents of Marina Close be encouraged to maintain the strip of highways land in question, and

ITEM 2

iii) they suggested that if residents wished to increase the height of the fencing at this location, they should do so at their own expense and subject to planning permission required from Runnymede Borough Council.

PETITION – LIMES ROAD EGHAM

A petition had just been received from residents of Lime Road and surrounding areas in Egham, in response to the Surrey County Council consultation about Controlled Parking Zones. It was agreed that the petition would be considered at the next Committee on 24 February, when a report on the Controlled Parking Zones consultation would be presented.

Some members commented that they had been contacted by residents who felt that there had been insufficient provision for those without computer access to submit their views, and that some residents were very opposed to the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones in their streets.

5/13 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]

No written public questions had been submitted.

6/13 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]

No written member questions had been submitted.

7/13 HIGHWAYS UPDATE AND PLANS FOR 2014-15 [FOR DECISION] [Item 7]

Item 7a : **A30/St Jude's Road Pedestrian Improvements** (Tabled item)

Mr Andrew Milne (Area Highways Manager North West) apologised to members for the late presentation of this report, which the chairman had agreed to table in response to new information received concerning the costs of this scheme.

Mr Milne summarised the reasons why the Committee had agreed previously to develop the improvements scheme:

- * a survey showing that 2,200 pedestrians had crossed at this junction within a twelve hour period;
- * a letter from Surrey Police urging the Committee to improve safety for pedestrians at this junction;
- * the rate of serious injuries and fatalities (two) at this site in the preceding five years;
- * a petition from local residents which had attracted 1174 signatories, one of the largest ever received by the Runnymede Local Committee;
- * the need to balance the aims of reducing injury/accidents whilst minimising traffic congestion on this busy trunk route.

Mr Milne reminded members that the original estimated total cost in February 2012 had been £350k. However this was not a typical scheme for local committee funding and was complicated by the design requiring relocation of six sets of utilities, dedication of private land, licensing, extensive traffic management at a busy location, and drainage improvements (which had just

come to light). He explained that a revised total costing had been submitted of £628k. This included an additional £60k as a result of Virgin Media cables discovered through trial holes, which had not been disclosed by the company, as well as the drainage issues, and the need to remove trees on private land. He said it had proved difficult to estimate accurately the extent of traffic management costs, prior to detailed design stage. Following internal negotiations in Surrey Highways and with the contractor Kier, a revised budget of £600k was considered to be sufficient for the project.

Mr Milne then presented the options before members, recommending that they agree that the scheme should proceed using the Local Committee anticipated capital allocations for 2014-15 to enable the final phase of construction from April onwards.

Members discussed the importance of the project and thanked Mr Milne for the clarity of his presentation. They questioned whether there was any contingency budget should costs escalate further, and Mr Milne confirmed that there was approximately £30k of leeway within the 2014-15 budget, plus a discretionary aspect in provision of anti-skid surfacing at the approach to the junction (cost £40k) which could be omitted if other costs came to light during construction. It was also noted that the 2014-15 capital budget was subject to confirmation and that the Royal Holloway College draft masterplan (published autumn 2013) indicated the potential need for crossing points further down Egham Hill (A30).

The recommendations were proposed and seconded prior to voting, with all in favour bar one abstention.

AGREED that

- i) the previously agreed pedestrian improvements should still be installed at the junction despite the increase in the estimated cost of the works (detailed in Section 2 of the report);
- ii) the Committee's full anticipated 2014/15 ITS and capital maintenance budget allocations of £266,572 is allocated to the scheme to enable the improvements to be installed.

ITEM 7B – RUNNYMEDE HIGHWAYS UPDATE REPORT DECEMBER 2013 (Tabled)

It was noted that this report had also been tabled, to reflect changes in the information provided as a result of the A30/St Jude's Road report.

The local member requested that, if further capital funding became available as a result of underspend on the capital maintenance budget 2014-15, the road suggested in Table 6 line 4: Oak Tree Close, be removed from the LSR programme, and replacement of the worn anti-skid surfacing on Callow Hill, Virginia Water be substituted.

The local member proposed an alteration to the programme for 2013-14 (current year) and this was seconded.

AGREED

ITEM 2

i) to remove the programme item Installation of VAS signs in Christchurch Road from the 2013/14 ITS programme (Table 1 of this report) and substitute installation of VAS signs in Lyne Road, at an equivalent cost.

8/13 MEMBER ALLOCATIONS EXPENDITURE [FOR INFORMATION] [Item 8]

Michelle Collins reminded county councillors of the deadline for applications for member allocation funding for 2013-14 and asked them to send details of expected requests as soon as possible.

9/13 FORWARD PLAN [FOR DECISION] [Item 9]

AGREED

The following items for its meeting on 24 February 2014:

- * Highways Update
- * Member Allocations
- * Controlled Parking Zone in Egham
- * Major Schemes consultation update
- * Plans to celebrate the anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta 2015
- * Project Horizon roads programme
- * Forward Plan

10/13 LOCAL UPDATES AND CONSULTATIONS (NO REPORT) [Item 10]

In addition to noting the items listed, Mr Furey reminded the Committee and press that the consultation on Major Schemes (Egham) remained open for public comments until 15 December.

Meeting ended at: 3.45 pm

Chairman

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 24 February 2014

LEAD OFFICER: Duncan Knox

SUBJECT: Road Safety Policy Update

DIVISION: ALL

**SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

To present to the local committee a draft update to the county council's policy on setting local speed limits and a new draft policy to address road safety outside schools, including school crossing patrols.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:

- (i) review, and provide comments on the draft policies. Comments will be taken into account prior to the policies being submitted to county council Cabinet for approval.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Local Committees are responsible for most highway and transport matters in their areas, including speed limits and road safety measures outside schools. This report presents new road safety policies with respect to speed limits and road safety outside schools for comment by the local committee, prior to submission to county council cabinet for approval.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 In January 2013 central government issued new national guidance for local authorities on setting speed limits (Circular 01/13). Consequently the county council's own policy has been reviewed to take into account the latest national policy, and to improve Surrey's existing policy and procedure.
- 1.2 One of the most frequently expressed road safety concerns is that of the safety of children outside schools. Fortunately the number of child casualties in the vicinity of schools is comparatively small, however the perceived danger to children on busy roads on the school journey, especially in the vicinity of a school, can prove to be a barrier to more walking and cycling. Consequently a new policy "Road Safety Outside Schools" has been created to set out how the council will respond to such concerns. This may become especially important in light of the schools expansion programme.
- 1.3 The county council's policy on school crossing patrols has also been reviewed and updated, and forms part of the "Road Safety Outside Schools" policy. The new policy has been designed to ensure that the county councils limited resources for the provision of school crossing patrols is maintained and prioritised at sites where they are most needed.

2. ANALYSIS:

Setting Local Speed Limits

- 2.1 It is proposed that with respect to setting speed limits, the county council's scheme of delegation will remain the same (repeated below for easy reference), but that the speed limit policy be updated.

"Local Committees will be responsible for the following:

To agree local speed limits on county council roads, within their area and to approve the statutory advertisement of speed limit orders, taking into account the advice of the Surrey Police road safety and traffic management team and with regard to the County Council Speed Limit Policy." (SCC Scheme of Delegation Part 3 Section 2 paragraph 7.2, b(iii)c).

- 2.2 The new draft policy "Setting Local Speed Limits" is included within **Annex A**. The new policy highlights the key point that simply changing a speed limit with signs alone 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. For the first time the new national guidance (Circular 01/13) provides formulas that can be used to predict the likely change in mean speeds from a change in speed limit using signs alone. The new policy contains tables that have been generated using these formulas, and a threshold is shown within the tables, below which a new lower speed limit with signs alone would be allowed. For cases where existing mean speeds are above the threshold shown in the table, then supporting engineering measures will need to be considered alongside any reduction in speed limit.
- 2.3 The new policy indicates that new 20 mph speed limits using signs alone will be allowed where existing mean speeds are 24 mph or less. Additional supporting engineering measures will need to be considered where existing mean speeds are above 24 mph in order to get speeds down. This is the same as the new national guidance (Circular 01/13), and is a change to Surrey's

www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede

existing policy where 20 mph speed limits using signs alone are only allowed where existing mean speeds are 20 mph or less.

- 2.4 With regard to speed limits outside schools, the new policy advises that there should always be an overall assessment of the safety issues outside a school to investigate and define the problem rather than consideration of the speed limit in isolation. For example the problems being experienced may be associated with inconsiderate parking or difficulties in crossing a road that will not be solved through a change in speed limit on its own. The new policy advises that the new "Road Safety Outside Schools" policy should be referred to instead.
- 2.5 The new policy contains a requirement that the Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team are consulted on all proposed speed limit changes, and that their views are contained within any report to the Local Committee considering the change in speed limit. The police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team have been consulted and are supportive of the new policy.
- 2.6 Following speed surveys and feasibility work, the Area Highway Manager will present a report to the Local Committee with recommendations for a change in speed limit, or not, along with supporting engineering measures, if required, based on the new policy. If the Local Committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager, and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment.
- 2.7 The new policy advises that speed surveys should be undertaken after a new speed limit has been introduced to check whether it has been successful. If it has been unsuccessful in reducing speeds to a level below the threshold in the table, then another report will be submitted to the Local Committee for them to consider whether any further engineering measures should be introduced. An alternative could be to remove the new lower speed limit and return to the original or different, higher speed limit. Again if the Local Committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager, and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment.

Road Safety Outside Schools

- 2.8 Fortunately the number of child casualties outside Surrey's 507 schools is comparatively small. For example in the seven year period from 2005 to 2011 there were 42,598 personal injury casualties recorded by the police (an average of 6,085 per year). Of these, 6% (2,747) were child casualties (an average of 392 per year). A total of 351 of these took place within 250m of the school gate, during school journey times (about 50 per year).
- 2.9 Nonetheless the perceived danger to children on busy roads on the school journey, especially in the vicinity of a school, can prove to be a barrier to more walking and cycling.
- 2.10 Therefore a new policy has been developed "Road Safety Outside Schools" (included within **Annex B**) that sets out the process that will be used by Surrey County Council for investigating and responding to concerns about road safety outside schools. The aim is to reduce the risk of collisions, and to make the

ITEM 7

road feel safer in order to improve the attractiveness of walking and cycling to and from schools.

- 2.11 The new policy highlights that Local Committees are allocated funding for highway improvements, and that the perceived problems will be investigated by county council officers who will then report back to the local councillors. The policy also highlights that schools and parents have a vital role to play in child pedestrian and cycle training, and encouraging responsible attitudes to using motor vehicles as children grow older. Therefore an assessment of the road safety education provided within a school and the school travel plan will always be undertaken alongside an assessment of the road safety situation outside the school gate.
- 2.12 The new draft *Road Safety Outside Schools* Policy incorporates the council's policy on school crossing patrols. The aim of the policy is to ensure that the provision of school crossing patrols is maintained and prioritised at sites where they are most needed, within the existing budget allocation.
- 2.13 At the time of writing there are 69 school crossing patrols operating within Surrey, with a further 18 approved sites vacant. It is the intention of the county council to continue with an existing budget of £206,000 to support all approved school crossing patrol services at maintained schools. It is proposed that a charge of £3,000 per year will be made to Academies, Independent and Free schools, to cover salary and training costs.
- 2.14 National guidance advises that school crossing patrols should not operate where there is a light controlled crossing already in situ as this is a duplication of resources and could cause confusion. Therefore it is proposed that the small number of sites in Surrey where this is the case will be reviewed and subject to risk assessment from April 2014, and may be relocated or withdrawn.
- 2.15 If a new light controlled or zebra pedestrian crossing is installed (or installed nearby to) where a school crossing patrol is currently operating, then the service will be reviewed and may be relocated or withdrawn after a provisional period of 3 months. Requests for new school crossing patrols where there is already light controlled or zebra crossings will not be approved. If there is a request for a new school crossing patrol where there is a pedestrian refuge, this will be subject to risk assessment.
- 2.16 Whenever a vacancy arises at an existing school crossing patrol site or a request for a new site is received, then the site will be risk assessed before a decision is taken to recruit a new or replacement school crossing patrol. Where there is insufficient funding for new or vacant sites then a waiting list will operate and future funds will be allocated on a priority basis. In the absence of central funding being available, schools will have the option to pay for the service themselves via alternative means at a cost of £3,000 per year.
- 2.17 If a school leadership disagree with a decision by the county council in relation to a school crossing patrol, then a meeting will be held with the school staff and governing body to explain the reasoning behind the decision. The school staff and governing body will then have the right to appeal to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment if they wish.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The draft policies are presented to the local committee for comment. Options for changes to the policies will be taken into account before the policies are submitted to county council cabinet for approval.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team have been consulted on the draft policies. As well as being submitted to all 11 of Surrey's Local Committees for comment, the policies will also be subject to public consultation.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The draft policies aim to ensure an efficient process for considering changes to speed limits, or additional road safety measures outside schools. The new policies also aim to ensure that new highways measures are selected that will be effective in tackling the identified problem. The cost of a change in speed limit or new highway measures will always be presented to local committee for decision on whether to invest their local allocation.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 An equalities and diversity impact assessment has been completed for the "Setting Local Speed Limits" policy. Consequently the policy has been amended to include specific mention of vulnerable road users such as children, older people and those with mobility impairment within road casualty analysis which is completed in order to inform upon the need for speed management measures. The policy has also been amended to include the fact that speed reducing features could also form part of improved facilities for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people.
- 6.2 An equalities and diversity impact assessment is being completed for the "*Road Safety Outside Schools Policy*", and will be completed before the policy is submitted to county council Cabinet.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The draft policies highlight the fact that it is the local committee within each area who will decide upon any changes to local speed limits, and whether to invest in any additional highway measures outside schools.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Effective speed management and road safety improvements will help to tackle antisocial driving as well as reduce road casualties.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Improving safety and reducing the fear of traffic in the vicinity of schools and on the journey to school will help encourage more walking and cycling to school, and so will help reduce carbon emissions from vehicles.

ITEM 7

Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	None
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	None
Public Health	Effective speed management and improvements to safety outside schools will reduce the risk of road casualties. Reducing the fear of speeding vehicles and the fear of traffic will encourage more walking and cycling which improves the health of participants.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The county council's policy on setting local speed limits has been updated in light of new government guidance, and in order to improve the existing assessment procedure. A new policy "Road Safety Outside Schools" has been developed to tackle concerns over road safety outside schools. As part of this the school crossing patrol policy has been updated to ensure that the provision of school crossing patrols is maintained and prioritised at sites where they are most needed, within the existing budget allocation.

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:

- (i) review, and provide comments on the draft policies. Comments will be taken into account prior to the policy being submitted to county council cabinet for approval.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Comments from local committees, and comments received following public consultation will be taken into account prior to the policy being submitted to county council cabinet for approval.

Contact Officer:

Duncan Knox, Road Safety Team Manager, 0208 541 7443

Consulted:

Surrey Police

Annexes:

Annexe A: Setting Local Speed Limits

Annexe B: Road Safety Outside Schools

Sources/background papers:

Setting Local Speed Limits, Department for Transport Circular 01/2013

Speed Enforcement Policy Guidelines 2011 to 2015: Joining Forces for Safer Roads, The Association of Chief Police Officers

School Crossing Patrol Service Guidelines, Road Safety Great Britain, June 2013



Setting Local Speed Limits

Surrey County Council's Policy



1. Introduction

The aim of the County Council is to set speed limits that are successful in managing vehicle speeds and are appropriate for the main use of the road. Reducing speeds successfully may reduce the likelihood and severity of collisions, and can help to encourage more walking and cycling. This can help to make communities more pleasant places to live, and can help sustain local shops and businesses. The desire for lower speeds has to be balanced against the need for reasonable journey times and the position of the road within the county council's Strategic Priority Network.

The purpose of this policy is to explain the roles, responsibilities and the procedure that will be followed by Surrey County Council when deciding whether to change a speed limit. The policy also provides advice and guidance on the factors and additional supporting measures that may be needed to ensure successful management of vehicle speeds.

This policy has been developed with reference to national policy issued by central government "Setting Local Speed Limits, Department for Transport Circular 01/2013" and national policy issued by the Association of Chief Police Officers, "Speed Enforcement Policy Guidelines 2011 to 2015: Joining Forces for Safer Roads".

2. Key Principles

National speed limits

The three national speed limits are:

- the 30 mph speed limit on roads with street lighting (sometimes referred to as Restricted Roads)
- the national speed limit of 60 mph on single carriageway roads
- the national speed limit of 70 mph on dual carriageways and motorways.

These national speed limits are not, however, appropriate for all roads. The speed limit regime enables traffic authorities like Surrey County Council to set local speed limits in situations where local needs and conditions suggest a need for a speed limit which is different from the national speed limit. For example while higher speed limits are appropriate for strategic roads between main towns, lower speed limits will usually apply within towns and villages. A limit of 20 mph may be appropriate in residential areas, busy shopping streets and near schools where the needs and safety of pedestrians and cyclists should have greater priority. Changing from the national speed limit on a road will require that speed limit repeater signs are provided along the route to indicate the new speed limit.

Decision making and responsibilities

Within Surrey decisions over most highway matters including setting speed limits are delegated to local committees of elected county council and borough/district councillors. There is a local committee in each of the 11 boroughs and districts within Surrey. Each local committee is provided with an annual budget from Surrey County Council for highway improvements throughout their area, and then the local committee decides where best to invest their budget in response to local concerns to tackle congestion, improve accessibility, improve safety and support the local economy. Therefore any



proposals for changing speed limits including the signing, legal speed limit order and supporting highway measures would require agreement and allocation of funding by the local committee from their budget for highway improvements.

The county council's Area Highways Team, who report to the local committee, will lead the process to assess a potential change in speed limit. The Area Highways Team will be assisted by the county council's central Road Safety Team and will consult with Surrey Police's Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. The output would be a report and recommendations (in accordance with this policy) for consideration by the local committee, who will then decide whether to allocate funding for a scheme to change the existing speed limit or not.

Speed limits and speed management

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.

Therefore speed limits should be considered as part of a package of measures to manage vehicle speeds and improve road safety. Changes to the highway (for example through narrowing, providing vertical traffic calming or re-aligning the road) may be required to encourage lower speeds in addition to any change in speed limit. Though these may be more expensive, they are more likely to be successful in the long term in achieving lower speeds without the need for increased police enforcement to penalise substantial numbers of motorists.

20 mph speed limits and zones

Within the latest central government guidance issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) there is greater encouragement for local authorities to introduce more 20 mph schemes (limits and zones) in urban areas and built-up village streets that are primarily residential, to ensure greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists.

Circular 01/2013 emphasises that research into signed-only 20 mph speed limits shows that they generally lead to only small reductions in traffic speeds. Signed-only 20 mph speed limits are therefore most appropriate for areas where vehicle speeds are already low. If the mean speed is already at or below 24 mph on a road, introducing a 20 mph speed limit through signing alone is likely to lead to general compliance with the new speed limit. Table 2 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a signed-only 20 mph speed limit.

Where the existing mean speeds are above 24 mph then a 20 mph scheme with traffic calming measures (known as a 20 mph zone) will be required. Research has shown that 20 mph zones with traffic calming measures have been very effective in reducing speeds and casualties, may encourage modal shift towards more walking and cycling and may result reductions in traffic flow on the road as vehicles choose alternative routes. However traffic calming measures are more expensive and are not always universally

popular. Table 1 shows the likely reduction in mean vehicle speeds following the implementation of a 20 mph zone with traffic calming.

It is possible to implement 20 mph schemes across an area that consist of a combination of physical features on some roads (where existing speeds are high), and signs alone on other adjoining roads (where speeds are already low).

Research has shown that mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits that apply only at certain times of day (using an electronic sign) are not very effective at managing vehicle speeds. Surrey police do not support 20 mph speed limits that are not generally self enforcing. The electronic variable message signage that would be required for a mandatory variable 20 mph speed limit would also place an additional maintenance burden on the county council for little benefit. Therefore Surrey County Council will not support the use of new mandatory variable 20 mph speed limits.

Speed limits outside schools

Requests are often made for lower speed limits outside schools as a result of concerns over the safety of children outside schools. It is the policy of Surrey County Council that there should always be an overall assessment of the safety issues outside a school to investigate and define the problem rather than consideration of the speed limit in isolation. For example the problems may be associated with inconsiderate parking or difficulties in crossing a road that will not be solved through a change in speed limit on its own. Therefore the county council have published a separate policy "Road Safety Outside Schools" that describes how concerns over road safety outside schools will be investigated.

School leadership and parents also have a vital role to play in ensuring the safety of children on the journey to school. Therefore an assessment of the road safety education provided within the school and the school's travel plan will always be undertaken alongside an assessment of the road safety situation outside the school gate.

Department for Transport regulations now allow the use of advisory "20 when lights show" with amber flashing lights on the approach to schools. However the influence of these signs on vehicle speeds is likely to be minimal and is not enforceable as it is an advisory sign, not a compulsory change in the speed limit. Regulations do not permit amber flashing lights to be used on the approach to signal controlled crossings or zebra crossings.



3. Procedure to decide whether to change a speed limit

STEP 1: Request to change a speed limit is received

Any requests to change speed limits should be submitted to Surrey Highways via www.surreycc.gov.uk or by calling 0300 200 1003. The Area Highways Team will then consider the request and if necessary will consult with the local member and local committee to decide whether to proceed with a full speed limit assessment. Reference will be made to the position of the road on the county council's Strategic Priority Network. If necessary the local committee may need to allocate funding for the speed limit assessment to be completed (to pay for speed surveys for example).

The Area Highway Team will determine the extent of the road to be assessed. The length of road over which a speed limit change is being considered should be at least 600m. This should ensure against too many speed limit changes that could be confusing to the motorist within a short space of road. However in some cases a slightly shorter length may be suitable where existing highway or roadside features provide a natural threshold which may complement a change in speed limit.

STEP 2: Measure existing speeds and analyse road casualty data

The Area Highways Team will commission one week automatic surveys of vehicle speeds (in both directions) in order to gather comprehensive data on existing mean vehicle speeds on the road. Several different speed survey locations may be required for longer stretches of road. If automatic surveys of vehicle speeds are not possible then a sample of speeds will be undertaken using a hand held speed measuring device at different times of the day to ensure the sample is representative.

Research has shown that reduced vehicle speeds reduce the risk of collision and also reduce the consequences and severity of any injuries, irrespective of the primary cause. Therefore the Road Safety Team will assess the number and pattern of road casualties along any route where a new speed limit is proposed, with particular attention given to vulnerable road casualties such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. This analysis will help inform the need for any speed management measures to reduce the risk of collisions and to reduce the severity of road casualties, especially vulnerable road users.

STEP 3: Compare the existing speeds with the suggested new speed limit

National policy issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2013) provides formulas derived from real examples of speed limit changes to predict the likely impact on traffic speeds of a change in speed limit. Table 2 shows the predicted reductions in mean vehicle speeds following a change to a new lower speed limit using the Department for Transport formulas.

For each speed limit change scenario within Table 2, a threshold is shown by a vertical line. If the measured existing mean speeds are below the threshold then the council will allow a change to a signed-only lower speed limit without supporting measures. If this is the case then proceed to STEP 5.

If the measured existing mean vehicle speeds are above the threshold, then the county council will not allow a lower speed limit without consideration of supporting engineering measures. In this case proceed to STEP 4.

It is anticipated that Table 2 presents data for the vast majority of speed limit change scenarios. However if there happens to be a scenario not covered by the table, then the Area Highways Manager will choose the example in the table that in their opinion provides the closest match to the case in question.

If more than one speed survey has been completed on a longer stretch of road, then it is possible that supporting engineering measures may be required on one part of the road, but not the other. Another option may be to introduce the proposed new lower speed limit on only one part of the road. Caution should be taken in cases where the proposed lower limit is above the existing measured mean speeds as this could have the effect of increasing mean speeds if drivers treat the new speed limit as a target.

Nearly all requests received in relation to speed limits are for a reduction in a speed limit. However though it is likely to be rare, it is also possible to consider a request for an increase in a speed limit. In these cases it should be assumed that this would have the effect which is the exact reverse of the effect of the equivalent speed limit reduction described within Table 2. Extreme care should be taken in any decision to increase a speed limit as this could result in increased speeds and increased risk and severity of collisions.

STEP 4: Conduct feasibility of supporting engineering measures

Where it is found that the existing measured mean vehicle speeds are too great for a signed-only change to a lower speed limit to be successful, then consideration of supporting engineering measures will be required.

The Area Highways Team will commission feasibility work on what measures may be possible. These may include traffic calming such as narrowing the road, chicanes, priority give-way arrangements, central islands, gateways, or vertical traffic calming. Speed reducing features could also form part of improved facilities for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people. However some forms of traffic calming will not be appropriate on major routes with large traffic flows and heavy vehicles, and it may be the case that speed reducing features and a reduction in speed limit is not always viable or desirable for some strategically important roads. For example vertical traffic calming cannot be used on roads that are 40 mph or greater. Accordingly the feasibility work and decision to change a speed limit will need to take into account the position of the road within the county's Strategic Priority Network.

STEP 5: Consult with Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team

As Surrey police are responsible for the enforcement of speed limits it is essential that they are consulted on any proposals to change a speed limit and consideration of supporting engineering measures. Surrey police have a specialist Road Safety and Traffic Management Team who will be presented with the proposals for the new lower speed limit and any supporting engineering measures along with evidence of existing and predicted mean speeds and road casualty analysis.

The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team will be recorded in writing and included within the subsequent report to the local committee.



STEP 6: Local committee decision and allocation of funding

A report describing the outcome of the speed limit assessment and recommendations will be submitted to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The report will include:

- a description of the position of the road within Surrey's Strategic Priority Network
- a summary of existing speed survey results
- a summary of the history and pattern of road collisions resulting in injury reported to the police, highlighting especially any vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists, children and older people
- the predicted speeds following a change in speed limit
- recommendations for a new speed limit and supporting engineering measures if required
- estimated costs of the scheme
- the views of Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team

The local committee will then decide whether to proceed with the change in speed limit or not, along with supporting engineering measures (where also recommended). If the committee decide to proceed, then the committee will need to allocate money from their budget to fund the scheme. Alternatively the committee may decide not to proceed because the scheme is not warranted, or because they may have other priorities for investment of their budget at that time.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment.

STEP 7: Advertisement of legal speed limit order and implementation

If the local committee decide to proceed with a speed limit change, then in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, a legal speed limit order will be advertised so that people have the opportunity to comment on the proposals if they wish to. Any objections will be considered in line with the County Council's constitution. Following advertisement, and after any objections are resolved or over-ruled, then the scheme will be implemented by the county council's highway contractors. Alternatively if the objections are upheld, then the scheme will not proceed.

STEP 8: Monitoring of success of scheme

After at least three months following implementation of the scheme, a one week automatic speed survey will be commissioned by the Area Highways Team. The "after" surveys will be undertaken using the same method as the "before" surveys to allow for a direct comparison to check whether the scheme has been successful in reducing vehicle speeds towards compliance with the new lower speed limit. The county council's Road Safety Team will compile data on before and after speed monitoring following speed limit changes so as to inform the need for any updates to this policy.

If the scheme has not been successful in reducing speeds to a level below the threshold contained within Table 2, then the Area Highway Manager will submit a further report to the local committee for consideration and decision at one of their public meetings. The

report will include a summary of the before and after speed surveys and consideration of any further engineering measures that may be possible to encourage greater compliance with the new speed limit. An alternative could be to remove the new lower speed limit and return to the original or different, higher speed limit.

The views of the police Road Safety and Traffic Management team will be sought, recorded in writing and included within the report to the local committee. This will include an explanation of whether any additional police enforcement would be possible to encourage compliance with the new lower speed limit.

If the local committee disagree with the recommendations presented to them by the Area Highways Manager and wish to proceed with an alternative option, then the issue must be submitted for decision by the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment.

Tables to Show Predicted Change in Mean Speeds Following a Change in Speed Limit

The following definitions are used in the tables below and are the same as those used nationally by the Department for Transport in relation to setting speed limits. The formulas used to generate the values within the tables are taken from Annex A of “Setting Local Speed Limits”, Department for Transport Circular 01/2013.

Urban – roads with a system of street lighting (three or more lamps throwing light on the carriageway and placed not more than 183 metres apart).

Rural – roads without a system of street lighting described above.

Rural Village – roads without a system of street lighting described above but with 20 or more houses (on one or both sides of the road); and a minimum length of 600 metres; and an average density of at least 3 houses per 100 metres, for each 100 metres.

Table 1 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a reduction to a 20 mph speed limit (with traffic calming)

Measured mean speed before	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Predicted mean speed after	14.9	15.1	15.3	15.5	15.8	16.0	16.2	16.5	16.7	16.9	17.1	17.4	17.6	17.8	18.1	18.3	18.5	18.7	19.0	19.2	19.4

Table 2 – Predicted change in mean speeds following a signed-only reduction in speed limit

Change from urban and rural 30 mph speed limit to 20 mph speed limit (without traffic calming)																					
Measured mean speed before	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Predicted mean speed after	19.9	20.6	21.4	22.2	23.0	23.7	24.5	25.3	26.1	26.8	27.6	28.4	29.2	29.9	30.7	31.5	32.2	33.0	33.8	34.6	35.3
	New lower speed limit allowed					New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures															
Change from urban 40 mph speed limit to 30 mph speed limit																					
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	30.5	30.7	30.9	31.2	31.4	31.7	31.9	32.2	32.4	32.7	32.9	33.2	33.4	33.7	33.9	34.1	34.4	34.6	34.9	35.1	35.4
	New lower speed limit allowed					New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures															
Change from rural village 40 mph speed limit to 30mph speed limit																					
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	29.3	30.1	30.9	31.6	32.4	33.2	33.9	34.7	35.4	36.2	37.0	37.7	38.5	39.3	40.0	40.8	41.6	42.3	43.1	43.8	44.6
	New lower speed limit allowed					New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures															
Change from rural village 50 mph or 60 mph speed limit to 30 mph speed limit																					
Measured mean speed before	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50
Predicted mean speed after	29.2	29.9	30.7	31.4	32.1	32.8	33.5	34.2	35.0	35.7	36.4	37.1	37.8	38.6	39.3	40.0	40.7	41.4	42.2	42.9	43.6
	New lower speed limit allowed					New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures															

Table 2 Continued

Change from rural village 50 mph or 60 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit																						
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	
Predicted mean speed after	37.5	38.1	38.8	39.4	40.1	40.8	41.4	42.1	42.8	43.4	44.1	44.8	45.4	46.1	46.7	47.4	48.1	48.7	49.4	50.1	50.7	
	New lower speed limit allowed							New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures														
Change from rural single carriageway 50 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit																						
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	
Predicted mean speed after	37.5	38.1	38.8	39.4	40.1	40.8	41.4	42.1	42.8	43.4	44.1	44.8	45.4	46.1	46.7	47.4	48.1	48.7	49.4	50.1	50.7	
	New lower speed limit allowed							New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures														
Change from rural single carriageway 60 mph speed limit to 40 mph speed limit																						
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	
Predicted mean speed after	38.7	39.4	40.1	40.9	41.6	42.3	43.0	43.7	44.5	45.2	45.9	46.6	47.4	48.1	48.8	49.5	50.2	51.0	51.7	52.4	53.1	
	New lower speed limit allowed							New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures														
Change from rural single carriageway 60 mph speed limit to 50 mph speed limit																						
Measured mean speed before	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	
Predicted mean speed after	47.6	48.3	49.1	49.9	50.6	51.4	52.2	53.0	53.7	54.5	55.3	56.0	56.8	57.6	58.4	59.1	59.9	60.7	61.5	62.2	63.0	
	New lower speed limit allowed								New lower speed limit only allowed with supporting highway measures													
Changes on rural dual carriageways from 70 mph, 60 mph, or 50 mph to a lower limit																						
Measured mean speed before	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	
Predicted mean speed after	42.8	43.3	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	45.9	46.5	47.0	47.5	48.0	48.6	49.1	49.6	50.1	50.7	51.2	51.7	52.2	52.8	53.3	
	New lower 40 mph speed limit allowed								New lower 50 mph speed limit allowed													
Measured mean speed before	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	
Predicted mean speed after	53.3	53.8	54.4	54.9	55.4	55.9	56.5	57.0	57.5	58.0	58.6	59.1	59.6	60.1	60.7	61.2	61.7	62.2	62.8	63.3	63.8	
	New lower 60 mph speed limit allowed																					



Road Safety Outside Schools

Surrey County Council's Policy



1. Introduction

One of the most frequently expressed road safety concerns is that of the safety of children outside schools. At school drop off and pick up times the roads in the immediate 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.

The purpose of this policy is to set out the process that will be used by Surrey County Council for investigating and responding to concerns about road safety outside schools. 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.

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 busy roads on the school journey, especially 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.

2. Main Principles, Roles and Responsibilities

Local committees allocate funding for highway improvements

Within Surrey decisions over most local highway matters are made by local committees of elected councillors in each District or Borough. Each local committee is provided with an annual budget for highway improvements, and it is for the committee to decide where best to spend their money. Therefore any proposals for highway improvements outside a school will require money from the local committee, and the committee will have to weigh this up alongside other requests for highway improvements at other sites.

The county council's road safety and highways colleagues will assess the site and develop possible solutions

The county council's Community Engagement Team will lead the process to investigate concerns over road safety outside a school, and the county council's local highways engineers, road safety engineering specialists and police road safety colleagues will also be invited to assist. This will result in a report containing options, where possible, to tackle the concerns that were raised. The local committee will then decide whether to allocate money from their budget on any improvements depending upon the extent of the problem, the estimated costs and the funds available.



Schools and parents have a responsibility to provide road safety education and training

Road safety education and training for children is just as important as improving the safety for road users outside schools. Schools and parents have a vital role to play in child pedestrian and cycle training, and encouraging responsible attitudes to using motor vehicles as children grow older. An assessment of the road safety education provided within a school will always be undertaken alongside an assessment of the road safety situation outside the school gate. The county council provide a range of resources for delivering road safety education and training to children and this can be found via www.drivesmartsurrey.org.uk.

Different problems require different solutions

The type of roads and problems will not be the same outside every school. There may be a mix of different problems such as inconsiderate parking, inappropriate vehicle speeds or difficulties in trying to cross the road. Therefore highway improvements provided outside one school will not necessarily be effective or useful outside another school. It will be important therefore to assess and understand the unique problems outside each individual school before any improvements can be developed and agreed.

School Crossing Patrols

A School Crossing Patrol is one possible road safety measure that could be considered when investigating safety issues outside schools. The School Crossing Patrol service is overseen by the county council's Community Engagement Team who ensure that School Crossing Patrols are recruited, trained and appropriately supervised, that adequate records are kept, and that potential sites are risk assessed to ensure that they are appropriate and safe. The operation of the School Crossing Patrol service will be based on the Road Safety GB School Crossing Patrol Guidelines (2010).

The Education and Inspection Act 2006 (section 508A) puts a duty on schools to promote sustainable travel to school and School Crossing Patrols are one option that can contribute to this duty. Whilst the county council's Community Engagement Team oversees the service, day to day management and the first line of management lie with the school.

Any school that has, or receives approval for a School Crossing Patrol will be expected to undertake further road safety education with their pupils and commit to reviewing their school travel plan with help and resources provided by the Community Engagement Team.

The county council will undertake a review of road safety outside a school whenever a school crossing patrol employee leaves their employment. This will

provide an opportunity to assess what solution would be the most effective to improve road safety before taking a decision on whether to recruit a replacement.

National guidance advises that school crossing patrols should not operate where there is a light controlled crossing already in situ as this is a duplication of resources and could cause confusion. Therefore any request for a new school crossing patrol at a site that has a light controlled, or zebra crossing, will not be approved. Existing sites where there is this is the case will be reviewed. If there is a request for a new school crossing patrol where there is a pedestrian refuge, this will be subject to risk assessment.

If a new light controlled or zebra pedestrian crossing is installed (or installed nearby to) where a school crossing patrol is currently operating, then the service will be reviewed and may be relocated or withdrawn after a provisional period of 3 months.

If the outcome of an assessment of road safety outside a school concludes that a School Crossing Patrol is the most appropriate measure at a site, the site will be prioritised as being high, medium or low risk. It is the intention of the Council to fund all approved School Crossing Patrol sites at maintained schools, although this is only possible where there is sufficient funding. If there is a shortfall in available funding, priority will be given to high risk sites, over medium and, in turn, low.

For Independent, Academy and Free schools a charge of £3,000 per annum will be made to cover the cost of salary, uniform and training.

If a school leadership disagree with a decision by county council officers in relation to a School Crossing Patrol, then a meeting will be held with the school staff and governing body to explain the reasoning behind the decision. The school staff and governing body can then appeal to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Highways and Environment if they wish.

3. Procedure to Assess Road Safety Outside a School

STEP 1: Request received

Any request for road safety improvements outside a school will be referred to the council's Community Engagement Team. If necessary the Community Engagement Team will contact the person who made the request to clarify and understand their concerns.

STEP 2: Consultation with local county councillor and highways colleagues

The Community Engagement Team will inform the local county councillor and local highways colleagues of the concerns who will in turn will be able to highlight any issues that have been raised before, and any work that has been completed previously. Consequently the local county councillor will confirm the need to proceed or not with the assessment described in the steps below. If the concerns



are submitted to the local committee (for example by petition), then the local committee will confirm whether or not to proceed with the assessment described in the steps below.

STEP3: School Travel Plan and road safety education assessment

A meeting will be set up with the school to discuss the concerns and to complete an audit of the road safety education provided within the school. The Community Engagement Team will advise the school if there are any gaps in provision and whether the school's travel plan needs to be updated.

STEP 4: Conduct site meeting and produce risk assessment

The Community Engagement Team will arrange a site meeting with key colleagues including the council's local highways engineers, road safety engineering team and Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. A risk assessment will be carried out for the area immediately outside the school. Other nearby points of concern on the journey to school may be assessed too if necessary. The assessment will include analysis of collisions, speeds, and may include the views of the school and comments from road users. The existing road conditions, signing and highway infrastructure will also be checked and noted.

STEP 5: Assess and report upon options

The Community Engagement Team will present a report to the school and local county councillor containing the results of the road safety education assessment and a description of any potential highway improvements along with estimated costs. The Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management team will also be consulted. It will be then for the local committee to decide whether to allocate funding to implement any improvements depending upon the extent of the problem, the estimated costs and the funds available. In some cases improvements may be possible through improved maintenance of the existing infrastructure, rather than through the implementation of new infrastructure. Sometimes there may be money available from developers as a result of the planning process.

STEP 6: Scheme implementation (if the decision is taken to proceed)

If funding is provided by the local committee, then the scheme will be submitted for design and then construction by the county council's highway contractors. A standard road safety audit of the design will also be completed as an integral part of the design process for schemes that involve changes to the highway.

STEP 7: Evaluation and monitoring

Following implementation, the Community Engagement Team will visit the site and will consult with the school and local councillor to check upon the effectiveness of the improvements. A stage three road safety audit involving a

site visit by road safety engineers and police will also be undertaken following implementation.

The diagram below sets out this process.

Flowchart showing the Procedure to Assess Road Safety Outside a School





4. How to Get in Touch about Road Safety Outside a School

If you have concerns about road safety outside a school, please get in touch with Surrey County Council's Community Engagement Team via the county council's contact centre 03456 009 009.

Alternatively you may wish to lobby your local committee to explain your concerns and to ask them to fund road safety improvements outside a school. Information on how to lobby your local committee can be found via www.surreycc.gov.uk or by calling 03456 009 009.

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 24 February 2014



LEAD OFFICER: PETER WELLS
(Assistant Engineer, Parking Strategy & Implementation team)

SUBJECT: CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE CONSULTATIONS IN EGHAM
AND ENGLEFIELD GREEN

DIVISION: Englefield Green; Egham

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

In October 2008, the Local Committee agreed funding for a feasibility study to possibly introduce controlled parking zones in three areas of Egham and Englefield Green. Plenty of individual requests had been received from residents, and it was considered by officers that the introduction of parking controls could ease traffic flow, improve road safety, better regulate parking and improve the local environment. Following discussions between officers and members it was decided to explore the possible introduction of these zones on a phased basis. This is the final study and covers two areas in Egham town centre and a revisit to Englefield Green. Parking surveys were carried out in October 2013, and a consultation took place with residents in November 2013. The results of these are discussed in this report.

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

- (i) it notes the contents of Annexes A and B;
- (ii) no further action is taken in respect of Egham Area 1 (covering Runnymede Road, Crown Street, Park Street, King Street, Hummer Road, Stroude Street and Denham Road);
- (iii) in respect of Egham Area 2 (covering Milton Road, Limes Road, part of Spring Rise, Grange Road, North Street, Queens Road, part of Clarence Street, Osborne Road, Windmill Shott, Rusham Road, Rusham Park Road, Braywood Avenue and Daleham Avenue) a parking restriction operating between 10am and 12 noon on Monday to Friday in parts of Braywood Avenue, Daleham Avenue, Rusham Park Avenue, Rusham Road and Windmill Shott is included as a proposal in the next scheduled Runnymede parking review;
- (iv) no further action is taken in respect of the Englefield Green area (covering South Road, Greenacre Court, Alexandra Road, Englefield Close, Armstrong Road, Albert Road, Armstrong Road and part of Harvest Road).

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that limited waiting restrictions are implemented in Egham Area 2 (as detailed on Page 23 of Annex B) in the next scheduled Runnymede Parking Review. They will make a positive impact towards:-

- Road safety
- Access for emergency vehicles
- Access for refuse vehicles
- Easing traffic congestion
- Better regulated parking
- Better enforcement
- Better compliance

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 In October 2008 the local committee agreed to fund a feasibility study into the possible introduction of controlled parking zones (CPZs) in Egham and Englefield Green. Following discussions between members and officers it was decided to subdivide the region into smaller areas and look to introduce parking schemes on a phased basis, starting where parking problems were perceived to be the most serious.
- 1.2 The first area chosen was the central part of Englefield Green. The second was the part of Egham Hythe closest to Staines Bridge together with Cumberland Street, Hythe Road and Railway Terrace. Parking studies took place in these two areas in November 2009 and the outcomes were reported to this committee in February 2010.
- 1.3 The final area is Egham town centre, and, owing to repeated requests, a revisit to the central part of Englefield Green. Surrey County Council's Parking Team commissioned Atkins Global Engineering, a consultancy firm, to carry out surveys into the parking patterns in Egham town centre and Englefield Green, and consultations with local residents. The detailed results of these surveys consultations are included in the reports written by Atkins that form the annexes to this report.

2. ANALYSIS:

Parking surveys

- 2.1 The roads surveyed in Egham and Englefield Green were divided into three subsections. These three areas would form individual parking zones and assist in managing and reporting the results of this project more efficiently and concisely. The areas were:

Runnemedede Road, Crown Street, Park Street, King Street, Hummer Road, Stroude Street and Denham Road were collectively known as Egham Area 1. (Shown on diagram 3.1 on page 2 of Annex A).

Milton Road, Limes Road, part of Spring Rise, Grange Road, North Street, Queens Road, part of Clarence Street, Osborne Road, Windmill Shott, Rusham Road, Rusham Park Road, Braywood Avenue and Daleham Avenue were collectively known as Egham Area 2. (Shown on diagram 3.2 on page 8 of Annex A)

South Road, Greenacre Court, Alexandra Road, Englefield Close, Armstrong Road, Albert Road, Armstrong Road and part of Harvest Road, collectively known as Englefield Green. (Shown on diagram 3.3 on page 15 of Annex A).
- 2.2 The parking surveys were carried out on Saturday 5 October 2013 and Tuesday 8 October 2013 hourly between 7am and 7pm and at half past midnight, to gauge night time usage.
- 2.3 In **Egham Area 1** the data indicates that the highest demand for parking is overnight when we believe that by and large only resident parking is occurring. Throughout the day, parking occupancy levels drop which suggests that whilst there are parking stresses within the area, it is predominantly due to resident parking rather than non-resident parking. The exception to this trend is

www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede

Runnymede Road, where parking stress levels remain fairly consistent throughout the day, which may be due to students of nearby Strode College parking there during the day. However, parking occupancy does not exceed 57%, which indicates there is substantial spare parking capacity. In light of this, we consider that resident parking permits may not have a beneficial impact upon parking stress within this area.

- 2.4 In **Egham Area 2**, the parking survey indicates higher weekday parking demand during the day than overnight on roads in close proximity to Egham rail station and the High Street. This suggests that parking stress on these roads is likely caused by non-residential parking. Milton Road, Grange Road, Queen's Road, Osborne Road and Clarence Street were recorded to have high parking occupancy; however occupancy is at its highest overnight, which suggests parking stress is mainly caused by residential parking and may not be alleviated through a resident permit scheme.
- 2.5 The parking survey indicates that the demand for residential parking is currently being met, with most roads showing parking occupancy levels less than 80%. The highest demand for parking within the Englefield Green area is overnight, at 00:30. At this time of day, it is assumed that only resident parking is occurring. Throughout the day, parking occupancy levels drop, which may indicate that there is not a major issue with non-residential parking and that resident parking permits may not have a beneficial impact upon any parking stress occurring.

Consultations

- 2.6 Consultation letters were issued to all residents and businesses considered to be impacted by the proposed scheme in the week commencing 4 November 2013. The letter included:
- details of the proposed scheme;
 - an explanation as to how the proposed parking controls would work;
 - the types and cost of parking permits available should a proposed scheme be implemented;
 - a statement to indicate that the hours of operation of the proposed scheme have yet to be decided and would take account of consultation responses;
 - contact details, should the resident or business require further information about the scheme or consultation process; and
 - details of how to access the on-line questionnaire on SCC's website, in order for the resident or business to submit their views.
- 2.7 A copy of the consultation letter is included in **Appendix A of Annex B**. The proposed scheme webpage on Surrey CC's website, which was referenced in the consultation letter, provided details of the proposed scheme, maps showing the proposed extent of the scheme, along with links to the on-line consultation questionnaire for each area, hosted on Survey Monkey. The survey forms, including questions asked, for the two areas in Egham and one area in Englefield Green are shown in **Appendix B of Annex B**. The online consultation ran from 5 November to 29 November 2013.
- 2.8 An issue was identified whereby some residents in Egham 1 and Egham 2 areas received the Englefield Green consultation pack, providing details of the link to www.surreycc.gov.uk/runnymede

ITEM 8

the Englefield Green online survey page. As a result, a notice was added to the Englefield Green online survey page, informing Egham 1 and Egham 2 residents not to respond to that survey, but instead providing a link to the survey relevant to them. This was also taken into account during the analysis of responses. At the end of the consultation period, all responses were collected and analysed. The results are detailed in the conclusions and recommendations section of this report.

- 2.9 During the analysis process, all responses (and IP addresses) were screened to ensure as well as possible that duplicate responses were removed and the analysis was as representative and robust as possible. It should be noted that for some households, multiple individuals provided a response, which may skew the results following analysis.
- 2.10 During the consultation process, a number of phone calls were received by Atkins from residents of all three areas. Queries were answered as well as possible by Atkins staff and opinions of residents recorded. Residents were also encouraged to complete the online consultation questions, so their opinions were registered for analysis.
- 2.11 A small number of residents contacted us to request hard copies of the questionnaire as they did not have access to the internet. They were supplied with a copy of the questionnaire, the information pack and a prepaid envelope, in which to return the completed questionnaire.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The committee can decide to implement parking controls in one, two or all three survey areas despite the findings and recommendations in this report.
- 3.2 The committee can decide that the recommendations for **Egham Area 2** are investigated in more detail, and a proposal is drawn up to be included in the next scheduled Runnymede parking review.
- 3.3 The committee can decide not to make any changes to the existing arrangements in any of the three survey areas.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 The County Council consulted with all properties in the three survey areas. 1,200 questionnaire and information packs were mailed out and results were collected by "Survey Monkey" and by post.
- 4.2 Atkins set up a telephone number, where queries were taken and hard copies of the questionnaire and information packs were sent out upon request.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Should the recommendation be approved by this committee, it will be incorporated into the 2014 Runnymede parking review. Funding to implement

this review will be made up of contributions from the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team and Local Committee budgets.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications for this report.

7. LOCALISM:

7.1 Each location where parking restrictions are proposed to be amended will have an impact on the local residents and visitors in that area. This effect will vary from slight to significant depending on the resident's/businesses circumstances and requirements for parking on street. The advertisement stage will allow these affected parties to get involved and comment or object to the proposals. This will impact on what decisions are made following the advertisement. Local councillors can also help in this process by liaising with residents who may not want to contact the parking team directly, and prefer to deal with their local councillor instead.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	Set out below.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

8.1 Crime and Disorder implications

There should be fewer instances of obstructive parking as a consequence of the restrictions.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

9.1 For **Egham Area 1**, 127 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received. Of these, 45% of respondents believe there is a parking problem on their street, whilst 54% believe there is not. It was noted that parking problems are highly perceived to be linked to Strodes College students parking on nearby residential roads. The majority of respondents (59%) were not in favour of a permit scheme in **Egham Area1**. The results of the consultation were also taken into consideration with the parking beat survey previously undertaken. The survey indicated that parking occupancy was at its highest during night time hours, when resident parking is prevalent.

ITEM 8

- 9.2 This suggests parking issues are mainly due to resident, rather than non-resident, parking. Given the lack of desire for the scheme through the consultation process, along with the parking survey indicating a resident rather than non-resident parking issue, it is not recommended to introduce a resident permit parking scheme to the area at present.
- 9.3 For **Egham Area 2**, 226 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received. Of these, 61% of respondents believe there is a parking problem on their street, whilst 36% believe there is not. It was noted that parking problems are largely perceived to be due to users of Egham rail station parking on residential roads, with over 100 comments submitted to highlight this. A marginal majority of respondents (47%) are in favour of a permit scheme in the **Egham Area 2**. The results of the consultation were also taken into consideration with the parking beat survey, previously undertaken in the area. The survey indicated pressure on parking capacity on a number of roads, but non-resident parking was only deemed a factor on roads in close proximity to Egham rail station and the High Street.
- 9.4 Given the majority of Egham Area 2 respondents were in favour of a resident permit scheme and the parking survey indicated issues of non-residential parking, it is recommended that parking controls are implemented within the area. However, the consultation highlighted that the cost of resident parking permits are, in general, not welcomed by residents. As a result, and due to the fact that parking issues appear to be predominantly due to commuter parking, it is recommended that **10am to 12 noon Monday to Friday** parking restrictions be introduced on certain roads in the area. This should negate commuter parking, whilst the Council will only need to provide resource to enforce the restriction for a short period of time. The roads on which the restriction is recommended are listed below and shown in Figure 22, Page 23 of **Annex B**:
- Braywood Avenue;
 - Daleham Avenue;
 - Rusham Park Avenue;
 - Rusham Road; and
 - Windmill Shott.
- 9.5 The roads selected for the parking restriction are those which are considered to have an issue with non residential parking (through the parking survey results and consultation comments received), and have a majority of consultation respondents in favour of parking permits. However, it should be noted that the introduction of parking restrictions on these roads may offset commuter/ non-residential parking onto adjacent roads and result in a detrimental impact upon parking at those locations. It is therefore recommended that, following implementation, parking levels in the area are reviewed and the scheme extended or adjusted, as deemed necessary.
- 9.6 The single yellow line restriction is proposed only where there is currently no restriction. Existing double yellow lines will be retained; however, where they extend less than 10 metres either side of junctions, it is proposed they be adjusted to 10m in length (as per Highway Code and industry standard practice) for safety reasons.

- 9.7 It is proposed that the existing parking bay on the northern side of Rusham Road be retained. However, it is currently unrestricted and allows commuter parking. Therefore, to mitigate this and allow a turnover of vehicles during the day, it is proposed to introduce a limited parking restriction, for Monday to Friday for 4 hours and no return within 2 hours.
- 9.8 For **Englefield Green**, 131 responses to the consultation questionnaire were received. Of these, 51% of respondents believe there is not a parking problem on their street, whilst 49% believe there is. It was noted that parking problems are largely perceived to be linked to Royal Holloway, University of London students parking on nearby residential roads. The majority of respondents (65%) are not in favour of a permit scheme in the Englefield Green area. The results of the consultation were also taken into consideration with the parking beat survey previously undertaken. The survey indicated that parking occupancy was at its highest during night time hours, when resident parking is prevalent.
- 9.9 This suggests that any parking issues are mainly due to resident, rather than non-resident parking, although the results indicated there is generally sufficient parking capacity at present to meet demand. Given the lack of desire for the scheme through the consultation process, along with the parking survey indicating a resident rather than non-resident parking issue, and sufficient supply of parking to meet demand in the area, it is not recommended to introduce a resident permit parking scheme at present.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 The recommended proposals for Braywood Avenue, Daleham Avenue, Rusham Park Avenue, Rusham Road and Windmill Shott will be drawn up and included in the 2014 Runnymede Parking Review which is scheduled to report to this committee in **January 2015**. It will then be formally advertised and subject to the necessary statutory process.
- 10.2 Once this stage has concluded, detailed design can begin in preparation to order both the lining and signings works required on the ground. Around the same time Traffic Regulation Orders will be made with a 'go live' date for enforcement to begin.

Contact Officer:

Peter Wells (Assistant Engineer – Parking Team)

Annexes:

Annex A. Egham and Englefield Green Parking Study. Parking Beat Survey Assessment.

Annex B. Egham and Englefield Green Parking Study. Consultation Results Technical Note.

Sources/background papers:

Report to Local Committee. 26 February 2010. Controlled Parking Zones in Egham and Englefield Green.

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)****DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2014****LEAD OFFICER: SUSIE KEMP – ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL****SUBJECT: MAGNA CARTA 2015****DIVISION: EGHAM/ENGLEFIELD GREEN****SUMMARY OF ISSUE:**

The sealing of the Magna Carta in Runnymede is a major part of Surrey's heritage and cultural identity, and the 800th anniversary (15 June 2015) will be an occasion of national and international prominence and significance. The Runnymede Meadow site witnessed the sealing of the Magna Carta which established the Rule of Law and Human Rights and effectively challenged for the first time the divine right of Kings. The County Council is providing strategic oversight, working with local, national and international partners to ensure that the 800th anniversary is celebrated and a lasting legacy is created by raising the profile of the area, attracting inward investment - for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked for comment on the progress of the project.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The aim of these recommendations is to celebrate our heritage, raise the profile of the area, increase economic growth and enhance existing facilities to encourage healthier lifestyles.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1 In December 2012, in response to the local bid for HLF funding for a proposed visitor centre, SCC requested that officers develop a Masterplan for the site together with proposals for the 800th celebrations. In July 2013, Surrey County Council's Cabinet approved funding of £1 million towards a partnership project that will to celebrate the 800th anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta in Runnymede and to bring a lasting legacy to the area.
- 2 Surrey County Council has been working closely in a leadership role with key stakeholder organisations (Runnymede Borough Council, National Trust, Royal Holloway University of London and Brunel University) to develop and implement these ambitious plans. At a national level, all partners are represented on the Magna Carta 800th Committee. This ensures coordination with national plans for celebrating the 800th anniversary.
- 3 Surrey County Council and the National Trust have jointly appointed a Project Manager, Geri Silverstone, whose principal role will be to oversee the delivery of the plans for 15 June 2015 and the anniversary weekend and be the a key contact for all partners. Roles and responsibilities have been clearly defined, and the governance structure that involves the principal partners and stakeholders in the project has been set up.

ANALYSIS:

- 4 Surrey County Council is supporting this scheme because of the tremendous importance of Magna Carta in terms of heritage education, economic development, tourism and civic pride in our county. Through the events in 2015 and the legacy of an enhanced visitor offer, the profile of the area will be improved both nationally and internationally which will benefit the economy of the area. This report covers:
- 5 The legacy – One of the key ambitions for the 2015 anniversary (at both local and national level) is to provide improved visitor facilities and interpretation arrangements at the historically important site in Runnymede with minimal impact on the natural environment.
- 6 Celebration events – creating an event programme that will raise the profile of the area, bring the community together to participate in a variety of cultural, healthy and educational pursuits, and provide an international celebration worthy of the occasion.

UPDATE ON THE PROPOSALS:

The Legacy

- 7 Runnymede and Ankerwycke offer sanctuary in an urbanised landscape, and it is this landscape which in many ways is the legacy of the Magna Carta. This project will better tell the stories of Runnymede and Magna Carta; improve the conservation of the historic landscape and the buildings within it; provide a more comprehensive and considered learning offer in conjunction with our partners; and encourage more people to come and spend time at this unique place. An option Masterplan was produced for the partnership in

summer 2013 and many elements of the project are based on its recommendations.

- 8 The vision for the legacy is based on a regional park concept to create a culturally branded destination and tourism identity for the Runnymede area - with the aim to increase economic benefit to the vicinity through increased visitor numbers and promote awareness of the national and international historic significance of the location – its heritage, countryside, wildlife, landscape conservation and bio-diversity of the area. This will be achieved by raising the profile of Runnymede and its environs. Historic Egham will be promoted as the “gateway” to “Magna Carta Country” – thereby generating an economic dynamic to support the growth/regeneration of the rural area and associated towns.
- 9 The area will embrace the site of the sealing of the Magna Carta, Runnymede Pleasure Ground (which has been agreed by the Pleasure Ground trustees), the ancient historic Meadows/NT Runnymede estate, Wraysbury, Ankerwycke, the Magna Carta and Kennedy memorials – as well as including the Commonwealth Air Forces Memorial and its adjacent woodland setting. The diverse habitats at Runnymede are rich in flora and fauna and represent a distinctive landscape area to be promoted for conservation and access. The Langham Pond area of the National Trust estate is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest and therefore protected under legislation. Key to the concept would be the promotion of access to the wider adjacent countryside and landscape for leisure and recreation purposes – land-based on the southern stretch and water- based activities on the northern section of the park.
- 10 Additional funding for the project is being sought on behalf of the partnership through a Heritage Lottery Fund application. The bid will seek support for long term improvements to the Runnymede Meadow and Runnymede Pleasure Ground sites as well as creating a gateway to the area from the town of Egham. An initial application will be submitted in April 2014, and if successful, a full bid for a 5 year legacy project will be submitted in 2015.
- 11 There will be increased numbers of visitors, which will require greater safety for pedestrians crossing the A308 Windsor Road. The Local Committee will be kept fully informed of the traffic management recommendations, for which there will be a subsequent report.
- 12 The plan to improve the visitor offer includes:
 - a. Improving and enhancing visitor facilities by better utilising existing buildings such as toilets, cafes, and educational facilities.
 - b. Safe pedestrian access across the A308 Windsor Road.
 - c. Providing a lasting legacy of the sealing of the Magna Carta through an iconic commission in the landscape of a British memorial for Magna Carta.
 - d. Improved interpretation through digital smartphone technology which is being designed by Royal Holloway University, and will be ready for testing by the end of 2014.

ITEM 9

Creating the economic dynamic to support the growth and regeneration of Egham and surrounding areas which will inform the Egham Masterplan (see www.runnymede.gov.uk) and Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) Masterplan (www.rhul.ac.uk). These Masterplans are in development and will create an additional inward investment into the area and provide a significant revitalisation/improvement to the town centre and local economy.

- e. Promoting awareness and understanding of the national and international historic significance of Runnymede and the surrounding area.
- f. Improving access to, movement around and understanding of the area's heritage, countryside, wildlife and biodiversity. This will include improvements to the Thames Path, walking and cycling trails around the area, and improved opportunities for boat trips along the river.
- g. Creating a new range of volunteering opportunities in the following areas: walking guides, rangers, visitor welcome, research, administration, operational support (tea room, exhibition space, education resource coordinator).
- h. Work with partners, particularly RHUL and Brunel to deliver a resource which can be used to deliver significant education programmes to a wide range of stakeholders, including school age children (KS3, KS4, KS5), university students and staff (undergraduate, postgraduate and research), and the wider public through local youth groups and initiatives such as the University of the Third Age.

Celebration Events

- 13 Awareness raising events in 2014 and early 2015 will increase awareness and interest in preparation for the major celebratory events on the weekend of the 800th anniversary and subsequent activities on the site during the summer months/school holidays. The events will be a range from high profile events attracting international attention, to community events involving celebrations with local residents.
- 14 June 15th 2014 will be used as a 'one year to go' event, to take place on the Runnymede Meadows to raise awareness and increase the profile of the project.
- 15 A Magna Carta themed event will be delivered by Surrey Arts at the Royal Albert Hall on 15th May 2015, providing an opportunity to showcase a range of high quality local music and drama at an iconic venue.
- 16 The weekend of 13th and 14th June 2015 will be Egham's Magna Carta Day on Saturday, and an exciting new fair event is being planned at the Royal Holloway University on Sunday, which it is hoped will become an annual occasion. The partnership is working with the Houses of Parliament to be part of national celebrations, such as 'Liber-teas' that will be enjoyed during the weekend.

- 17 Monday 15th June 2015, the 800th anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta, it is anticipated that this occasion will be marked by the attendance of national and international dignitaries.
- 18 During the summer of 2015, projects will take place in Egham, to ensure that visitors continue to spend time in the town and as a gateway to access the Runnymede Meadows.

CONSULTATIONS:

- 19 Regular consultation has taken place with key stakeholders in Runnymede. A programme of regular member updates and stakeholder events is planned.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 20 Resourcing for the project is from a variety of sources. The project is a long term legacy development for which funding for 5 years has been sought from the Heritage Lottery Fund. Surrey County Council has committed to invest £1 million (comprising £700,000 towards the commission in the landscape, £300,000 towards events). Contributions in kind have been committed by partners such as
- 21 The Project Manager post (Para 3) is jointly funded by SCC and NT and SCC will, on behalf of the Surrey Partnership, finance the local contribution to the Magna Carta Trail Marketing and promotion initiative.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 22 The site currently has very limited accessibility and the proposals will improve this for all visitors and residents.

LOCALISM:

- 23 Localism can be defined as how communities can be more empowered and have a bigger say on the issues that matter to them. In this context, the Magna Carta anniversary programme has already provided an excellent opportunity to engage with communities and to encourage local residents and businesses to guide the partnership in how best to deliver this project successfully.
- a. Consultation results have shown that about 96% of respondents feel that the 800th anniversary of the sealing of Magna Carta in Runnymede should be commemorated. Consultation with a range of local groups and organisations has helped to shape the Masterplan, and is linked to the needs of the local area.
 - b. Health is a concern in Runnymede, since statistics reveal that Runnymede has a higher than average percentage of residents who are obese. This is particularly marked in Englefield Green West and

Egham Hythe. The life expectancy of men in Egham Hythe is more than 5 years less than the Surrey average. The legacy plans for the site includes walking and cycling trails that will provide better opportunities for physical activity, which was also a need identified in the consultation.

- c. Runnymede has the largest proportion of single occupancy households in Surrey (30%), and levels of single occupancy households of residents over 65 is significantly higher than the national average in Egham and in the Runnymede Meadows area. Opportunities for cultural activity and learning are therefore planned as part of the Magna Carta programme. The partnership has made contacts with Adult Social Care in order to create suitable cultural and volunteering opportunities.
- d. In 2012/13 Runnymede had 60 NEETs (young people not in education, employment or training), which equated to 97 people. The Magna Carta project will provide opportunities for volunteering, further learning. Employment is likely in the hospitality and leisure industry, that will be created to service the needs of visitors.
- e. Regular engagement meetings are planned with local stakeholders, to ensure that the project continues to meet the needs of local communities and businesses.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

24

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	Set out below.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	Set out below.

a. Sustainability implications

Legacy work that will enhance local natural landscapes will be carried out using sensitive techniques that will ensure protection of the local environment and ecology.

b. Public Health implications

By increasing the opportunities for physical activity in the area, through improved walking and cycling trails, there will be a positive impact on the health and wellbeing of visitors.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

25 The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked for comments on the progress of the project.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

26 The views of the Local Committee will be fully considered and the project team will provide regular updates as and when required.

Contact Officer:

Peter Milton	Head of Cultural Services (Peter.Milton@surreycc.gov.uk)
Geri Silverstone	Project Manager (Geri.Silverstone@nationaltrust.org.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 24 February 2014

LEAD OFFICER: Mark Borland, Group Manager (Surrey Highways)



SUBJECT: Operation Horizon 5 Year Carriageway Maintenance Plan

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report records the progress made in the first year of the 5-year carriageway investment maintenance programme, any changes to the year one programme and the success of the countywide Operation Horizon project to date. Progress of the supporting surface treatment programme of roads in Runnymede that have been carried out this financial year is also reported.

It sets out the proposed Operation Horizon roads within Runnymede for the year two programme (financial year 2014/15), along with the remaining approved roads to be completed in years three to five (2015 – 2018).

RECOMMENDATIONS:**The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to note:**

- (i) The success of the countywide 5-year programme in year one
- (ii) The progress of Operation Horizon roads, Surface Treatment roads, and changes in year one in Runnymede in **Annex 1**.
- (iii) The proposed programme of Operation Horizon roads for Runnymede for year two (2014/15) and the remaining approved roads to be undertaken in years three to five (2015-2018) listed in **Annex 1**.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 In tandem with majority of local highway authorities, Surrey's roads are now deteriorating at a faster rate than ever before.
- 1.2 In 2012 the AA published results of a year-long study and expressed serious concern about the state of Britain's roads following a succession of heavy rain, flooding, snow and ice. It concluded that nearly one fifth of the UK network require urgent attention over the next five years, with an estimated cost of up to £10bn to deliver the necessary maintenance.
- 1.3 Radical and urgent action is therefore required to meet residents' expectations for road condition. Consequently over the past 18 months Surrey Highways has been working with its contractors, UK research laboratories and senior

stakeholders to develop a new innovative approach to highway road maintenance.

- 1.4 The outcome of this exercise was Operation Horizon, a new targeted 5-year countywide investment programme for carriageway maintenance that will significantly increase both the scale and scope of highway repair.
- 1.5 In February 2013, Cabinet approved the £100m Maintenance programme. The Horizon project will deliver 16%-20% saving on existing contract rates, enabling £16m- £20m to be re-invested in Surrey's roads. This will enable a total investment programme of nearly **£120m** to replace the worst 500km (10%) of Surrey roads. The start of the 5-year Horizon project (year one) commenced in April 2013.
- 1.6 For Runnymede in particular, the new programme will result in £6m being invested in the local road network and will enable 33km of road (11% of local network) to be reconstructed.
- 1.7 On 1 July 2013 the Local Committee (Runnymede) formally approved the roads in Runnymede to be resurfaced or reconstructed over the 5-year investment period.
- 1.8 The approved roads in Runnymede are listed **Annex 1**. This details the progress and successes of the Horizon programme to date, any changes to the proposed year one with reasons, the programme for year two roads commencing April 2014, and the remaining roads to be treated in years three to five (2015 - 2018). It also updates progress of the roads in Runnymede programmed for surface treatment in year one that extend the life of the carriageway which supplement the Horizon maintenance programme.

4. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The investment programme will be fully funded by Surrey Highways Medium Term Plan and no financial contribution is required from the local committee budget.
- 5.2 It is, however, recognised that the fixed five year investment programme will reduce local committee flexibility to promote future maintenance schemes as petitioned by residents.
- 5.3 The scale and scope of investment programme is only sustainable if programme changes are limited, thus Surrey Highways will not be able, over the project period, to delivery new schemes not previously identified in **Annex 1**.
- 5.4 Consequently there could be increased pressure on local committee allocation to respond to residents' petitions to re-surface roads not already identified in **Annex 1**.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Improved road maintenance will support all travelling commuters and minority stakeholders.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The investment proposal will further support localism. Not only have local communities directly influenced the programme, it will also enable communities to have a clearer understanding of Surrey Highways “Level of Service” in regards to major repair and a fuller appreciation of the longer term programme.
- 7.2 This appreciation will enable the programme to more effectively co-ordinate with local priorities and support wider initiatives, for example, delivering re-surfacing schemes at the same time as new safety crossings.

8. CONCLUSION :

- 8.1 The Committee is asked to note the contents of this report.

9. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 9.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of approved roads under the Operation Horizon investment maintenance programme.
- 9.2 Officers will provide an annual report confirming progress in delivering year two schemes programmed to be undertaken in 2014/15.

Contact Officer:

Mark Borland, Group Manager (Surrey Highways), 0208 541 7028

Consulted:**Annexes:**

Annex One_ Operation Horizon Investment Programme _ Runnymede

Sources/background papers:

- Environment & Transport Select Committee Reports_ November 2013
- Cabinet Report_ February 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

2013- 2018

SURREY ROAD MAINTENANCE OPERATION HORIZON



INVESTING IN YOUR COMMUNITY

AREA: Runnymede

Surrey County Council

UPDATE 06/02/2014

ITEM 10 INTRODUCTION

The health and condition of our road network is vital to local businesses, the wider economy and residents' pride in their community.

However, with the fourth busiest road network in the UK, ever-increasing demands from the utility companies to install new infrastructure and escalating incidents of severe weather combining to cause cracks and uneven surfaces, the challenge to maintain our network, to the standards demanded by our residents, has never been greater.

INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

To meet the challenges of the future and deliver significant improvement in Surrey's road network, in February 2013 Surrey County Council therefore approved the delivery of one of the largest single road investment programme in Surrey's recent history.

The **£100m** investment programme, **Operation Horizon**, will be delivered over a five year period from 2013 – 2018 and has five key objectives of:

- i. Replacing 500km (10%) of the council's road network
- ii. Reducing the number of potholes and safety defects
- iii. Improving the council's national score for road condition
- iv. Improving the appearance and ride quality of network
- v. Supporting local economy through reduced road disruption and closures

This information leaflet provides the investment information for **Runnymede** and details the specific roads that will be replaced over the five year period in your area.

YEAR ONE UPDATE

Surrey County Council have to date reconstructed over 115km (70 miles) of its network under the County Horizon programme, which is the equivalent of the distance from Guildford to the Channel Tunnel at Folkestone.

By the end of November 2013, we reached our target of completing 100km (62 miles) of the network.

Surrey Engineers have led an integrated team consisting of contractors and specialists to investigate, design and construct each road identified under the Horizon programme, such that it is suitable for future use. As a result, over 150 of the worst roads across Surrey have now been reconstructed with a ten year guarantee. Issues that have affected the integrity of the carriageway, such as underlying drainage problems, and insufficient road foundation to cater for modern traffic loading, have been identified and addressed during the design process. These type of issues are a major factor of the formation of potholes and defects. From a recent inspection of the completed Horizon roads following the severe weather of December and

January, many of which have been under water, were found to be defect and pothole free, thus proving the success of the Horizon approach.

Savings in excess of £2 million have already been achieved through contract savings and value engineering, which is being reinvested into the reconstruction of more roads.

Over 10km of the Runnymede network has received surface treatment, which is equivalent to the distance from the Magna Carta monument in Runnymede Park to Heathrow Airport.

This supporting surface treatment programme is designed to extend the life of the existing carriageway of roads not identified under Horizon

RUNNYMEDE – ROAD INVESTMENT PROGRAMME

Runnymede has **281km** of road, many of which are residential streets that feed into the major arterial network, with direct links to the M3 and M25.

Over the five year programme, Operation Horizon will invest a minimum of **£6m** in Runnymede's road network. The investment will enable over **33km (11%)** of Runnymede's road network to be replaced, significantly improving ride quality and community pride.

The provisional programme for roads to be resurfaced in Runnymede under 'Operation Horizon' is detailed by town/village, from Page Six.

HOW WERE THE ROADS SELECTED?

In 2012 a full engineering survey was completed for the majority of Runnymede's road network. All surveyed roads were then prioritised and scored using condition data to determine the worst 28km of roads in Runnymede.

In conjunction, a public consultation exercise was held which allowed members of the public to nominate their own worst roads, while to support the consultation a series of road shows were held across the County.

Using the condition data, public nominations and local knowledge, Engineers then worked with the Local Runnymede Committee to determine, within the funding constraints, the optimum five year programme for the Runnymede area.

WHAT WILL THE WORK INVOLVE?

Prior to construction, all roads on the Operation Horizon Programme will be assessed by a qualified engineer to determine reason for road failure. This will include assessment of the underlying road base and top surface. Depending upon the needs analysis, one of two options will be selected;

- ✓ **full reconstruction**, replacing the underlying road base & top surface
- ✓ **partial reconstruction**, replacing top road surface only

The right engineering option will be selected for each road, with the latest road design and engineering best practice deployed to ensure the road is fit for purpose for at least the next 10-15 years.

In addition to Operation Horizon, Surrey Highways will also deliver an annual Surface Treatment programme. This programme will provide minor road repairs and add a new surface layer to protect road from future water ingress.

For 2013/14 approximately 24 roads were identified as suitable for this treatment and are detailed at the end of the report in Appendix 1 with comments regarding the up to date status.

WHAT TO DO IF YOUR ROAD IS NOT INCLUDED IN OPERATION HORIZON?

Operation Horizon will replace the worst 10% of roads in Runnymede and will make lasting improvement to the road network. However, we recognise the investment programme is not able to replace every road in the area to the desired standard. If you therefore believe urgent work is required on your road and it is not on the proposed programme, you have two available options:

Option One: Safety Defects

If your road contains defects or potholes which are causing a hazard to safety then you can report the defect via our online reporting tool at www.surreycc.gov.uk/do-it-online/report-it-online#highways. The defect will be inspected and you will receive written confirmation of proposed remedial action within 28 days.

Option Two: Condition Repair

If your road has poor ride quality and is causing significant local inconvenience then you can petition the local Runnymede Committee to allocate funding for a full reconstruction or repair. Funding is limited and the Committee will not be able to meet all requests, with petitions assessed on a needs basis. Details on how to submit petition are available via the Surrey CC website.

MANAGING CHANGE OVER PROGRAMME TERM

Operation Horizon was developed based using the best information available in 2012 and it is the Council's intention to maintain, over the five year period, the programme integrity to the best of its ability.

However, it is clearly recognised that over a five year period, the network is subject to change with impact of weather, utility works and further events forcing changing maintenance priorities. The programme for Operation Horizon will therefore be formally reviewed on an annual basis, to ensure it meets the latest needs of the Runnymede network. This may involve bringing schemes forward in the programme or replacing schemes. Any such amendments will be evaluated scientifically, with updated programme published each April via the Runnymede Local Committee and County Council website.

FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information, including actual dates for proposed schemes due within the next six months, and further questions/answers please see:

www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/highways-information-online/improving-surreys-roads

Key:

Completed

Deferred

1. Addlestone

Project Horizon

Year One (2013/14)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Weybridge Rd	A317	Woburn Hill	Borough Boundary	1000	Deferred to Yr 2, works to be co-ordinated with all A317 works

Year Two (2014/15)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Chertsey Road	A317	Chertsey R/A (Inc. R/A)	Eastworth Rd	800	
Weybridge Rd	A317	Woburn Hill	Borough Boundary	1000	Deferred from Yr 1
Woburn Hill	A317	Chertsey Rd r'about	Station Road	1026	Brought forward from Yr 2

Years Three to Five (2015/18)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Copperfield Rise	D3107	Rudd Rise	End	362	
Dickens Drive	D3107	Copperfield Rise	Ongar Hill	241	

1. Addlestone (Continued)

Years Three to Five (2015/18) continued

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Heron Dale	D3089	Bois Hall Road	End	196	
Lime Grove	D3035	Quiet Close	Church Road	218	
Marley Close	D3108	Copperfield Rise	End	140	
St Peters Way RB	A317	All Approaches		550	
Liberty Lane	D3098	Brighton Road	End	700	
School Lane	D3031	Church Road	Green Lane	750	
Ongar Hill	C128	Spinney Hill	Hare Hill	640	
Crouch Oak La	D3038	Station Road	Princess Marys Road	320	
Station Road	B3121	Weybridge Road	Brighton Road	1010	Moved from Yr 2 due to development works
Church Road	B3121	Brighton Road	M25 bridge	815	Moved from Yr 2 due to development works
Spinney Hill	B3121	M25 bridge	Hare Hill	894	Moved from Yr 2 due to development works
Chertsey Road	A318	Chertsey R/A	High Street	615	Moved from Yr 2 due to development works
High Street	A318	Chertsey Road	Station Road	376	Moved from Yr 2 as had recent ST works

Project Horizon

Year Two (2014/15)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Guildford Road mini r/abouts	A320	Green Lane 2 mini r/abouts	Little Green Lane	400	
Grove Road all sections	D3011	St Ann's Road	To End inc Sth Grove	700	

Years Three to Five (2015/18)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
St Ann's Road	B375	Chertsey Bypass	Windsor Street	470	
London St/ Windsor Street	B375	St Ann's Road	Bridge Road	700	
Bridge Road	B375	London Street	Chertsey Bridge	900	
Paddocks Way	D3042	Fordwater Road	End	120	
Mead Lane	B3043	Fordwater Road	End	594	Development works. Road humps issue.

3. Egham

Project Horizon

Year One (2013/14)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Thorpe Road	B3376	Hythe Field Ave	Egham R/about	500	Deferred to Yr 2 due to material option HRA

Year Two (2014/15)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Chertsey Lane	A320	Egham R/A	Timsway	500	
Thorpe Lea Road	B3376	Ayebridges Ave	Hythe Field Ave	700	
The Glanty/The Causeway	A308	Runnymede R/A	The Causeway	500	
Thorpe Road	B3376	Hythe Field Ave	Egham R/about	500	Deferred from Yr 1

Years Three to Five (2015-2018)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Grange Road	D3184	Church Rd	North St	285	
Stroude Road	C10	Manorcrofts Rd	New Wickham Lane	500	
Wapshott Road	D3155	St Pauls Road	Bowes Road	350	
Vicarage Road	B388	Thorpe Lea Rd	M25 Bridge	1000	
Claremont Rd	D3148	The Causeway	End	230	
Station Road	C10	Church Road	Manorcrofts Road	300	
Egham Bypass	A30	High Street	A308 Windsor Rd	1100	Deferred from Yr 2 due to planned utility works

4. Englefield Green / Egham Town

Year Two (2014/15)

Project Horizon

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Fairhaven	D7015	High St	Fairhaven Court	102	
Hummer Rd	D3144	Egham Bypass	High Street	320	
Bond Street	D3120	Kings Lane	St Judes Rd	500	

Years Three to Five (2015/2018)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Windsor Road	A308	Runnymede R/A	Pleasure Ground	1100	
Church Road	D3407	Hummer Rd	Grange Rd	528	
Spring Rise	D3182	Lynwood	Limes Road	790	
Bakeham Lane	D3191	Prune Hill	London Rd	253	
Tite Hill	D3131	Middle Hill	Egham Hill	1000	Deferred from Yr 2 awaiting confirmation of planned utility works

5. Foxhill, Thorpe & Virginia Water

Year Two (2014/15)

Project Horizon

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Murray Road	B3121	Spinney Hill	Guildford Rd	1000	
Callow Hill (incl Bakeham Lane)	D3192	Bakeham Lane	International Schl	450	Brought forward from Yr 3 to Yr 2
Christchurch R/A	B389	Roundabout	Junct with Callow Hill	250	

Year Three to Five (2015/18)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Mill House Lane/ Thorpe Rd	B388	Thorpe By-Pass	Staines Rd	1100	
Trumps Green Rd	C10	Tithe Meadows	Sandhills	1000	
Foxhills Road	D3046	Stonehill Road	Chobham Road	1000	
London Rd	A30	Christchurch Rd	Portnall Drive	650	Deferred from Yr 2 due to utility works

ITEM_10
6. Woodham & New Haw

Year Two (2014/15)

Project Horizon

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
King George's Dr	D3064	Queen Mary's Dr	Grange Rd	280	
Queen Mary's Dr	D3062	King George's Dr	Woodham Park Rd	400	
Braeside	D3072	Kings Road	Scotland Bridge Rd	185	

Years Three to Five (2015/8)

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Comments
Woodham Park Rd	D3057	Brox Lane	Woodham Lane	1300	Deferred to Yr 3 awaiting confirmation of utility works
Grange Road	D3065	Woodham Lane	Manor Drive	450	Deferred to Yr 3 awaiting confirmation of utility works

Year One Surface Treatment Update

Addlestone

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Brighton Road	A318	Station Road	Crockford Park Rd	400	Completed

Chertsey

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Chilsey Green Rd /Pycroft Rd	A320	Thorpe Rd	Bell Bridge Rd	660	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works
Laburnum Rd	D3019	Entire Length		380	Completed
Alwyns Lane	D3010	Entire Length		383	Completed
Guildford Rd/Bell Bridge Rd	A320	Pycroft Rd	M25 Bridge	800	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works
Guildford Rd	A320	Bittams Lane	Little Green Lane	788	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Blue Ball Lane	D3184	High Street	Grange Road	91	Completed
Glebe Road / Hythe Park Road (inc Roundway)	D3153	Thorpe Lea Road	To End	700	Completed
Clandon Ave	D3164	Ashleigh Ave	Warwick Ave	140	Completed
Wavendene Ave	D3164	Thorpe Lea Rd	Ashleigh Ave	460	Completed

Englefield Green/Egham Town

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Almond Close	D3118	Kingsley Ave	End	90	Completed
Vegal Crescent	D3120	Willson Road	Bond Street	74	Partially Completed, section to do in Yr 2
Rusham Rd	D3185	Station Road	Queen's Road	225	Completed
Queen's Rd	D3185	Rusham Rd	End	175	Completed
Ripley Avenue	D3190	Spring Rise	Clarence Street	240	Completed
Lynwood Ave	D3190	Ripley Avenue	End	191	Completed
Egham Hill	A30	St Davids Drive	Egham High St	1700	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utilites

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Guildford Road	A320	St Peters Way	A319/ B2131	860	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works
Guildford Road	A320	Coach Rd	Brox Rd	780	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works
Chertsey Lane	A320	Timsway	Craigwell Close	820	Deferred to Yr 2 due to utility works
Stroude Road	C10	New Wickham la	Sandhills Lane	2500	Completed
Almners Rd	D3005	Lyne Lane Crossing	Hardwick Rd	1150	Completed
Trumps Green Rd	C10	Tithe Meadows	Junct with Kitsmead Lane	950	Completed

Woodham & New Haw

Road name	Road ref	Limits (start)	Limits (end)	Length (metres)	Status
Howards Lane (inc Malus Drive & Close)	D3506	Row Town Road	To End	600	Completed

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2014



LEAD OFFICER: ANDREW MILNE – AREA HIGHWAYS MANAGER (NW)

SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

To report progress made with the delivery of proposed highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2013/14 financial year.

To provide an update on the latest budgetary position for highway schemes, revenue maintenance and Community Pride expenditure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to:

- (i) Note the progress with the ITS highways schemes, developer funded schemes, and revenue funded works for the 2013/14 financial year.
- (ii) Note progress with budget expenditure.
- (iii) Note that a further Highways Update will be brought to the next meeting of this Committee.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The above recommendations are made to enable progression of all highway related schemes and works.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) states the aim of improving the highway network for all users, through measures such as reducing congestion, improving accessibility, reducing personal injury accidents, improving the environment and maintaining the highway network so that it is safe for all users.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 2013-14 Integrated Transport and Developer Funded Schemes

2.1.1 Following the Runnymede Local Committee held on 26th November 2012, the programme of schemes shown in Table 3 below was agreed:

Project	Budget estimate (£k)	Committed as at 10 February 2014 (£k)	Details
A30 London Road j/w St Judes Road controlled pedestrian facilities (2013/14 expenditure only)	177	177	Detailed design complete. Application/payment has been made to utility companies for adjustments. Planning Consent received for works to protected trees. RHUL land has been dedicated as highway. Site clearance works started on 20 January and are now complete.
A30 London Road/Christchurch Road junction improvements	20	0	Feasibility and design only project for possible construction in 2015/16.
Woburn Hill/Weybridge Road speed limit assessment	15	9	Scheme complete. New speed limit came into operation October 2013.
Lyne Lane VAS	10	8	Installation of VAS to be carried out in 2013/14. Locations agreed and VAS ordered.
Byfleet Road bridge warning signs	10	4	Scheme complete Upgraded bridge warning signs installed December 2013.
A317 Weybridge level crossing signs	15	0	Sign/activation system agreed with network rail. Awaiting quotations. It is proposed that sign is installed in 2013/14.
Bridge Road/Weir Road junction improvements	10	2.5	Surveys undertaken. Feasibility/design work in progress with a view to delivering identified improvements in 2014/15.

Egham Controlled Parking Zone (proposed)	10	10	In process of delivery by Parking Team. Funding has been transferred to their budget.
Overhead and profit	15	15	
Total	282	226	

Table 1 – 2013/14 ITS programme

2.1.2 The capital ITS allocation for Runnymede is £133,285. In addition to this, £95,000 has been carried forward from the previous financial year. To support delivery of the A30 London Road/St Jude's Road pedestrian facilities scheme, Safety Engineering has allocated £25,000 and £14,000 has been allocated towards drainage repairs, giving an overall ITS capital budget of £267,285. This programme exceeds available funding and was agreed to allow flexibility. For this reason, depending upon confirmed costings, some schemes may need to be deferred.

2.1.3 Overall, this programme of works is progressing satisfactorily, and it is anticipated that the majority of schemes will be successfully delivered by the end of this financial year. Members are asked to note that the design resource has initially focussed on schemes intended for construction, and in consequence there has been a delay in the delivery of design only projects.

2.2 Revenue maintenance allocations and expenditure 2013/14

2.2.1 The 2013/14 revenue maintenance allocation for Runnymede is £210,025. Table 2 shows how these funds have been allocated and the spend progress to date.

Item	Allocation (£)	Comment (as at 10 February 2014)
Drainage / ditching	40,000	£30,756 committed.
Carriageway and footway patching	100,025	£106,536 committed.
Vegetation works	30,000	£31,815 committed.
Signs and markings	20,000	£11,390 committed.
Low cost measures	20,000	£25,931 committed.
Total	210,025	£206,428 committed

Table 2 – 2013/14 Revenue Maintenance Expenditure

2.2.1 It is noted that there has been very good progress with budget use and that the revenue maintenance allocation is now essentially fully committed.

2.3 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND

2.3.1 The total 2013/14 Community Enhancement allocation for Runnymede is £30,000. Committee have previously determined to divide this fund equally between County Councillor Committee Members.

ITEM 11

- 2.3.2 The Maintenance Engineer for Runnymede will provide guidance and assistance, organise cost estimates, and raise orders to ensure delivery of works.
- 2.3.3 To ensure that this fund is effectively spent, and to enable highways contractors to deliver works before the end of the financial year, it is recommended that all works should be agreed by 31st October 2013, and in the event of no firm spending decisions being made, the Maintenance Engineer will determine suitable works and organise their delivery.
- 2.3.4 As the deadline of 31st of October has now passed, the Maintenance Engineer is progressing suitable local works where spending plans have not been put forward and the Community Enhancement Fund is now fully committed as noted in Table 3 below:

Member	Allocation (£)	Comment (as at 10 February 2014)
Chris Norman	5,000	£5,000 committed.
Yvonna Lay	5,000	£5,000 committed
John Furey	5,000	£5,000 committed.
Mel Few	5,000	£5,000 committed.
Marisa Heath	5,000	£5,000 committed.
Mary Angell	5,000	£5,000 committed.
Total	30,000	£30,000 committed

Table 3 – 2013/14 Community Enhancement Fund spend progress

2.4 2013-14 Capital Maintenance Budget

- 2.4.1 Following the Committee meeting held on February 2013, it was agreed to fund a programme of localised structural repair work (LSR) as shown in Table 4 below utilising the £133,285 capital maintenance allocation:

Item	Cost estimate (£)	Final Cost (£)	Comment
A308 Windsor Road	-	-	Delivery through Year 2 Project Horizon.
School Lane	24,739	24,739	Work completed.
Claremont Road	53,395	53,395	Work completed.
A30 Egham Bypass	-	-	Delivery through Year 2 Project Horizon.
Paddocks Way	29,815	29,815	Work completed.
Hare Hill	14,284	14,284	Work completed.
Trotsworth Avenue	-	-	Not affordable this financial year.
Barnsway	-	-	Now included on central works programme.

St Peters Way roundabout	-	-	Not affordable this financial year.
Village Road	6,000	6,000	Awaiting date for works
Overhead and profit	10,000	10,000	
Total	138,233	138,233	

Table 4 – 2013/14 LSR Programme

2.4.2 The agreed programme exceeds the capital maintenance allocation, and was approved to allow flexibility of delivery and ensure that the budget can be fully utilised alongside the main capital programme (Project Horizon).

2.4.3 All works shown above have now been delivered as indicated. As the remaining sites were unavailable within the remaining budget, a section of Village Road in Thorpe has been added to the LSR programme, at an estimated cost of £6000. The date for this work is to be confirmed.

2.5 ITS and Capital Maintenance proposals for 2014/15

2.5.1 Following the Committee meeting held on 2 December 2013, it was agreed that the full anticipated 2014/15 capital allocation (ITS and maintenance) of £266,572 is committed to the installation of the proposed pedestrian improvement at the junction of A30 Egham Hill/London Road with St Jude's Road and Bakeham Lane.

2.5.2 If the anticipated 2014/15 capital allocation is not fully utilised in delivering the pedestrian improvement scheme then the ITS and capital maintenance proposals shown in Tables 5 and 6 are recommended as contingency works.

Project	Budget estimate (£k)	Details
Annual Parking Review	10	Implementation of the recommendations of the 2013 parking review.
Low cost measures	10	To enable delivery of small items such as responding to requests for new dropped kerbs or signage during the course of the year.
Total	20	

Table 5 – 2014/15 ITS Programme (Contingency)

Location	Cost (£)	Comment
B386 Holloway Hill	80,500	
D3160 Langton Way	11,000	
D3069 Faris Barn Drive	13,000	
D3178 Oak Tree Close	73,500	Possible 2 year programme.
Total	178,000	

Table 6 – 2014/15 LSR Programme (Contingency)**3. OPTIONS:**

3.1 Options, where applicable, are presented in this report.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

4.1 Consultation is routinely carried out for highway-related schemes with relevant key parties, including residents, Local Members, Surrey Police and Safety Engineering. Specific details regarding consultation and any arising legal issues are included in individual scheme reports as appropriate.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Proposed ITS schemes are prioritised to ensure that the maximum public benefit is gained from any funding made available. So far as is practicable, Officer proposals follow the Countywide scheme assessment process (CASEM) and the prioritisation order determined by this.
- 5.2 The Committee Capital and Revenue Maintenance budgets are used to target the most urgent sites where a specific need arises, to keep up with general maintenance activities that reduce the need for expensive repairs in the future, and to support local priorities. The nature of these works is such that spend may vary slightly from that indicated in Table 2.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

6.1 It is an objective of Surrey Highways to treat all users of the public highway equally and with understanding. An Equalities Impact Assessment is undertaken for each Integrated Transport Scheme as part of the design process.

7. LOCALISM:

7.1 Through the views and needs expressed by local communities, and accommodating where possible the involvement of local communities in looking after the public highway, localism is routinely considered as part of the consultation and bidding processes for highway-related works. Specific details regarding localism are included in individual reports as appropriate.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

8.1 Other implications, such as the contribution that a well-managed highway network can give to reducing crime and disorder, are considered in relation to individual schemes, and specific details are included in individual reports as appropriate.

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising

	from this report.
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report.
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report.
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report.
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report.

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress with all schemes and budgets.
- 9.4 It is recommended that a further Highways Update is presented at the next meeting of this Committee.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Officers will continue to progress delivery of all schemes and ensure effective use of all budgets.

Contact Officer:

Jason Gosden, Senior Engineer (NW) – 0300 200 1003

Consulted:

-

Annexes:

-

Sources/background papers:

-

This page is intentionally left blank

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

LOCAL COMMITTEE (RUNNYMEDE)

DATE: 24 FEBRUARY 2014
 LEAD OFFICER: MICHELLE COLLINS



SUBJECT: LOCAL COMMITTEE & MEMBERS' ALLOCATION FUNDING - UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

Surrey County Councillors receive funding to spend on local projects that help to promote social, economic or environmental well-being in the neighbourhoods and communities of Surrey. This funding is known as Members' Allocation.

For the financial year 2013/14 the County Council has allocated £12,876 revenue funding to each County Councillor and £35,000 capital funding to each Local Committee. This report provides an update on the projects that have been funded since May 2013 to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Runnymede) is asked to note:

- (i) The amounts that have been spent from the Members' Allocation and Local Committee capital budgets, as set out in **Annex A** of this report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The allocation of the Committee's budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Greater transparency in the use of public funds is achieved with the publication of what Members' Allocation funding has been spent on.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The County Council's Constitution sets out the overall Financial Framework for managing the Local Committee's delegated budgets and directs that this funding should be spent on local projects that promote the social, environmental and economic well-being of the area.
- 1.2 In allocating funds councillors are asked to have regard to Surrey County Council's Corporate Strategy 2010-14 Making A Difference that highlights five themes which make Surrey special and which it seeks to maintain:
 - A safe place to live;
 - A high standard of education;
 - A beautiful environment;
 - A vibrant economy;
 - A healthy population.
- 1.3 Member Allocation funding is made to organisations on a one-off basis, so that there should be no expectation of future funding for the same or similar purpose. It may not be used to benefit individuals, or to fund schools for direct delivery of the National Curriculum, or to support a political party.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 All the bids detailed in Annex A have been considered by and received support from the local county councillor and been assessed by the Community Partnerships Team as meeting the County Council's required criteria.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee is being asked to note the bids that have already been approved.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 In relation to new bids the local councillor will have discussed the bid with the applicant, and Community Partnerships Team will have consulted relevant Surrey County Council services and partner agencies as required.

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Each project detailed in this report has completed a standard application form giving details of timescales, purpose and other funding applications made. The county councillor proposing each project has assessed its merits prior to the project's approval. All bids are also scrutinised to ensure that they comply with the Council's Financial Framework and represent value for money.
- 5.2 The current financial position statement detailing the funding by each member of the Committee is attached at **Annex A**. Please note these figures will not include any applications that were approved after the deadline for this report had passed.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 The allocation of the Members' Allocation and Local Committee budgets is intended to enhance the wellbeing of residents and make the best possible use of the funds. Funding is available to all residents, community groups or organisations based in, or serving, the area. The success of the bid depends entirely upon its ability to meet the agreed criteria, which is flexible.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 The budgets are allocated by the local members to support the needs within their communities.

8. OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	No significant implications arising from this report
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications arising from this report
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications arising from this report
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	No significant implications arising from this report
Public Health	No significant implications arising from this report

9. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9.1 The spending proposals put forward for this meeting have been assessed against the County standards for appropriateness and value for money within the agreed Financial Framework.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 10.1 Payments to the organisations have, or will be paid to the applicants, and organisations are requested to provide publicity of the funding and also evidence that the funding has been spent within 6 months.

Contact Officer:

Adele Seex, Local Support Assistant, 01932 794079

Consulted:

- Local Members have considered and vetted the applications
- Community Partnership Team have assessed the applications

Annexes:

Annex A– The breakdown of spend to date per County Councillor

Sources/background papers:

- All bid forms are retained by the Community Partnerships Team

This page is intentionally left blank

Runnymede Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2013-2014

Each County Councillor has £12,876 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, also an equal portion of the local committee's capital funding. Annex A

Mary Angell	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800193276	Runnymede BC	Runnymede Youth Festival Equipment	£500.00		05.07.2013
	EF300363132	CAMHS Youth Advisors - CYA	CYA Awards 2013	£1,500.00		22.07.2013
	EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede	£1,666.70		16.08.2013
	EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children	£500.00		16.09.2013
	EF300369307	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children	£500.00		28.10.2013
	EF400181507	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Duke of Edinburgh Awards for Care Council	£1,800.00		12.11.2013
	EF400181494	Childrens Rights Service	Care Council on the road	£325.00		31.10.2013
	EF700202121	Buckles & Bows Preschool	Installation of new fencing at the site		£1,000.00	07.08.2013
	EF700210746	Holy Family Catholic Primary Sch.	Contribution towards the new Space Immersive Suite for the school		£2,000.00	25.10.2013
	EF700213491	All Saints Church PCC	Contribution towards the new Photocopier / Printer	£146.60	£2,833.00	25.11.2013
	EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative	£1,000.00		12.12.2013
	EF700211977	New Haw Library (CPL)	Quiet room furniture	£2,000.00		22.11.2013
	EF700218087	Satro	Science Workshop: Ongar Hill & Holy Family School	£600.00		10.01.2014
	EF800212734	New Haw & Woodham Community Event	Midsummer Community Event 2014	£1,800.00		10.01.2014
			BALANCE REMAINING	£537.70	£0.00	

Mel Few	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
				£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800190245	Ottershaw Community P'ship CIC	Ottershaw May Fair	£400.00		23.06.2013
	EF800192112	Royal Holloway of London	Volunteering Week 2013	£300.00		01.07.2013
	EF800191067	Stroude Residents Association	Stroude Summer Spectacular - Event Costs	£250.00		01.07.2013
	EF800190943	Thorpe Ward Residents Association	Thorpe Heritage Street Lighting (Towards 8 Hertiage Lamposts)	£2,000.00		01.07.2013
	EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede	£1,666.66		16.08.2013
	EF800198269	Homestart	Home-Start Runnymede Christmas lunch & family vouchers	£1,000.00		04.10.2013
	EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after children	£500.00		16.09.2013
	EF800202385	Virginia Water Library	Virginia Water CPL Pop-up Library - Hire of scout hall	£500.00		25.10.2013
	EF700202557	Stroude Residents Association	Contribution towards the installation of a new boiler		£200.00	07.08.2013
	EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative	£1,000.00		12.12.2013
	EF800211597	Virginia Water Community Association	Kitchen refurbishment :- Purchase of appliances and sink		£4,500.00	10.01.2014
	EF700218118	Virginia Water Community Association	Kitchen refurbishment :- Purchase of cupbaords & work surfaces		£1,133.00	10.01.2014
	EF700218118	Virginia Water Community Association	Kitchen refurbishment :- Purchase of cupbaords & work surfaces	£2,167.00		24.01.2014
		Virginia Water Community Partnered				
	EF800211580	Library	Purchase of coffee machine and supplies	£2,060.00		10.01.2014
		Virginia Water Community Partnered				
	EF800213232	Library	Virginia Water CPL Pop-up Library - Running costs bills	£200.00		24.01.2014
			BALANCE REMAINING	£832.34	£0.00	

Runnymede Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2013-2014

Each County Councillor has £12,876 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, also an equal portion of the local committee's capital funding. Annex A

John Furey				REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION		£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
EF800193641	Royal Holloway of London	Volunteering Week 2013		£200.00		19.07.2013
EF800193612	Rotary Club of Chertsey	Black Cherry Fair - Band and BBQ Evening		£1,000.00		05.07.2013
EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede		£1,666.66		16.08.2013
EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children		£500.00		16.09.2013
EF700202121	Buckles & Bows Preschool	Installation of new fencing at the site			£1,000.00	07.08.2013
EF700210746	Holy Family Catholic Primary Sch.	Contribution towards the new Space Immersive Suite for the school			£4,000.00	25.10.2013
EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative		£1,000.00		12.12.2013
EF300371329	Addlestone Youth Centre / Eikon	Addlestone Youth Centre - Residential		£1,600.00		22.01.2014
EF800211638	SATRO	Science Workshop		£600.00		22.01.2014
		BALANCE REMAINING		£6,309.34	£833.00	

Runnymede Members Funding - Balance Remaining 2013-2014

Each County Councillor has £12,876 to spend on projects to benefit the local community, also an equal portion of the local committee's capital funding. Annex A

				REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
Marisa Heath	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800192140	Royal Holloway of London	Volunteering Week 2013 @ 5 locations in Division	£750.00		01.07.2013
	EF800194410	Egham & Thorpe Royal Agricultural & Horticultural Association	Egham Royal Show	£5,000.00		22.07.2013
	EF800194737	Village Centre Child contact Centre	Village Centre Child Contact Centre	£712.12		22.07.2013
	EF700203803	Surrey Hills Society	Surrey Wood Fair - Olympic Boat display	£250.00		16.08.2013
	EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede	£1,666.66		16.08.2013
	EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children	£500.00		16.09.2013
	EF400179337	SCC, Street Lighting Team	Upgrade of heritage street lighting Coopers Hill, Englefield Green	£627.00	£5,833.00	21.10.2013
	EF700212139	Runnymede Art Society	Egham Community Group Adults with Special Needs Christmas Lunch	£300.00		11.11.2013
	EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative	£500.00		12.12.2013
		BALANCE REMAINING	£2,570.22	£0.00		

				REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
Yvonna Lay	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800192136	Royal Holloway of London	Volunteering Week 2013 @ Hythe Community & Matthew Arnold Schools	£400.00		01.07.2013
	EF300363132	CAMHS Youth Advisors - CYA	CYA Awards 2013	£1,500.00		22.07.2013
	EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede	£1,666.66		16.08.2013
	EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children	£500.00		16.09.2013
	EF400181494	Childrens Rights Service	Care Council on the road	£325.00		31.10.2013
	EF400181507	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Duke of Edinburgh Awards for Care Council	£1,800.00		12.11.2013
	EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative	£1,500.00		12.12.2013
			BALANCE REMAINING	£5,184.34	£5,833.00	

				REVENUE	LC CAPITAL	DATE PAID
Chris Norman	REFERENCE	ORGANISATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	£12,876.00	£5,833.00	
	EF800192126	Royal Holloway of London	Volunteering Week 2013 @ Pyrford Grange School & St Peter's Hospital	£500.00		05.07.2013
	EF800193058	Runnymede Borough Council	Chertsey Meads Big Lunch - St John's Ambulance	£150.00		05.07.2013
	EF800197558	Runnymede Foodbank	Foodbank - Runnymede	£1,666.66		16.08.2013
	EF400176662	SCC, Corporate Parenting	Looked after Children	£500.00		16.09.2013
	EF400175319	SCC, Streetlighting Team	Upgrade of Streetlights in London Road, Chertsey		£3,671.70	24.07.2013
	EF300370864	Youth Support Service	St Peters Hospital - Memory Box initiative	£1,000.00		12.12.2013
	EF800209101	Chertsey Society	Christmas Lights Chertsey	£950.00		19.12.2013
	EF800211061	Runnymede Borough Council	Family Support Project	£500.00		10.01.2014
	EF700217445	Chertsey Good Neighbours	Chertsey Good Neighbours - Assisting people in the community	£1,000.00		19.12.2013
		BALANCE REMAINING	£6,609.34	£2,161.30		

This page is intentionally left blank