

Agenda

6.30 pm

Monday, 10 December 2018

Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames

TW18 1XB



Discussion

- **Community Safety Partnership update**
- **Parking enforcement**
- **Highways projects**

You can get involved in the following ways

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 joint committee a question about it. The joint committee provides an opportunity to raise questions, informally, for up to 30 minutes before the formal business of the meeting officially starts. If an answer cannot be given at the meeting, it 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 joint committee in writing. The committee officer must receive it by noon a minimum of four 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 Spelthorne and have a local issue of concern, you can petition the joint 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 at least two weeks before the meeting. You will be asked if you wish to outline your key concerns to the committee and will be given three minutes to address the meeting. Your petition may either be discussed at the meeting or alternatively, at the following meeting.

Attending the Joint Committee meeting

Your Partnership officer is here to help.

Email: gregory.yeoman@surreycc.gov.uk

Tel: 01483 517530

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



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

This is a meeting in public.

Please contact **Gregory Yeoman, Partnership Committee Officer** using the above contact details:

- If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, e.g. large print, Braille, or another language
- If you would like to attend and you have any **additional needs, eg access**
- If you would like to talk about something in today's meeting or have a local initiative or concern

Surrey County Council Appointed Members

Mr Richard Walsh, Laleham and Shepperton (Chairman)
Mr Robert Evans, Stanwell and Stanwell Moor
Mr Tim Evans, Lower Sunbury and Halliford
Mr Naz Islam, Ashford
Miss Alison Griffiths, Sunbury Common & Ashford Common
Mrs Sinead Mooney, Staines
Ms Denise Turner-Stewart, Staines South and Ashford West

Borough Council Appointed Members

Cllr Ian Beardsmore, Sunbury Common
Cllr Ian Harvey, Sunbury East (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Maureen Attewell, Laleham and Shepperton Green
Cllr Alfred Friday, Sunbury East
Cllr Joanne Sexton, Ashford North & Stanwell South
Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley, Laleham & Shepperton Green
Cllr Howard Williams, Ashford Common

Chief Executive
Spelthorne Borough Council
Daniel Mouawad

Chief Executive
Surrey County Council
Joanna Killian

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Note: This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the representative of Community Partnerships Team at the meeting.

Thank you for your co-operation

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

(Pages 9 - 16)

To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting on 8th October 2018 as a correct record.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter

- (i) Any disclosable pecuniary interests and / or
- (ii) Other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at this meeting.

NOTES:

- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.
- As well as an interest of the Member, this includes any interest, of which the Member is aware, that relates to the Member's spouse or civil partner (or any person with whom the Member is living as a spouse or civil partner).
- Members with a significant personal interest may participate in the discussion and vote on that matter unless that interest could be reasonably regarded as prejudicial.

4 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION)

(Pages 17 - 22)

To review any outstanding decisions from the Joint Committee.

5 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES

(Pages 23 - 30)

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

Two petitions have been received and officer responses are provided.

Gresham Road – petition to implement traffic calming measures to control speeds.

211 signatures received. Lead petitioner Mr John Elliott.

Chertsey Road – petition to implement traffic speed reduction measures.

32 signatures received. Lead petitioner Mr David Fudge.

6 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS

To receive any written questions from members under Standing Order 13. The deadline for members' questions is 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

7 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS

To answer any questions from residents or businesses within Spelthorne borough area in accordance with Standing Order 14.2. Notice should be given in writing or by email to the Partnership Committee Officer by 12 noon four working days before the meeting.

8 COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION)

(Pages 31 - 58)

This report is an update for the Spelthorne Joint Committee on the role of the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership.

9 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION)

(Pages 59 - 92)

To receive an update from the Highways Area Team Manager (North East).

10 ON-STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

(Pages 93 - 126)

Joint Committees have a scrutiny role for the on-street parking enforcement service in their area and a share of any surplus income that is raised.

This report sets out the background for these arrangements and provides an overview of the enforcement operation in Spelthorne.

11 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2018/19

(Pages 127 -
128)

To review the forward programme 2018/19, indicating any further preferences for inclusion.

12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be held on Wednesday 13th March 2019 at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber, Spelthorne Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1XB.

(Meeting will start with an Informal Open Forum.)

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Minutes of the meeting of the
Spelthorne JOINT COMMITTEE
 held at 6.30 pm on 8 October 2018
 at Council Offices, Knowle Green, Staines-upon-Thames. TW18 1XB.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * Mr Richard Walsh (Chairman)
- * Mr Robert Evans
- * Mr Tim Evans
- * Mr Naz Islam
- Miss Alison Griffiths
- * Mrs Sinead Mooney
- * Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

Borough / District Members:

- * Cllr Ian Beardsmore
- * Cllr Ian Harvey (Vice-Chairman)
- Cllr Maureen Attewell
- * Cllr Alfred Friday
- Cllr Joanne Sexton
- * Cllr Richard Smith-Ainsley
- * Cllr Howard Williams

* In attendance

Open Forum questions

Questions and responses from the informal open forum session are attached as an Annex to the minutes.

31/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Cllr Sexton, Cllr Attewell and Cllr Griffiths.

32/18 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]

The minutes of the meeting held on 23rd July 2018 were approved as a correct record.

33/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

34/18 PRESENTATION FROM LEAD SCC CABINET MEMBERS FOR PEOPLE AND PLACE (SERVICE MONITORING AND ISSUES OF LOCAL CONCERN - AGENDA ITEM) [Item 4]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers/members attending: Tim Oliver, SCC Lead Cabinet Member for People; Colin Kemp, SCC Lead Cabinet Member for Place; Victoria Berry, Policy and Programme Manager (Health and Social Care Integration)

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: None

Member discussion – key points

Tim Oliver and Victoria Berry gave a presentation on changes to support the health and wellbeing of residents. As is well known, the County Council has significant budget pressures, arising from increased costs in adult social care and special educational needs, which account for a significant portion of the budget. In order to manage cost a process of transformation is underway to focus on early help and prevention, whilst maintaining front line services. Members have already seen the vision and going forward the County Council will be looking to have a greater understanding of residents' priorities and be more transparent.

Only 20% of health needs are influenced by health care, the remaining 80% are influenced by other factors. He reported that Spelthorne residents perform badly on measures of both childhood and adult obesity, taking basic exercise and eating '5 a day' and that this can affect the demand for services.

Surrey Heartlands is looking at changing systems so they are not centred on hospitals and integrating with other health and social care agencies by joining up computer systems and co-locating staff. The emphasis will be on partnership and working together rather than on competition between providers. Resident involvement is a key aspect as well, and 3000 residents have signed up as members of the Citizen Panel to provide information and feedback through surveys, workshops and working groups.

Rationalising the County estate will be an important element with services being provided through hubs rather than separate buildings. The aim will be to maintain levels of service and use savings made from divesting buildings to support this.

Cllr Oliver stressed that the culture at the County had changed significantly with the appointment of a new team of senior officers and a new outlook. The recent Vision for 2030 exercise had shown that it was not possible for Surrey to deliver all the services by itself and the importance of the contribution made by the voluntary, faith and charity sectors was recognised. 18 transformation business cases would be presented to Cabinet in October and he asked members to bear with the re-organisation process.

The Committee thanked Tim Oliver and Victoria Berry for the presentation and Colin Kemp for his support.

35/18 DECISION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 5]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Are Highways Officer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

Cllr Mooney asked for clarification on when the drainage issue at Crooked Billet would be resolved. The Area Highways Officer apologised for the delay; there is a high pressure gas pipeline running through the site, and once Highways England, Surrey County Council and the gas suppliers have been able to coordinate their activity it was hoped the work would be carried out by Christmas.

Equipment is on order to carry out a CCTV survey and cleaning of the drainage pipework in Charlton Village. The standard target for completion of work is within three months of the order being placed; the Highways Officer confirmed that he would write to the borough and Charlton Village Residents' Association to let them know the order date.

Members confirmed that high level conversations were ongoing with Heathrow Airport Ltd (HAL) regarding bus routes through the north of the borough. Cllr R Evans had spoken to the operator of route 8 to see if it would be possible to redirect it up Town Lane rather than Stanwell Moor Road. The chairman commented that pressure should be maintained on HAL from all sides to ensure satisfactory provision of bus transport to and from the airport.

Other recommendations in the decision tracker were agreed as described.

36/18 PETITIONS & PETITION RESPONSES [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: 1 petition was received.

The petitioner presented the petition and explained that the HGVs and taxis driving through Stanwell Moor and using it as a parking area were causing congestion and dangerous road conditions, together with noise, vibration and pollution.

Member discussion – key points

Members expressed their support for the restriction of HGV access and the vice-chairman stated that Spelthorne borough council would cover the cost of a feasibility study looking into the introduction of width restrictions. The scope of the study would be arrived at in consultation with the Residents' Association and the work either taken on by the County's Highways department or an outside contractor according to resource availability and subject to cost.

It was confirmed that visits by Spelthorne officers to the former Vermeulens site in Stanwell Moor were planned to ensure current activity did not violate planning or Green Belt conditions, and that Surrey Police have appointed a new neighbourhood support officer to Stanwell Moor and Stanwell village to ensure the PCSOs are working effectively with regard to the taxi and minicab problem.

The Highways Manager confirmed that work was already underway to improve the weight restriction signage that applies to Millstream bridge, with

the aim of providing better advanced warning signs and to move the 7.5 tonne restriction signs closer to the bridge to make enforcement easier. It was also suggested that signs could be introduced at the exit to Oakleaf Farm, indicating that HGVs should turn right to avoid the weight limit.

The chairman asked for the follow-up work to be reported to the next committee meeting.

37/18 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

There were no questions.

38/18 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]

There were no questions.

39/18 ECO PARK UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM - FOR INFORMATION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Richard Parkinson, Waste Operations Group Manager, Surrey County Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

Wet-leakage testing of the anaerobic digestion facility is underway and the first waste is expected to be accepted in December with a view to Surrey's taking over the facility in March 2019. Commissioning of the pre-treatment process for waste in the gasification facility starts in November, with commissioning of the turbines in January 2019; planned take-over by Surrey is at the end of Jan 2019.

Mr Parkinson stressed there was no financial risk to the County if there were any over-runs or delays, with the contractors responsible for these. The County only starts making payments once it takes over the operation of the fully-tested and properly working facility. There are also no additional costs involved in using alternative waste treatment facilities while the Eco Park is under development.

The movements of lorries through Charlton Village was raised, with a request that the routing of traffic during the construction period be maintained throughout commissioning and operation of the plant. Mr Parkinson gave an assurance that he would check with Planning colleagues and provide an answer.

The chairman reminded members, and also those members of the public present, that there is the Eco Park Liaison Group organised by Suez which meets quarterly – next meeting would be taking place the day after this committee and would be the best place for any detailed or technical questions to be raised.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) **noted** the report.

40/18 HEATHROW EXPANSION UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM - FOR INFORMATION) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Heather Morgan, Group Head Regeneration and Growth and Ann Biggs, Strategic Planning Manager, Spelthorne Borough Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

The officers prefaced their presentation by saying that Spelthorne broadly supports Heathrow expansion, but its priority was the protection of its residents and the environment.

The presentation highlighted potential changes in parking arrangements for vehicles visiting the airport, with a number of existing parking areas being removed as a result of the proposed new runway and relocated to the south of the airport near Stanwell and Stanwell Moor to create a single parking area for an estimated 25000 vehicles.

Potential issues in relation to access to the airport via southern routes for increased numbers of vehicles, and replacement of borough land lost to airport developments, were also covered.

Members were very concerned to hear the possible scale of parking provision on or very close to the borough's northern areas, which they agreed would affect the borough as a whole with increased traffic movements on many key roads. Officers stated that in their discussions with Heathrow Airport Ltd (HAL) they are challenging the assumptions behind the new parking plans, which may not give sufficient weight to the possible financial benefits to Heathrow of consolidating currently disparate parking arrangements.

The borough is keen to see the development of the southern light rail scheme, which would run from Staines. The route is not yet confirmed although the borough's current preferred option passes alongside the M25; a possible alternative could follow Stanwell Moor Road between King George VI and Staines reservoirs. Construction costs are estimated at approximately 10% of those for a traditional railway. Concerns from members of possibly high ticket prices for passengers on the finished rail link if it is financed by private investment were countered by officers stating that the intention would be to have Staines included in TfL's Zone 6 and Oyster area.

It was stressed that the best way to represent Spelthorne's residents is through constructive dialogue with HAL, and also for the borough and Surrey County Council to work closely together. Neighbouring councils such as Hillingdon should also be engaged with to ensure a coordinated approach.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) **noted** the contents of the presentation.

41/18 SPELTHORNE HOMELESS HOSTEL UPDATE (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Birley, Housing Strategy & Policy Manager, Spelthorne Borough Council

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

David Birley presented his report. Spelthorne has engaged positively with the Salvation Army, working with its Housing Association section. The aim is to submit final designs to Planning early next year and to have the hostel fully operational by the end of 2020.

Central government decided in August this year that rental costs will continue to be provided through the existing housing benefit system and therefore Spelthorne will not need to approach Surrey for payments. However, there may in the future be one-off instances relating to personal care and support plans, or on a wider area level, when the borough would need to approach Surrey regarding revenue funding in support of the aims of the hostel. The chairman stressed that Surrey would work in partnership with SBC in order to realise the development of the hostel.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne):

- (i) Noted that funding arrangements for short term supported housing, including those for homeless people, are to remain within Housing Benefit from 2020/21.
- (ii) Continued to support Spelthorne Borough Council's plans to build a single persons homeless hostel in Spelthorne.

42/18 HIGHWAYS UPDATE (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION - FOR DECISION) [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Nick Healey, Area Highways Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

The report was presented and there were no questions or comments.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) agreed:

- (i) To approve the provisional allocation of budgets for 2019-20 as shown in Table 3 below (paragraphs 2.1.7 to 2.1.13 refer);
- (ii) To authorise the advertisement of a legal notice for the relocation of two speed cushions in Clare Road, Stanwell, in support of bus stop improvements at the junction with Bedfont Road, and to consider any representations in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member and if there are no significant objections to relocate the speed cushions (paragraphs 2.6.1 to 2.6.3 and Annex B refer);

- (iii) To authorise the implementation of a new bus stop clearway at the bus stop in Clare Road at the junction with Bedfont Road (paragraphs 2.6.1 to 2.6.3 and Annex B refer);
- (iv) To authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

Reasons for recommendations:

Recommendations are made to facilitate development of Committee's 2019-20 Highways programmes, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

A number of changes are proposed to improve bus stop facilities in Clare Road at its junction with Bedfont Road.

Committee is asked to provide the necessary authorisation to deliver its programmes of work in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member without the need to revert to the Committee as a whole.

43/18 SCHOOL TRAVEL PLANS (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 13]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: Duncan Knox, Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

Members were asked to encourage all schools in their wards and divisions to develop a School Travel Plan, and to take advantage of the activities offered by the Safer Travel and Cycle Training Teams. They were reminded that any school with development of a plan as part of their planning consent would be written to to ensure that they are complying.

Duncan Knox responded to a question about Park Smart, commenting that the students working in conjunction with local police officers to place polite notices on vehicles parked illegally or in an antisocial way provided a useful way of reinforcing good parking practice when enforcement officers were unable to attend. He stressed the importance of campaigns such as Living Streets' 'Walk Once a Week' (WOW), which can lead to changes in behaviour and consequent improvements in child health and also air quality around schools.

Resolved:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) noted that:

- (i) The county council's Safer Travel Team will continue to encourage and support all Surrey's expansion schools to complete and maintain their School Travel Plan using the online Modeshift STARS system.

- (ii) From 2018/19, the Safer Travel Team will also encourage all Surrey's schools to create a School Travel Plan using the online Modeshift STARS accreditation system. This will involve promotion and the offer of training and support to all schools.
- (iii) Members are invited to assist by encouraging schools to sign up to Modeshift STARS, and to take up the activities offered by the Safer Travel and Cycle Training Teams to improve road safety and encourage sustainable travel.

Reasons for recommendations:

Successful implementation of School Travel Plans will lead to improvements in road safety and more sustainable travel on school journeys. This will reduce congestion, improve air quality, and active travel will improve the health of children.

44/18 MEMBERSHIP OF THE SPELTHORNE SAFER STRONGER PARTNERSHIP (SSSP) (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 14]

Cllr Patel's membership of the SSSP was noted.

45/18 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2018/19 [Item 15]

The Stanwell Moor petition was added to the Forward Plan for the next meeting; other contents of the plan were noted.

46/18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 16]

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday 10 December 2018 at 6.30pm.

Meeting ended at: 9.50 pm

Chairman



Spelthorne Joint Committee Decision Tracker

This tracker monitors progress against the decisions that the Joint Committee has made. It is updated before each committee meeting.

- Decisions will be marked as 'open', where work to implement the decision is ongoing.
- When decisions are reported to the committee as **complete**, they will also be marked as 'closed'. The Committee will then be asked to agree to remove these items from the tracker.
- Decisions may also be 'closed' if further progress is not possible at this time, even though the action is not yet complete. An explanation will be included in the comment section. In this case, the action will stay on the tracker unless the Committee decides to remove it.

Meeting Date	Item	Decision	Status (Open / Closed)	Officer	Comment or Update

6 Dec 2017	6	To lobby Heathrow Ltd to provide bus services around the south of the airport (Vice Chairman to assert Heathrow's social responsibilities as members' session)	OPEN	Strategic Transport team/ Chairman	<p>Chairman to update on his conversations with Heathrow.</p> <p>Strategic Transport team are awaiting data from LHR on their staff's work journeys to determine if additional services are viable.</p> <p>SBC 10/8/18 - SBC officers engaging regularly with HAL in bi-lateral discussions on Heathrow expansion, and via the Heathrow Strategic Planning Group (both in sub group on Transport sub group and at main meeting). Meetings also taking place at Chief Exec level between SBC and HAL on bus services and wider public transport issues.</p> <p>SCC 12/9/18 - Effectively, there has been little progress with dialogue with Heathrow Airport Ltd. This has been exacerbated by an extensive change of HAL personnel dealing with surface access and their pre-occupation with planning surface access developments in connection with the long-term Heathrow expansion plans.</p> <p>SCC Passenger Transport has been represented at stakeholder workshops considering the airport expansion plans and has made the point that enhancements need to be facilitated now by HAL for bus</p>
------------	---	--	-------------	---------------------------------------	--

					<p>services from the south side of the campus, in order to establish a better platform on which to build in the future. The need for better services in the short term is also being pursued through the Heathrow Transport Forum.</p> <p>For itself, SCC still has no budgetary capacity to pay for enhanced bus services from the south side</p> <p>8/10 - Cllr R Evans has asked the operator if bus route 8 could change to include Town Lane rather than follow Stanwell Moor Road.</p> <p>8/10 – SBC Leader stressed that regular mtgs with senior HAL officers, including the CEO, take place and the borough is pushing hard on resolving bus access.</p> <p>Recommend this item remains open for further updates.</p>
19 Mar 2018	6	Examine possibility of strategic review of crossing amenities along Staines Road West.	CLOSED, subject to funding	Area Highways Manager	<p>No funding allocated so no progress.</p> <p>Closed, subject to funding.</p>

19 Mar 2018	6	Review of flooding issues in Charlton Village and proposal for future additional measures to be taken.	OPEN	Area Highways Manager/ Cabinet Member	Officers are working to develop a solution for implementation this Financial Year 2018-19. 10/18 – Equipment is on order to clean the pipework and carry out a CCTV check to trace all the pipes. Any necessary minor repairs will be carried out and then if there is still a problem it may become a capital scheme. The standard for work being completed is three months following the placing of the equipment order – the Area Highways Mngr will circulate this date to the Borough and to CVRA. 9/10/18 – information circulated by AHM. Recommend this item remains open for further updates.
19 Mar 2018	7	Look into possible additional solutions at Crooked Billet: extra overflow ditches.	OPEN	Area Highways Manager	Works on order to create an overflow ditch. 10/18 - The contractor is lined up; it is necessary to coordinate with Highways England and the gas company as there is a high pressure pipeline running through the site. Work is expected to be completed by Christmas. Recommend this item remains open for further updates.
8 Oct 2018	Open forum	Response to Mr Seaman regarding earlier notification to SCC of malfunctioning of traffic lights at Staines Road West/Crossways junction	OPEN	Area Highways Manager	

8 Oct 2018	Open forum	Response to Mr Lagden regarding SBC's approach to improve air quality in particular in relation to the planned third runway.	CLOSED	Strategic Planning Mngnr, SBC	Response sent 12/11/18 Recommend this item is removed at next meeting.
8 Oct 2018	6	Highways Manager to liaise with Stanwell Moor RA to set scope of feasibility study into HGV width restrictions. SBC to commission contractor if necessary according to SCC resource availability.	OPEN	Area Highways manager; SBC	SCC provided draft feasibility brief for Stanwell Moor Width restriction project to SBC on 16.10.18. SBC now waiting to hear back from their transport consultants. SCC in-house design team are 80% confident of reporting a feasibility study back to the March 2019 Committee meeting for decision if able to start work immediately. The intention is to engage with the SMVRA when SBC have heard back from their consultants, so we know what we can be offered. Recommend this item remains open for further updates.
8 Oct 2018	9	Eco Park – traffic routing during operation	CLOSED	Waste Operations Group Manager (SCC)	Officer to provide information to K Howkins, Charlton Village, on traffic routings during commissioning and operation of the Eco Park. Information sent 8.11.18 Recommend this item is removed at next meeting.
8 Oct 2018	13	School Travel Plans – Cllr T Evans requested info on non-complying schools in his division	OPEN	Road Safety & Active Travel Team Manager	Officer to provide information to Cllr Evans.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**



SURREY

JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

DATE: 10 December 2018
SUBJECT: PETITION – Gresham Road

DIVISION: Staines

PETITION DETAILS:

Implement measures to reduce and calm traffic on Gresham Road and surrounding roads

The Spelthorne Joint Committee received a petition from Mr Richard Buckland which contained 211 signatures and was concerned about the excessive level of traffic going through Gresham Road and associated roads in the area.

Excessive and increasing traffic is causing:-

- 1) Long queues of traffic forming at both ends of Gresham and associated roads.
- 2) Increased pollution.
- 3) Increased traffic noise.
- 4) Increase of potential for accidents
- 5) Anti-social driving/behaviour e.g. loud music, blocking carriageway, arguments.
- 6) Illegal activities e.g. speeding, driving along pavement to bypass blockages. We are particularly concerned about the risk to the many children that attend the local schools in the area of Gresham Road.

Our suggestions are as follows:-

- 1) Move any corporate pick-up and drop-off shuttles to the car park at the Station entrance on Kingston Road. This is off the main road and is designed for buses picking up and dropping off.
- 2) Traffic signs enforcing the speed limit.
- 3) Speed bumps to be reassessed for height, condition, position.
- 4) Traffic lights at Kingston and/or Laleham Road
- 5) Bollards on the pavements.
- 6) Police presence during rush hours to prevent illegal and anti-social activities.

OFFICER COMMENT:

Gresham Road provides a link between Kingston Road (C248) and Laleham Road (B376). It is subject to a 30mph speed limit and has existing traffic calming in the form of speed cushions.

Situated at the north end of Gresham Road is Staines Preparatory School, towards the middle is a pedestrian access to Staines Station and a car park. Near

www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne

this access is located a taxi rank and off-carriageway private shuttle pick up point for employees. South of the station there is an industrial estate in Drake Avenue.

Surrey Highways, in partnership with Surrey Police, identifies locations with a poor safety record by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted locations where it is thought that there may be a traffic problem. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns. Residents may raise concerns relating to driver behaviour or anti-social activity to Surrey Police as the sole enforcement authority.

The council does currently receive a small amount of funding to be used specifically to reduce road casualties. These resources are focussed on sites where there are patterns of casualties that could potentially be addressed through engineering interventions. We are obliged to prioritise those sites with the greatest frequency of casualties, ahead of those sites with a lesser frequency of casualties.

Surrey Police records details on road collisions where personal injury has resulted. The junction of Gresham Road and Kingston Road was the subject of a road safety scheme in 2016. This followed identification of a history of collisions causing injury at the junction, mainly involving vehicles turning out of Gresham Road colliding with vehicles travelling on Kingston Road. A scheme was promoted to alter the junction, to improve visibility for drivers in Gresham Road and Kingston Road.

Staines Preparatory School has also been the subject of a Road Safety Outside Schools Audit. This was in response to the junction changes nearby and also a recent RTA where a vehicle hit the school wall. Speed was not recorded as a contributing factor. A recommendation from the audit was the installation of an additional pair of speed cushions. It was also observed that some of the existing speed cushions appeared to have been worn down and might not act as a deterrent, particularly with larger cars. To date there has been no funding available to progress these recommendations.

Available collision data for the most recent three year period has been reviewed for the section of Gresham Road in question. There have been no collisions resulting in personal injury where speed was recorded as a contributory factor. This indicates that the traffic calming has been successful in terms of road safety.

As such, there is currently no provision within the road safety programme for measures on Gresham Road, when compared with other locations.

As well as schemes to specifically address problems evidenced by a history of injuries, Surrey County Council does introduce other local highways improvement schemes. For example, these may be to improve traffic flow, relieve congestion, provide facilities such as pedestrian crossings, or to address locations where residents have highlighted areas of concern. Schemes may also aim to improve the quality of life and general environment for residents, as well as address safety concerns. These are the types of schemes promoted via Spelthorne Joint Committee.

Should committee be minded to prioritise Gresham Road for further measures, the first step would be to undertake a feasibility study to establish the existing conditions and behaviours to enable the development of suitable measures. These may include physical measures such as traffic calming, building out of kerbs, or change of priority. Assessment would consider the likely impacts on local residents as well as on the road network.

Any vertical traffic calming or changes to permitted vehicle movements require statutory consultation and it should be noted that features such as humps, cushions or tables are not always universally popular, with particular concerns being related to noise and vibration. There is also the issue of potential re-routing of traffic to less appropriate roads. It is also worth noting that any measures to alter road layouts are likely to be prohibitively expensive based on likely committee budgets, although external funding may be an option.

RECOMMENDATION

The Joint Committee is asked to decide:
(a) to allocate funding for a feasibility study, (b) to place this suggestion on the prioritisation list for future consideration, or (c) to do nothing at this stage.

Contact Officer:

Nick Healey, Area Highway Manager (NE)

Tel: 0300 200 1003

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

**DATE: 10 December 2018
SUBJECT: PETITION – Chertsey Road**

DIVISION: Sunbury Common and Ashford Common



SURREY

PETITION DETAILS:

Implement speed reduction measures along the entire length of Chertsey Road

The Spelthorne Joint Committee received a petition from Mr David Fudge which contained 32 signatures and was concerned about the speed of traffic going through Chertsey Road in Ashford.

We the undersigned petition Surrey County Council to Implement speed reduction measures along the entire length of Chertsey Road to ensure the safety of all pedestrians but especially all children walking to school with their families, and to emulate the speed reduction measures already in place for the surrounding roads.

Chertsey Road in Ashford runs from Tesco Express on the Staines Road West to the BP Head Office. In the middle of this stretch of road is a large Primary School with over 500 pupils including a nursery, Children's Centre and Special Education Needs unit. The alternative route for traffic to the school or BP would be via Feltham Hill Road or Chertsey Road from the north via Groveley Road, and both these roads have speed bumps and through BP the speed limit is 20mph. The current speed limit along Chertsey Road is 30mph with no speed bumps and traffic heading towards the school comes from Staines Road West which has a speed limit of 40mph. Chertsey Road is a residential road with the majority of homes having their own drives so cars are regularly pulling out/reversing into the road. The council are trying to encourage more families to walk to school for health benefits and for this objective to success, children need a safe environment to do so.

OFFICER COMMENT:

Chertsey Road provides a link between Staines Road West (A308) and Cadbury Road (A244). Approximately at its midpoint is a junction with Feltham Hill Road, which provides access for Meadhurst Primary School. Also accessed nearby are

the nursery and children's centres for which Chertsey Road and Feltham Hill Road are key routes.

Surrey Highways, in partnership with Surrey Police, identifies locations with a poor safety record by analysing collision data and trends. Locations of community concern are also considered, when residents, elected members or community surveys have highlighted locations where it is thought that there may be a traffic problem. Assessment potentially leads to the development of measures such as physical changes, enforcement, or educational campaigns. Residents may raise concerns relating to driver behaviour to Surrey Police as the sole enforcement authority.

The council does currently receive a small amount of funding to be used specifically to reduce road casualties. These resources are focussed on sites where there are patterns of casualties that could potentially be addressed through engineering interventions. We are obliged to prioritise those sites with the greatest frequency of casualties, ahead of those sites with a lesser frequency of casualties.

Available collision data for the most recent three year period has been reviewed for Chertsey Road in question. There have been no collisions resulting in personal injury where speed was recorded as a contributory factor. However, there was one collision, in January 2017, where a child pedestrian sustained injury (categorised as 'slight' injury).

As such, there is currently no provision within the road safety programme for measures on Chertsey Road, when compared with other locations.

As well as schemes to specifically address problems evidenced by a history of injuries, Surrey County Council does introduce other local highways improvement schemes. For example, these may be to improve traffic flow, relieve congestion, provide facilities such as pedestrian crossings, or to address locations where residents have highlighted areas of concern. Schemes may also aim to improve the quality of life and general environment for residents, as well as address safety concerns. These are the types of schemes promoted via Spelthorne Joint Committee. The committee has recognised the need for a safer environment in the vicinity of the school. As such, funding was allocated to develop proposals for a new zebra crossing in Feltham Hill Road, close to the roundabout junction with Chertsey Road. Construction is anticipated in 2019, subject to securing of funding.

Should committee be minded to prioritise Chertsey Road for further measures, the first step would be to undertake a feasibility study to establish the existing conditions and behaviours to enable the development of suitable measures. These may include physical measures such as traffic calming, building out of kerbs, or change of priority. Assessment would consider the likely impacts on local residents as well as on the road network.

Any vertical traffic calming or changes to permitted vehicle movements require statutory consultation and it should be noted that features such as humps, cushions or tables are not always universally popular, with particular concerns being related to noise and vibration. There is also the issue of potential re-routing of traffic to less appropriate roads. It is also worth noting that any measures to alter road layouts are likely to be prohibitively expensive based on likely committee budgets, although external funding may be an option.

<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
<p>The Joint Committee is asked to decide: <i>(a) to allocate funding for a feasibility study, (b) to place this suggestion on the prioritisation list for future consideration, or (c) to do nothing at this stage.</i></p>

Contact Officer:

Nick Healey, Area Highway Manager (NE)

Tel: 0300 200 1003

This page is intentionally left blank

**SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL AND
SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**



SPELTHORNE JOINT COMMITTEE

DATE: 10 December 2018

LEAD OFFICER: Lee O'Neil, Deputy Chief Executive, Spelthorne Borough Council (Chair of the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership Board)

SUBJECT: Community Safety Partnership update

AREA(S) AFFECTED: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

Section 17 of The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a requirement on each local authority to:

- i. Have due regard to the likely effect its functions can have on, and
- ii. Do all that it reasonably can, to prevent, crime and disorder in relation to all the services it provides.

This report is an update for the Spelthorne Joint Committee on the role of the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Spelthorne Joint Committee (SJC) is asked to note:

- (i) The contents of this report
- (ii) The 2017-2020 Partnership Plan
- (iii) The successes and challenges for the Community Safety Partnership as detailed in the report to Spelthorne's Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 11 September 2018, along with the key initiatives and campaigns that have been undertaken.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

This report presents the Partnership Plan for 2017 – 2020.
This item is for information only.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and subsequent legislation place a requirement on Spelthorne Borough Council (SBC) and Surrey County Council (SCC) to consider, and do all they reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in all the services they provide.

- 1.2 Membership of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) must include “Responsible Authorities” as defined by the Crime & Disorder Act 1998. The Responsible Authorities on the local CSP, known as the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership (SSSP), are SBC, SCC, Surrey Police, Surrey Fire & Rescue Services (SFRS), Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Probation Service.
- 1.3 As statutory Responsible Authorities of the SSSP, SBC and SCC are required to work with partners to improve community safety and reduce crime and disorder.
- 1.4 The SSSP uses a wide range of methods to engage with the local community. These have included the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) Crime Summit, Face the People events and written forms of engagement such as surveys, newsletters and websites.
- 1.5 The provision of a Community Safety Strategy is a statutory requirement. The SSSP’s current three-year Community Safety Strategy 2017-20 is included as Annex 1 and can also be found here on the Spelthorne community safety pages https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/4185/Safer-Stronger-Spelthorne-Partnership-Community-Safety-Strategy-2017-2020/pdf/2017-2020_Partnership_Plan.pdf
- 1.6 The key responsibilities of the SSSP include:
- To oversee analysis of crime and disorder and ensure an evidence-based approach to priority setting
 - To agree priorities at a local level and ensure there is a three-year Community Safety Strategy and action plan
 - To contribute to the development of other local strategies and plans which are aligned to the community safety agenda, such as health and wellbeing, to ensure better use of resources, avoid duplication and provide better outcomes
 - To ensure establishment and delivery of Domestic Homicide Reviews;
 - To approve the allocation of funding received by the CSP
 - To ensure that any changes in the community safety landscape are effectively managed
 - To ensure that the work of the CSP supports the Police and Crime Plan and that effective links are established with the PCC.
- 1.7 The priorities in the strategy have been developed using information and data related to:
- Crime and disorder issues across the borough, taking into account issues which local people consider to be of most concern
 - Supporting victims of domestic abuse via the domestic abuse outreach service
 - Supporting individuals with substance misuse issues
 - Raising awareness of hate crime
 - Raising awareness of how to spot signs of emerging threats that target vulnerable people, such as Child Exploitation and Modern Slavery
 - Monitoring the local PREVENT (anti-radicalisation) action plan.

2. ANALYSIS:

- 2.1 National crime trends in previous years have shown a reduction in recorded crime. However, for 2017-18 numbers increased, which has primarily been attributed to changes in crime categories and the way that crimes are recorded.
- 2.2 A community safety report with crime figures was presented to Spelthorne's Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 11 September 2018 which can be viewed at Annex 2 and via the following link:
<http://democracy.spelthorne.gov.uk/documents/s16228/Review%20of%20Community%20Safety%20O%20S%202018%20v2.pdf>

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 The Committee is asked to note the information provided within the report.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Consultation takes place on an annual basis to help inform the Community Safety Strategy. The Crime Summit held by the Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) was a key method of carrying out surveys with the local community.
- 4.2 The Crime Summit is no longer organised by the PCC; however, this has been replaced by Panel Meetings which are held in various locations across the borough to ensure our communication channels remain open.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 Resources for the SSSP are prioritised as part of the action planning process and the Partnership makes best use of its available resources.
- 5.2 There are no government grants or allocated funding from the PCC to support the SSSP; this is a challenge experienced across most of England and Wales.
- 5.4 With budgets to CSPs from Government sources cut, the financial burden falls to local authorities who themselves are also facing significant financial cuts. To help maintain a healthy budget the SSSP continues to be pro-active in seeking financial support from businesses within the borough to deliver Partnership activities and community safety work.
- 5.5 In previous years the Partnership received funding of £21,000 a year from A2 Dominion Housing (A2D), £3,000 a year from BP and £27,000 from SBC. The current situation is that A2D no longer make a contribution and SBC contribute £10,000. This reduction relates to the fact that SBC no longer claim back salaries paid for Community Safety Officers of £43,000. These posts are fully funded by SBC.
- 5.6 In 2017/18 SFRS and the Royal National Lifeboat Institution (RNLI) joined forces to promote water safety to help prevent people losing their lives

through drowning. This initiative was supported by the SSSP with financial contributions being made by SCC and SBC.

- 5.7 In August 2018 the SSSP held a budget balance of £109,000. The Partnership has agreed that a sum of £40,000 from this budget should be set aside to deal with any Domestic Homicide Reviews (DHR) should any occur in Spelthorne. The remainder of the budget is available for community safety initiatives approved by the SSSP Board.

6. WIDER IMPLICATIONS:

6.1

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	As outlined within this report
Equality and Diversity	No significant implications
Localism (including community involvement and impact)	No significant implications
Sustainability (including Climate Change and Carbon Emissions)	No significant implications
Corporate Parenting/Looked After Children	No significant implications
Safeguarding responsibilities for vulnerable children and adults	As outlined within this report
Public Health	As outlined within this report

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 7.1 Spelthorne Borough Council and Surrey County Council are required by legislation to consider, and do all they reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in all the services they provide. Both are Responsible Authorities of the local Community Safety Partnership (the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership).
- 7.2 Together with key local partners, the SSSP has been working to tackle crime and disorder in the Borough, focusing on key priorities within the Partnership Plan.
- 7.3 That this report be noted

8. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 8.1 The Spelthorne Joint Committee is asked to note the report.

Contact Officer:

Lee O'Neil, Deputy Chief Executive Spelthorne Borough Council

Consulted:

Not required for the purposes of this report

Annexes:

Annex 1 – 2017-20 Partnership Plan

Annex 2 – Review of Community Safety

Background papers:

None

This page is intentionally left blank



Safer Stronger Partnership

2017 - 2020 PARTNERSHIP PLAN

OUR VISION

'TO BUILD A SAFER COMMUNITY'

OUR PRIORITIES

To Reduce: -

- **Crime – with particular reference to Residential Burglary; Harm Caused through Misuse of Drugs and Alcohol; Organised Crime, Violent Crime & Acquisitive Crime.**
- **Anti-Social Behaviour**
- **Re-Offending**
- **The Threat of Terrorism**
- **The threat of child sexual exploitation and cyber related crime**

To Improve:-

- **Engagement with our public to help make our communities stronger**
- **Water Safety in the River Thames areas of the Borough**

CONTENTS

TITLES	PAGE NUMBER
Forward and Background	3
Introduction and Governance	4
Community Engagement	6
Strategic Assessment	7
Key Priorities	12
Meeting our Priorities	13
The Future	13
Statutory Responsibilities	14

SPELTHORNE SAFER STRONGER PARTNERSHIP PLAN 2017 – 2020

FOREWORD AND BACKGROUND

Nationally each Community Safety Partnership is required annually to undertake a strategic assessment of crime and disorder and to consult with the community about the areas of concern. This assessment is an analysis of crimes, including trends and projections linked to community feedback. This leads to emerging priorities for action. Following the completion of the assessment, a Partnership Plan has to be prepared setting out our agreed priorities. This is then followed by action plans which include funding allocations from the Partnership to help implement various schemes and initiatives.

Following the completion of an assessment, I have pleasure in launching our Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership Plan for 2017 to 2020.

The Partnership is committed to playing a key role in reducing all aspects of crime and disorder, and our strategic assessment identified key priorities upon which to concentrate effort and resources. These priorities reflect the concerns of our community and are as follows:

Reduce: -

- Crime – with particular reference to Residential Burglary; Harm caused through Misuse of Drugs and Alcohol; Organised Crime, Violent Crime and Acquisitive Crime.
- Anti-Social Behaviour
- Re-offending¹
- The threat of terrorism
- The threat of child sexual exploitation and cyber related crime

Improve

- Engagement with our public to help make our communities stronger
- Water Safety in the River Thames areas of the Borough

The strategic assessment and this Partnership Plan relate specifically to the situation within Spelthorne and, whilst responding to targets specific to other agencies, it seeks to provide a local response that is relevant to the specific needs of the local community.

Other aspects of crime and disorder, whilst not identified as priorities, will continue to be dealt with as appropriate by the relevant agency; e.g. robbery and vehicle crime.

The Partnership Plan is a rolling three-year plan that has to be refreshed annually. This process will be aided by the completion of annual strategic assessments, performance monitoring and stakeholder consultation. Feedback will be particularly welcomed from members of the community living and working within the borough.

Roberto Tambini
Chair of the SSSP Board

¹ This is a Government priority that we are required to adopt

INTRODUCTION AND GOVERNANCE

How We Currently Operate

The Spelthorne Community Safety Partnership (CSP) is known locally as the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership (SSSP). It has a strong commitment and a good track record of tackling all aspects of crime and disorder, providing reassurance to local communities and of community engagement. The Partnership has established a Strategy Board which includes both statutory and non-statutory members.

Strategy Board

This has responsibility to support the Task Groups and monitor the overall implementation of the Strategy and detailed action plans; to approve the financial strategy; oversee funding arrangements, and to ensure that overall objectives and individual targets are met. The Board meets quarterly.

Statutory members are identified with an *

Spelthorne Borough Council*
Surrey Police*
Surrey Fire Authority*
Public Health Surrey County Council*
Surrey County Council*
Surrey & Sussex Probation Service*
A2Dominion Housing
Bronzefield Prison
Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner

Operational Management Group (OMG)

The Operational Management Group oversees the delivery of the Action Plans. It brings together the leads for each of the areas of work, identifies gaps in delivery, makes recommendations to the Board and evaluates the projects and the final spending. It physically meets every 6 months in order to confirm progress; between these times the group will meet 'virtually' via e-mails and telephone.

Spelthorne Borough Council
Surrey Police
Public Health Surrey County Council
Surrey & Sussex Probation Service
Surrey County Council

Joint Enforcement Team Tasking and Co-ordinating Group (JET/TCG)

The JET/TCG's primary role is to facilitate improved partnership responses to localised crime and disorder issues by continually appraising local intelligence, monitoring incidents, as well as dealing with concerns relating to Anti-Social Behaviour etc. The group utilises geographical hot spotting which assists in recording patterns of crime thereby helping to create solutions at an operational level. The group also carries out a tasking and coordinating role with the Law Enforcement Officers employed by SBC, as a consequence it is able to provide a quick and

effective localised response. This group meets every 6 weeks.

Community Incident Action Group (CIAG)

The Group will address community safety issues that are caused by problem individuals and families that are disruptive to the community as well as locations that have become a cause for concern. This group meets every 6 weeks and membership is as follows: -

Spelthorne Borough Council – Surrey Police, NHS Surrey, Transform Housing Trust A2 Dominion Group, Surrey Youth Justice Service, Spelthorne Locality Team Adult and Children Services, Surrey Children’s Services, Surrey Youth Support Service Service (Lifetrain), Thames Valley Housing, Victim Support, Community Mental Health Team and Supported Families Team.

Prolific and other Priority Offenders (PPO) Management Panel

This group work closely together with a specific duty to prevent and deter new entrants to the criminal justice system, to catch and convict active criminals who cause most harm to our communities, and to help resettle and rehabilitate those offenders who want to turn their backs on a life of crime. This group meets monthly and membership is as follows: -

Spelthorne Borough Council, Spelthorne Police PPO Officer; Engage (Drug Intervention Programme); National Probation Service; Youth Justice Service.

The Local Strategic Partnership (known as Spelthorne Together)

This Partnership is led by an Executive, which sets the strategic direction for the Partnership, and oversees the work of the theme groups, which carry out the action plan. There are four theme groups as follows: -

- Safer Stronger Partnership
- Children & Young People
- Health & Wellbeing
- Economic Development

Each of the theme groups contribute towards the holistic needs of the Borough through agreed action plans; Spelthorne Together produce a long term Community Plan (over ten years) bringing together a variety of agencies via the themed groups to deliver services and report directly to the Spelthorne Together Executive.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

How We Consult

The Partnership uses a wide range of methods to engage with the local community. These include meetings such as forums and panels and written forms of engagement such as publications, surveys, newsletters and websites.

Neighbourhood Policing Panels

Police hold panel meetings at different locations as required across the Borough, based on neighbourhood policing areas. The Panels are informal meetings, giving residents the opportunity to meet amongst others their Police Community Support Officers and Neighbourhood Specialist Officers and highlight the issues they are most concerned about in their community. The issues they raise will then be prioritised for the local policing team who will identify ways of dealing with them over the proceeding weeks; details of measures taken will be reported back at subsequent meetings.

Events of significant local interest

These are open meetings for residents to find out more about issues of local significance, ask questions and air their views and concerns. These public meetings will be convened when a matter of significant public importance or interest within a local area arise.

Partnership Face The People Event

The Partnership will hold at least one of these events each year; the purpose of this is to raise the visibility of the Partnership, to update the communities in relation to progress in tackling crime and disorder, the activities that have taken place in the Borough, schemes undertaken etc and future plans. It will also take questions from the community in a public forum where on issues of concern. Listen to concerns and allow the Partnership to communicate face to face, consult on issues and develop, adjust priorities so that they reflect the needs of the community

Partnership Action Days²

These are multi agency days which take place around the borough. They involve numerous agencies such as the Local Authority, Police, NHS Surrey, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service and the voluntary and community sector to name but a few, who work together to tackle issues highlighted for that particular area. Each day includes an opportunity for the public to meet and talk to officers from the Police, Fire, Council and other partners; future events will develop a closer relationship with local school involvement where practicable.

² A one-day operation involving many partnership agencies working together to reduce crime and disorder, provide visible presence to increase reassurance and to provide crime prevention and other advice to residents. The key themes include engagement, awareness and enforcement.

THE STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Current Key Priorities

The strategic assessment is an annual document and covers the period from 1st October to 30th September each year.

Spelthorne is situated within one of the safest counties in England and is a safe place within which to live, work or visit. The SSSP, whilst committed to making it even safer, acknowledges that the perception of some people is that the borough is not as safe as it actually is. **Overall, crime has remained fairly static from the reporting period 2014 – 2016**

THE DRAFT KEY PRIORITIES FOR 2016 - 2019

Having undertaken a strategic assessment, our proposed priorities for 2017 – 2019 have not changed significantly from the 2016/19 assessment and plan, they are now as follows: -

TO REDUCE: -

CRIME With particular reference to: -

Burglary (dwelling)
Harm caused through misuse of drugs & alcohol
Acquisitive crime (particularly shoplifting & metal thefts)
Violent Crime (with injury)

ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

To reduce the level of reported anti-social behaviour
(Particularly rowdy & inconsiderate behaviour / neighbourhood disputes)

RE-OFFENDING

Particularly around our prolific & priority offenders / domestic abuse perpetrators

Re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders
Repeat incidents of domestic violence

THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

Protection against terrorist attack
Building communities resilient to violent extremism

CHILD EXPLOITATION AND CYBER CRIME

Raise awareness of the threat
Work with other agencies on joint initiatives

And

TARGETED ENGAGEMENT WITH OUR PUBLIC TO HELP MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES STRONGER

To work with and provide information, guidance and advice to make our communities stronger, particularly helping deliver the '**Supported Families Programme**', **neighbourhood watch** and **residents associations**:

In support of the Spelthorne Together Local Strategic Partnership priority, provide additional support for older people within our community.

IMPROVEMENT OF WATER SAFETY IN THE AREA OF THE RIVER THAMES

To work in conjunction with partner agencies in the delivery of a water safety strategy in the area of the river Thames.

MEETING OUR PRIORITIES

The Partnership has a set of annual action plans to deliver against these priorities. These plans are S.M.A.R.T³ and monitored by the Operational Management Group, with overall performance monitored by the Partnership Board.

THE FUTURE

The Partnership has a very strong record of success in helping reduce overall crime and disorder and in running numerous innovative Partnership schemes across the Borough. We are proud of our achievements but determined to make best use of our resources in order to meet our vision.

In the current economic climate and reducing budgets the Partnership will seek to achieve even greater value for money in respect of our limited resources and will explore opportunities of maximising our funding by identifying jointly funded initiatives and projects with our Community Safety Partnership neighbours.

OUR STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES

The police and other responsible agencies are required by law to work together to reduce crime and disorder, anti-social behaviour, alcohol, drug and other substance abuse and anti-social behaviour that impacts adversely on the environment and to reduce re-offending. In doing so the Partnership has a statutory requirement to:

³ Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic Time-bound

- Undertake an annual strategic assessment of crime trends and reasons for the crimes that are occurring within their area
- Consult and engage with the community and develop and implement an annual three-year rolling Community Safety Partnership Plan.

Relevant legislation bringing statutory requirements for responsible agencies to work together in this way are as follows:

Crime and Disorder Act, 1998
 Police Reform Act, 2002
 Police and Justice Act, 2006

Section 17, Crime and Disorder Act 1998 - as amended by Schedule 9, Section 4 of the Police and Justice Act 2006: "Without prejudice to any other obligations imposed upon it, it shall be the duty of each authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area including anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment and the misuse of drugs and other substances in its area."

"This means that all authorities should take account of the community safety dimension in all of its work. All policies, strategies, plans and budgets will need to be considered from the standpoint of their potential contribution to the reduction of crime and disorder." (Home Office Executive Summary to Crime and Disorder Act 1998) 'Responsible Authorities' (as defined within the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002) as relates to the Spelthorne Community Safety Partnership are:

- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- Surrey Police
- Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
- Public Health- Surrey County Council
- Surrey & Sussex Probation Service

A number of other cooperating persons or bodies are required to be part of the process of working to reduce crime and disorder within the partnership and these are also represented within the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership Board.

Section 115, Crime and Disorder Act 1998 – establishes the power to disclose and use information for the purposes of resolving crime and disorder. The process for sharing information is set out in the Surrey Information Sharing Protocol.

Police and Justice Act 2006 and Statutory Instruments 1830 and 1831 of 2007 – Improvements and changes to partnership provisions are reflected within this legislation. The statutory requirements form part of what are known as: 'Hallmarks of Effective Partnerships'⁴

⁴ Further information on this and other guidance is contained within 'Delivering Safer Communities: A guide to effective partnership working'.
<http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships/partnerships001.htm>.

- Empowered and effective leadership
- Intelligence led business processes
- Effective and responsive delivery structures
- Engaged communities
- Visible and constructive accountability
- Appropriate skills and knowledge

Performance Monitoring

Each key priority that is identified within this plan contains a number of actions. These are designed to ensure that priority objectives are achieved. Targets have been set as an essential part of bringing about that achievement; this will form the Action Plan. Monitoring performance will be set against a series of agreed performance indicators. These indicators will be set against each key priority.

The Action Plan will be placed on the council web site and updated on a 6 monthly basis so that the public can track progress.

Crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour data and associated performance information will be collected by the Operational Management Group and presented to the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership Board at the quarterly meetings, so that delivery can be monitored and any lack of progress challenged. This information will also be available to other bodies, including those with community representation, as appropriate. Annual reports will also be available for wider community consultative processes and transparency.

Other national, county and local plans, strategies and policies complement or impact in some way upon this Community Safety Partnership Plan; the more significant of these are as follows:

- Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner: Police and Crime Plan
- Civil Contingencies Act 2004
- Corporate Strategy (Spelthorne Borough Council)
- National Crime Strategy

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

11 September 2018



Title	Review of Community Safety		
Purpose of the report	To note		
Report Author	Jackie Taylor Group Head Neighbourhood Services		
Cabinet Member	Councillor Ian Harvey	Confidential	No
Corporate Priority	Clean and Safe Environment		
Recommendations	To note the information contained within the report		

1. Key issues

- 1.1 Community Safety involves various organisations working together with local communities to tackle persistent crime and disorder issues that are adversely affecting the quality of life of local people within the borough. From feeling secure in their home to feeling confident while out in the local neighbourhood, community safety is one of the most important issues for residents living in Spelthorne.
- 1.2 It remains a statutory requirement for local authorities to work in partnership to reduce crime and Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB). We achieve this through the Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership (SSSP). Responsible partners namely the Local Authority, Fire & Rescue Service, Clinical Commissioning Group, Probation services, Surrey County Council and the Police, work collaboratively in partnership. The SSSP meets on a quarterly basis.
- 1.3 By working together, these organisations have a greater impact on preventing crime & disorder, and develop more effective and sustainable solutions to better protect, support and empower local residents to feel safe and secure.
- 1.4 Over the last few years, Government has introduced a number of national changes that have significantly impacted on the community safety landscape. Some of these changes include the introduction of directly elected Police & Crime Commissioners and the publishing of a range of national strategies and policies linked with domestic abuse, ASB, counter terrorism and crime prevention. All of which have altered the focus of the work delivered by the community safety partners.
- 1.5 Policing & community safety continues to change and the crime and demands on services/resources are different. Online and cyber-crime are increasing and there is an emergence of complex and harmful crimes such as sexual exploitation and human trafficking. While incidents linked with vulnerability

(e.g. mental health problems) are increasing and more victims are confidently reporting issues linked with domestic and sexual abuse.

- 1.6 In setting the current year's priorities, the SSSP used police data and the local crime profile. There was also stakeholder engagement to decide on the following priorities for 2017/18 which were:-
- Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)
 - Serious & Organised Crime (SOC)
 - Closed Circuit Television (CCTV)
 - Community Engagement
 - Water safety
- 1.7 The community safety partnership has the responsibility to convene a strategic group of all responsible authorities, prepare an assessment of local crime and community safety priorities using information provided by partner agencies and the community, and produce an action plan to meet those priorities. The Community Safety Team at Spelthorne takes responsibility for co-ordinating activities and events and driving performance.
- 1.8 It is important to recognise that the SSSP has statutory obligations, and although not listed as current strategic priorities, there continues to be a great deal of work undertaken to ensure we comply with relevant legislation. For example, as a partnership we have a responsibility to deliver activity linked with preventing violent extremism, commission reviews into domestic-related homicides and deliver actions to help minimise serious and organised crime within the borough. Partnership activity takes place around these themes, as part of our core day-to-day business and will continue to be delivered during 2018/19.
- 1.9 The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 defines ASB as:
- Conduct that has caused, or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to any person (i.e. objectively causes fear for one's own safety), or
 - Conduct capable of causing nuisance or annoyance to a person in relation to that persons occupational residential premises, or
 - Conduct capable of causing housing-related nuisance or annoyance to any person
- 1.10 The Spelthorne Neighbourhood policing team consists of 4 police officers and 10 police community support officers. The team are also supported by a large team of omnicompetent response officers. These police teams work closely with the council's 5 Joint Enforcement Team officers (JET) and 2 Community Safety Officers. Regular meetings take place between all of the team in the form of a joint tasking and co-ordinating meeting, where geographical problems around all areas of ASB are highlighted and actions allocated to deal with emerging and/or historical problems.
- 1.11 In August 2017 Surrey Police carried out a public confidence survey across the County which showed a confidence level of 94%, a 1.6% increase on the

last quarter of 2016/17. This increase was higher than the results from both Runnymede & Elmbridge.

2. Current position

ASB - police data

2.1 The following data which has been provided by Surrey Police shows the number of incidents of ASB and Crime reported to Surrey Police for the Borough of Spelthorne.

The data below shows an increase of 106 reported incidents of ASB over the previous 12 months.

Category description	2016-17	2017-18	% change
Abandoned vehicle not stolen or causing obstruction	193	209	8.2
Animal problems	29	24	-17
Fireworks-inappropriate sale/use/possession	36	32	-12
Malicious/nuisance communications	66	73	10.6
Noise	126	112	-12
Littering/Drugs paraphernalia	45	69	53
Nuisance neighbours	143	160	11.8
Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour	1337	1358	1.5
Street drinking	14	3	-79
Trespass	36	49	36
Vehicle nuisance/inappropriate use	543	585	7.7
Total	2568	2674	4.1

2.2 Whilst annual figures of ASB for 17/18 show a slight increase of 4.1%, there has been a general decline of recorded ASB incidents across the county in the last five years. The figures provided below show a 24% reduction in Surrey between 2013 & 2018.

Year	ASB
2013/14	3507
2014/15	3541
2015/16	3077
2016/17	2568
2017/18	2674

It is recognised that there is no room for complacency and the multi-agency partnership continues to work together to resolve local community issues.

2.3 The detail behind some of the figures in the table at **para 2.1** is given below:-

- Malicious nuisance/communications - a reflection of the use of social media
- Litter – this is mainly due to the proactive and active deployment of the Spelthorne Joint Enforcement Team (JET).
- Nuisance neighbours – which is a common issue, use of the Mediation Service has been used where possible.

- Trespass - the borough has suffered from a number of unauthorised encampments mainly in our parks. This is a county wide issue and we are working to help improve the process to resolve such incidents swiftly.
- Vehicle nuisance - during this period Bridge Street car park in Staines upon Thames became a focal point for car enthusiasts with associated ASB use of vehicles. This was successfully addressed by partner agencies through use of enforcement and physical measures.
- Total anti-social behaviour is up by 4.1% on the previous 12 months and continues to be monitored by the Police Neighbourhood Teams. However the focus of the ASB has been around “Threat, Harm and Risk”, this is to ensure that those that are vulnerable get a priority service in line with the force priorities. These are high-harm offences, hate crimes and domestic abuse and for North Surrey specifically includes domestic burglaries. Work was also carried out relating to “County Lines” drug dealers which has encouraged reporting of ASB in order to evidence closures.

3. Current position

Crime - police data.

3.1 The data in the table below shows an increase of 862 reported crimes over the previous 12 months

Crime type	2016-2017	2017-2018	% change
Criminal damage	884	1004	13.6
Domestic burglary	339	522	54
Drug offences	160	200	25
Fraud and forgery	6	13	116.7
Non-domestic burglary	222	123	-44.6
Other criminal offences	177	203	14.7
Other sexual offences	28	34	21.4
Robbery	29	31	6.9
Serious sexual	129*	145*	12.4
Theft (other than vehicle and handling stolen goods)	1305	1441	10.4
Vehicle crime (excluding interference)	512	553	8.0
Vehicle interference and tampering	43	54	25.6
Violence with injury	635	641	0.9
Violence without injury	1883*	2250*	19.5
Total notifiable offences	6352	7214	13.6

*Clarified post meeting

- Violence with injury is up by nearly 1% on the previous 12 months. This is the smallest increase across all crimes mainly because the detection of violent crimes is high.
- Violence without injury is up by 19.5% on the previous 12 months. The steep increase can be related to the fact that this category now includes harassment, public order issues and possession of weapons. Possession of

weapons has shown a relatively significant increase for the police force in the last 12 months. This is mainly amongst youths carrying weapons to protect themselves. There is an on-going education programme through the Youth Officers with the schools to tackle this issue.

- Theft and handling stolen goods (not including vehicle theft) is up by 10.4% on the previous 12 months. Despite this increase Surrey Police have the lowest recorded theft per 1000 population. This is currently still seeing an upward trend and Surrey Police officers are working with the Staines-upon-Thames Business Improvement District (BID) team to put an intelligence sharing system in place between the shops and the BID Rangers.
- Criminal damage is up by 13.6% on the previous 12 months. The upward movement in this category is around threats or possession with intent to commit damage. A number of these are crimes from domestic incidents i.e. where a child threatens to smash a parent's property and they are over the age of criminal responsibility.
- Data from across the County shows a marked increase in crime figures that range from an 18.4% increase in Waverley to an 8.6% decrease in Tandridge.

3.2 National figures from the Crime Survey for England & Wales (CSEW)

	Year ending December 2017	To note
Burglary	9% increase in police recorded offences (to 438,971)	Burglary offences are thought to be relatively well reported by the public and relatively well recorded by the police and so the increase in police recorded burglary is likely to reflect a genuine increase.
Computer misuse	28% decrease in offences estimated by the CSEW (to 1,374,000)	Falls in computer misuse crimes were the main driver of the overall decrease in crime estimated by the CSEW.
Fraud	No change in offences estimated by the CSEW (3,241,000)	The CSEW provides the best indication of the overall trend in fraud as it captures the lower-harm cases that are more frequent but less likely to have been reported to the authorities.
Homicide	9% increase in police recorded offences (to 653 – excluding terrorist attacks in London and Manchester and events at Hillsborough in 1989)	The recent trend is affected by exceptional events with multiple homicide victims.

Robbery	33% increase in police recorded offences (to 74,130)	Recording improvements are likely to have contributed to this rise, but the impact is thought to be less pronounced than for other crime types. Therefore, the increase may also reflect an element of a real change in these crimes. The CSEW does not provide a robust measure of short-term trends in robbery as it is a relatively low-volume crime.
Vehicle-related theft	17% increase in offences estimated by the CSEW (to 929,000)	A 16% increase was also seen in vehicle offences recorded by the police (to 452,683), continuing the rising trend seen over the last two years. Vehicle offences are thought to be relatively well reported by the public and well recorded by the police.
Violence	No change in overall violent offences estimated by the CSEW (1,245,000) 22% increase in police recorded knife or sharp instrument offences (to 39,598 offences) 11% increase in police recorded firearms offences (to 6,604 offences)	The CSEW provides the better measure of trends in overall violent crime, covering the more common but less harmful offences. Police recorded crime provides a better measure of the more harmful but less common violent offences that are not well measured by the survey because of their relatively low volume. These offences are thought to be relatively well recorded by the police.

4. Current Strategic Priorities

As well as reflecting on how the partnership responds to ASB generally and reviewing options and practices to ensure they remain fit for purpose, efforts have been focused elsewhere to target issues that are of concern to our communities. The following section provides a brief overview of the activities the Partnership has been involved in delivering in response to community concerns.

4.1 Combatting Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) Key Challenges

The Council and its partners continue to receive a high volume of complaints relating to ASB, ranging from nuisance and environmental related issues through to calls concerning behaviour targeted towards specific persons/groups. ASB reports have reduced over the last 5 years but still equate to almost 14% of all incidents recorded by Surrey Police in Spelthorne.

- ASB can affect anyone and negatively influences public confidence
- Tackling youth related ASB continues to be the top concern for local residents followed by rubbish, fly tipping, litter, dog fouling, speeding and/or dangerous driving and unauthorised encampments.

- Despite fewer partnership resources, resident's expectations of how we respond to ASB remains the same, which may lead to an increase in calls for service where no action is taken.
- The number of ASB cases that involve complex needs and vulnerability, which are more difficult to address (e.g. mental health related issues ASB) are increasing.
- There are national and local increases in the number of hate crime incidents with specific community groups known to be targeted, which are significantly underreported.

4.2 Combatting Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) and how we respond

- Work with partners to efficiently tackle the changing nature of ASB in order to effectively meet the demands of local communities
- Be intelligence led and information driven to ensure resources are deployed through tasking and coordination in the right areas at the right time to combat ASB effectively
- Ensure that timely and targeted enforcement action is taken against perpetrators of ASB
- Tackle specific elements of ASB e.g. youth disorder, graffiti-signal crimes etc.
- Work collectively in order to prevent and/or divert ASB and hate crime from occurring in the first place
- Review how we combat ASB within the borough in order to improve our response to ASB complaints
- Review the implementation of ASB legislation locally e.g. the use of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO)
- Deliver awareness raising campaigns to demonstrate the impact of ASB and hate crime
- Provide support to vulnerable and repeat victims of ASB and hate crime

4.3 Combatting Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) 2017/18 Actions

- Responding to community concerns associated with the anti-social use of vehicles in Sunbury by supporting the implementation of a dispersal order
- Review of the PSPO at Sunbury Cross to address street drinking to ensure that it was fit for purpose
- Utilised Community Protection Warnings (CPW) and Community Protection Notices (CPN) to target individuals who persistently act in an anti-social manner including parents where the children are consistently involved in ASB

- Taken a multi-agency approach to problem solving people and places. Three arrests have been made in response to issues and concerns around the misuse and theft of pedal cycles and mopeds

Moorings

During 2017/18 a total of 37 periods of enforcement were carried out (each period consisting of 3 days). During the same period 51 warning letters were issued to boat masters who had overstayed the 24 hour in 48 hour bye-laws.

- In May 2017 a Community Protection Warning Notice was issued to two boats illegally moored at Staines Bridge. Both boat masters had cordoned off the mooring and had used it to fly-tip rubbish, draw water from a Council building and use of a chemical toilet in plain view of the public.
- On 12 May 2017 at Staines Magistrates Court Leroy Bryant was convicted of 4 offences in relation to his boat St. George III. The boat had previously sunk at Kings Law. The offences related to abandoning the vessel and failing to deal with the derelict wreck. The Council were awarded £2125 in Compensation and £2001 in Costs.

Unauthorised encampments

During 2017/18 the Council had a total of 18 unauthorised encampments

- 11 were dealt with under the ASB Crime and Policing Act 2014 – SBC issued Community Protection Notices followed by Court Orders to leave the land
- 6 were dealt with under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 S.77 – SBC issued a direction to leave land and then obtained a S.78 order from the Court to leave the land
- 1 was dealt with by the Police using powers under S.61 of the Criminal Justice & Public Order Act 1994
- 3 of the unauthorised encampments required the services of Bailiffs to remove at a total cost of £12,615

4.4 Serious & Organised Crime

Organised crime covers a wide range of activities and individuals involved in areas such as Class A drug trafficking, organised immigration crime and fraud. Other threats include counterfeiting, cuckooing, high tech crime, armed robbery and other gun crime, art theft and money laundering.

“Cuckooing” is the term used to describe the practice where professional drug dealers take over the property of a vulnerable person and use it as a place from which to run their drugs business. The drug dealers will target those who are vulnerable, potentially as a result of substance abuse, mental health

issues, or loneliness, and befriend them or promise them drugs in exchange for being able to use their property.

4.5 **Serious & Organised Crime 2017/18 Actions**

Working alongside our partners there have been:-

- 4 partial house closures under ASB legislation to deal with Cuckooing
- 1 Criminal Behaviour Order served on a youth
- 1 Injunction
- A joint site visit with police, planning officers and JET officers was undertaken to investigate reports of modern slavery.
- Investigated £63,000 of Scrap Metal offences. Ashley Brooks of Ashdale Close, Stanwell was convicted at Guildford Magistrates Court on 17 July 2017 on 5 charges and ordered to pay £10,373. Mr Brooks later appealed and appeared at Guildford Crown Court on 21 February 2018. His conviction was upheld and his appeal was dismissed. The Judge did vary his sentence and reduced the order to pay to £6400.

4.6 **CCTV**

Closed Circuit Television (**CCTV**) is a system where the circuit in which the video is transmitted is closed and all the elements (camera, display monitors, recording devices) are directly connected. Our current CCTV on street monitoring systems are outdated. Capital funding was made available by Spelthorne and we have now procured a new wireless system (currently being installed) which will continue to be monitored from the CCTV control room based in Runnymede.

4.7 **CCTV 2017/18 Actions**

- We have awarded a new contract for the delivery of wireless CCTV cameras and connectivity. The camera replacement programme and connection is underway with the project expected to be complete in September/October 2018. This new system will assist with the detection and investigation of crime and disorder. CCTV signage will be reviewed as and when new cameras are installed.
- In 2018 SBC purchased 2 deployable CCTV cameras to assist with obtaining evidence around ASB. Both cameras have to date provided evidence in cases of fly tipping and youth disorder.
- Working with SCC the community safety team have identified a number of key location lamp columns (hotspots) where the deployable CCTV cameras could be located. These lamp columns in key locations have been adapted to enable us to quickly place a deployable camera as and when needed.
- A review of all CCTV camera locations has been undertaken to ensure that we comply with the Information Commissioners Office guidelines and GDPR Regulations. A report of this review has been published on the Council's website.

4.8 **Community Engagement**

We promote the concept of community based action to inhibit and remedy the causes and consequences of criminal, intimidatory and other related anti-social behaviour. Its purpose is to secure sustainable reductions in crime and the fear of crime in local communities.

4.9 **Community Engagement 2017/18 Actions**

- Worked with the voluntary and community sector to increase our knowledge and understanding of the issues that directly affect the most vulnerable in our community.
- Supported activities in the borough to improve community cohesion.
- Proactively assist with the “Prevent Programme” aimed at helping to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism through awareness raising around extremism. A Spelthorne resident was responsible for the attempted bombing at Parsons Green tube station, and was subject of a Channel Panel meeting under the Prevent Strategy. This process was run by Surrey County Council and is currently under review to ensure all learning points are identified and shared across all agencies.
- Continue to seek resources from the Police & Crime Commissioners Community Safety Fund to fund work within secondary schools in a priority area of the district highlighting the exploitation of young people by ‘County Lines’ gangs.
- Continue to review the Council’s web pages to ensure that residents are given clear guidance on who to contact for community safety issues, information and support.
- Delivered training to all 5 rotas at the Surrey Police contact centre to help improve customer service. The training resulted in agreed responses by the police to key issues such as noise nuisance, parking and ASB for callers using the 101 service.
- Proactively engaged with local communities to build relationships and provide advice, education and guidance.
- Delivery of the 2 week Junior Citizen event to over a thousand children from Spelthorne’s primary schools. At the event the children receive vital advice from teams at Spelthorne as well as St Johns Ambulance, Surrey Fire & Rescue, Surrey Police and the RNLI.
- Delivery of an ‘older persons’ afternoon briefing at the Salvation Army church and community centre. Those present were given advice on matters related to community safety, including topics such as frauds and scams. Over 60 older residents attended and we received much positive feedback. Further events are planned for later in 2018 and also 2019.
- Two Partnership Action Days (PAD) were delivered, the first focused on road safety, speeding, use of mobile phones and waste enforcement. The second integrated with ASB week and involved visits

to vulnerable victims, patrols of local hotspots and public information stalls within the Two Rivers shopping complex.

- A multi-agency response to vehicle related ASB at Bridge Street car park, resulting in physical improvements being introduced, joint letters being sent to registered owners of offending vehicles and police visits to residential properties.
- Assisted the police in delivering the Police Panel meetings giving residents the opportunity to ask questions on local issues affecting them.

4.10 **Water safety**

A tri-borough agreement with Elmbridge & Runnymede boroughs has been developed along the River Thames on a water safety project named “Respect the Water”. Fourteen enhanced water safety signs are being installed along the banks of the river along with throw-lines. The lines are stored in locked cabinets with access being achieved via the Surrey Fire & Rescue control room in case of need. Surrey County Council have provided financial support for this project.

4.11 **Spelthorne Safer Stronger Partnership (SSSP)**

The partnership works towards a rolling three year plan (2017-2020) with the following priorities:-

To reduce

- Crime – residential burglary, harm caused through misuse of drugs & alcohol, serious organised crime and violent & acquisitive crime
- Anti-Social Behaviour
- Re-offending
- The threat of Terrorism
- The threat of Child Sexual Exploitation and Cyber related crime

To improve

- Engagement with the public to help our communities become stronger
- Water safety in areas of the borough bounded by the River Thames

The SSSP meets quarterly and monitors delivery against the priorities of the two tactical partnership forums of Joint Enforcement Team (JET) the Tasking & Co-ordinating Group (JET/TCG) and the Community Incident Action Group (CIAG).

4.12 **Joint Enforcement Team (JET) tasking & coordinating group**

Since April 2018 this group has worked on interventions at 38 locations on the borough across a wide range of community issues.

These mainly involve low level ASB (noise/youth disorder/parking issues/anti-social use of vehicles/planning breaches). To date 12 (32%) of these issues have been closed due to noted improvements in the area which is characterised by a cessation of reported issues.

4.13 **Community Incident Action Group (CIAG)**

Since April 2018 this group has monitored 13 adults, two families and three juveniles. These individuals have been of concern due to their disruptive impact within their local community and/or their vulnerability as victims of anti-social behaviour/criminal behaviour.

Interventions include:-

- 8 Criminal Behaviour Orders (Includes 3 converted ASB Orders)
- 1 Civil Injunction
- 4 Partial Closure Orders of premises (to prevent criminal “cuckooing”)

5. Financial implications

- 5.1 The SSSP receives a grant from the Police & Crime Commission which is used to fund small community projects within the borough.
- 5.2 There are no additional financial implications as the Community Safety team and JET officers are funded by Spelthorne Borough Council.

Background papers: There are none

Appendices: SSSP plan 2018-2021 (this is in process of being updated and the final version will follow when it has been signed off by the SSSP Board at its meeting on 6 September)

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)

DATE: 10TH DECEMBER 2018



SURREY

LEAD OFFICER: NICK HEALEY, AREA HIGHWAY MANAGER (NE)

SUBJECT: HIGHWAYS UPDATE

DIVISION: ALL

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

This report summarises progress with the Joint Committee's programme of Highways works for the current Financial Year 2018-19.

Committee is asked to agree the strategy for allocation of Joint Committee Highways budgets for next Financial Year 2019-20. Further Committee is asked to agree a programme of Integrated Transport Schemes (ITS schemes) for next Financial Year 2019-20.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Joint Committee (Spelthorne) is asked:

- (i) To agree the strategy for allocation of Joint Committee Highways budgets for next Financial Year 2019-20 as set out in Table 4 (paragraphs 2.1.8 to 2.1.12 refer);
- (ii) To delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Divisional Member, to decide on completion of the feasibility study and subject to funding being made available, whether to promote a traffic regulation order for a new width restriction in Horton Road, Stanwell Moor Village, to consider any objections to any traffic regulation order and if feasible to implement the scheme (paragraphs 2.2.2 to 2.2.3 refer);
- (iii) To agree the programme of ITS schemes for next Financial Year 2019-20 as set out in Table 6 (paragraphs 2.2.4 to 2.2.6 refer);
- (iv) To agree to the removal of 33 schemes from the prioritisation list in Annex A (paragraph 2.2.7 refers);
- (v) To agree to the Area Highway Manager reviewing the Staines SCOOT region revalidation project with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Staines Division and Ward Members, to review the observations of the project team and prioritise suggestions for further work (paragraphs 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 refer);
- (vi) To provide feedback on the draft reviewed Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme to the Area Highway Manager by 10th January 2019 (paragraphs 2.10.2 to 2.10.6 and Annex C refer);
- (vii) Authorise the Area Highway Manager in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and relevant Divisional Member(s) to undertake all necessary procedures to deliver the agreed programmes.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendations are made to facilitate development of Committee's 2019-20 Highways programmes, while at the same time ensuring that the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Members are fully and appropriately involved in any detailed considerations.

Committee is asked to provide the necessary authorisation to deliver its programmes of work in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and relevant Divisional Member without the need to revert to the Committee as a whole.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) aims to improve the highway network for all users. In general terms it aims to reduce congestion, improve accessibility, reduce the frequency and severity of road casualties, improve the environment, and maintain the network so that it is safe for public use.
- 1.2 The Spelthorne Joint Committee has been delegated Highways budgets to be able to contribute to the objectives set out in Surrey County Council's LTP, according to local priorities.

2. ANALYSIS:

2.1 Joint Committee finance

- 2.1.1 The Spelthorne Joint Committee has been delegated Highway budgets in the current Financial Year 2018-19 as follows:
 - Committee revenue: £168,182
 - Member revenue: £52,500 (£7,500 per Division)
 - Capital: £36,364
 - Capital under spend carried forward from 2017-18: £30,500
 - **Total: £287,546**
(2018-19 budget £257,046 plus 2017-18 carry forward £30,500)
- 2.1.2 The funds delegated to the Joint Committee are in addition to funds allocated at a County level to cover various Highways maintenance and improvement activities, including inspection and repair of safety defects, resurfacing, structures, vegetation maintenance, and drainage.
- 2.1.3 In accordance with Committee's authorisation in March 2018, the Area Highway Manager consulted Committee at its informal meeting of April 2018 and allocated the 2018-19 budgets as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Allocation of budgets for 2018-19

Allocation	Amount
Capital to deliver minor ITS schemes and feasibility studies	£36,400
Capital contingency	£30,000
Revenue for day to day maintenance To cover various revenue concerns across the Borough for example: patching and kerb works, minor safety schemes, extra vegetation and drainage.	£168,200
To support the ITS programme or the maintenance programmes according to priorities within each Division	£52,500 £7,500 per Divisional Member.
Re-validation of Staines Town Centre SCOOT region	£30,000 from Parking surplus
Revenue to deliver the Parking Review	£20,000 from Parking surplus
Develop strategic schemes for CIL bids The Area Highways Manager will work with the CIL Task Group to develop recommendations for schemes to develop with this allocation.	£18,000 from Parking Surplus <i>subject to agreement of programme of schemes</i>
Total	£355,100 Including £68,000 from Parking Surplus

2.1.4 In addition to the regular Highways capital and revenue budgets detailed above Committee is able to make allocations from the parking surplus. The surplus must be spent according to section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/27/section/55>). Expenditure can cover all types of highway improvement and maintenance. The parking surplus and associated expenditure is detailed in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Parking surplus – financial summary

Surplus	Amount	Expenditure / Allocation	Amount
2013-14	£22,868	Signs & lines maintenance and additional enforcement	£32,000 (Expenditure)
2014-15	£8,407	2017-18 Parking Review implementation	£20,000 (Allocation to be used in 2018-19)
2015-16	£38,577	2017-18 develop strategic schemes for CIL bids	£18,000 (Originally allocated in 2017-18)

Surplus	Amount		Expenditure / Allocation	Amount
2016-17	£36,966		Re-validation of Staines Town Centre SCOOT region	£30,000 (Allocation to be used in 2018-19)
2017-18	£8,500			
Total	£115,318		Total	£100,000

- 2.1.5 Members will observe that the parking surplus account is currently under allocated, and also that monies that were previously allocated have not been spent. Monies from the parking surplus carry over from Financial Year to Financial Year, so the unallocated monies may be held in reserve for future projects.
- 2.1.6 To date there has been no expenditure from the previous allocation from the parking surplus to develop strategic schemes for CIL bids. Spelthorne Borough Council Officers are preparing to convene an advisory group of officers to identify potential community infrastructure projects of all kinds within Spelthorne. The intention is to make recommendations to the CIL Task Group in the New Year. If the CIL Task Group were to approve highway / transport infrastructure projects as part of a greater programme of community infrastructure projects, the £18,000 allocation would be needed to develop these schemes to the point where CIL bids could be submitted for consideration.
- 2.1.7 Officers will update Committee with progress in the delivery of its works programmes at each Committee meeting. In addition Committee Chairmen are provided with detailed monthly finance updates, which detail all the orders raised against the various budgets, as well as the works planned for each of the budgets.
- 2.1.8 At its October meeting Committee agreed provisional allocation of its 2019-20 Highways budgets based on the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) that was agreed by Surrey County Council's Cabinet on 27th March 2018. This was the MTFP that was current at the time. The provisional Highways budget allocations for 2019-20 agreed by Committee in October 2018 are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Previously agreed provisional allocation of budgets for 2019-20

Allocation	Amount
Capital to deliver minor ITS schemes and feasibility studies	£36,000
Revenue for day to day maintenance To cover various revenue concerns across the Borough for example: patching and kerb works, minor safety schemes, extra vegetation and drainage.	£196,000
To support the ITS programme or the maintenance programmes according to priorities within each Division	£70,000 £10,000 per Divisional Member.
Total	£302,000

2.1.9 In October 2018 Committee was made aware that in the context of the current financial challenges faced by the County Council, the MTFP was likely to be reviewed, and any Highways budgets allocated to Local and Joint Committees may well change. On 17th November the Lead Cabinet Member for Place announced the following Highways amended budget allocations for the Local and Joint Committees:

- Capital: £2,000,000 split evenly between all eleven areas, with each Local and Joint Committee receiving £181,818.
- Revenue: £7,500 per Division.
- The only other source of revenue funding available is Parking Surplus in areas where this is produced.

2.1.10 The provisional allocation of budgets shown in Table 3 is no longer possible. It is therefore recommended to allocate Committee's Highways budgets for next Financial Year 2019-20 as outlined below in Table 4.

Table 4 Recommended amended allocation of budgets for 2019-20

Allocation	Amount
Capital to deliver minor ITS schemes and feasibility studies	£100,000
Capital for patching / resurfacing of carriageways and footways	£81,818
Maintenance works according to priorities within each Division	£52,500 £7,500 per Divisional Member.
Total	£234,318

2.1.11 Please see below for discussion and recommendations for the 2019-20 programme of ITS schemes and feasibility studies.

2.1.12 It is possible that there will be further parking surplus income during 2018-19, which Committee could allocate to programmes of works in 2019-20, in addition to any Highways budgets that may be delegated to Committee.

2.2 Joint Committee capital works programme

2.2.1 This Financial Year's allocation for Capital ITS schemes is being used to promote capital schemes previously approved by the Joint Committee. In accordance with Committee's authorisation in March 2018, this programme has been decided by the Area Highway Manager in consultation with Committee. Table 5 below summarises progress with this capital programme.

Table 5 Progress with Capital ITS Programme

Location	Proposed works	Cost	Status
Ashford Road	Speed Management measures	£8,000 including contribution from Divisional Member	Detailed design for improvements to signs and road markings complete; awaiting implementation in November or December 2018. Two new VAS also to be included in scheme.
Charlton Village	Further feasibility work following the previous traffic and speed management feasibility study.	£2,400 including contribution from Divisional Member	On hold pending outcome of potential Shepperton Studios development.
Laleham Village	Further feasibility work following the previous traffic and speed management feasibility study.	£5,000 including contribution from Divisional Member	Feasibility study in progress. Due to be published in March 2019.
Wraysbury Road near Vicarage Road	New pedestrian refuge island	£10,000 to £20,000 including contribution from Divisional Member	Detailed design complete. Awaiting construction in the New Year.
Springfield School	Safety improvements	£5,000	Complete. Halo beacons installed at Zebra Crossing. Bollards installed to prevent footway parking.
Spelthorne School	Safety improvements	£tbc Developer funding available for implementation	Officers have met with the Divisional Member to identify preferred options. Detailed design in progress. Legal notice for a new Zebra Crossing to be advertised.
A308 Staines Road West junction with C233 Chertsey Road and Littleton Road (Black Dog junction)	Pedestrian improvements	£5,000 to 10,000 for feasibility study	Feasibility study in progress. Due to be published in March 2019.

Location	Proposed works	Cost	Status
Laytons Lane	New 20mph limit	£2,000 including contribution from Divisional Member	Complete.
Halliford Road, on the approach to Halliford Village	New VAS	£2,500 including contribution from Divisional Member	Location agreed; quotes for installation received.
French Street	Feasibility study for extension of the 20mph Zone	£5,000 including contribution from Divisional Member	Feasibility study in progress. Due to be published in March 2019.
Stanwell Moor Village width restriction	Feasibility study for new weight restriction	£5,000 Funded by Spelthorne Borough Council	See comments below.
Total – noting that costs are approximate		Approximately £49,900 to £64,900	

2.2.2 A commitment was given at the Joint Committee meeting in October 2018 that £5,000 funding for the **Stanwell Moor Village width restriction** feasibility study would be provided by Spelthorne Borough Council, and that there would be a progress update at Committee's December 2018 meeting. In the week following Committee's October meeting, officers discussed possible routes to deliver the feasibility study. The Area Highway Manager provided a draft commission brief to Spelthorne Borough Council on 16th October 2018, to enable Spelthorne Borough Council to approach a number of transport consultants to explore costs and likely timescales for delivery. Quotations were returned from two transport consultants in mid-November. Both consultants that responded indicated that they could complete the feasibility study by March 2019, but the quoted costs were in the range £13,000 to £16,000. Surrey County Council's design team could complete the feasibility study for approximately £5,000, but the study would need to take its turn in the Countywide programme of improvement schemes, meaning that the earliest the feasibility study could be reported to Committee would be at its June 2019 meeting. Therefore to ensure that there is no undue delay in progressing this scheme, Spelthorne Borough Council has decided to provide additional funding to be able to commission a transport consultant to complete the study.

2.2.3 To ensure that there is no delay to this project while waiting for the Joint Committee to meet, it is recommended to delegate authority to the Area Highway Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Divisional Member, to decide whether to promote a traffic regulation order for a new width restriction in Horton Road, Stanwell Moor Village as and when the feasibility study concludes and funding is made available for implementation. Committee should note that no funding has currently been identified to implement this project, and that implementation of the project would be subject to the relevant statutory consultation processes. If a decision is taken to promote a new width restriction the earliest a new width restriction could be implemented would be next Financial Year 2019-20.

- 2.2.4 Committee's prioritisation list of ITS schemes is presented in Annex A. Officers have reviewed and re-prioritised this list. The first section lists ten schemes for which feasibility studies and designs have already been completed, or are anticipated to be completed by the end of the current Financial Year 2018-19. These are schemes that Committee could consider for implementation next Financial Year 2019-20, subject to funding being available.
- 2.2.5 The second section lists 29 schemes that have some technical justification but for which there has been no feasibility or design to date. These are schemes Committee could consider for feasibility studies next Financial Year 2019-20. Committee should note that because no feasibility or design work has been done on these schemes, the cost estimates for priority ranking purposes are very approximate.
- 2.2.6 Officers have prioritised schemes in the first and second sections of Annex A according to Local Transport Plan objectives. The recommended programme of ITS schemes for 2019-20 is outlined in Table 6 below. Officers have taken into account the priority ranking based on cost vs benefit, and also the affordability of schemes within the context of the Joint Committee's annual Highways budgets. A number of the schemes on Committee's prioritisation list would be highly beneficial in terms of the County Council's Local Transport Plan objectives, but could only be implemented with funding in addition to the Joint Committee's budgets, for example CIL.

Table 6 Recommended Capital ITS Programme for 2019-20

Location	Proposed works	Cost	Status
Worple Road, Staines	Implementation of accessibility improvements (dropped kerbs)	£15,000	Feasibility study presented to Committee in March 2016.
French Street, Lower Sunbury	Implementation of extension of 20mph zone northwards and improvements to pedestrian crossing at Hawke Park	£30,000	Feasibility study in progress. Due to be published in March 2019. Part of Lower Sunbury area wide scheme.
Halliford Road, between Halliford Village and Thames Street	Implementation of accessibility improvements (dropped kerbs)	£30,000	Outline design completed in 2016 for a range of improvements. Drawings available on request. Need to prioritise which improvements to implement with Divisional Member.
Laleham Village	Implementation of speed and traffic management measures and pedestrian improvements	£tbc	Feasibility study in progress. Due to be published in March 2019. This scheme may be delivered in the context of the Shepperton Studios development.
Shepperton High Street	Feasibility study for pedestrian improvements.	£8,000	New feasibility study. May be able to implement low cost scheme using allocated funding.

Location	Proposed works	Cost	Status
Walton Lane, Shepperton	Feasibility study for amendment to one-way system.	£5,000 Funded from Walton to Halliford Transport study	New feasibility study. Spin off from Walton to Halliford Transport Study.
Lower Hampton Road, Sunbury	Feasibility study for speed management scheme.	£3,500	New feasibility study prompted by cluster of casualties.
Church Street / Green Street, Lower Sunbury	Feasibility study for extension of 20mph Zone to start of one-way system	£5,000	New feasibility study. Part of Lower Sunbury area wide scheme.
Gresham Road, Staines	Feasibility study for traffic, parking and speed management.	£5,000	New feasibility study.
Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton	Feasibility study for pedestrian crossing improvements	£5,000 Funded from Walton to Halliford Transport study	New feasibility study. Spin off from Walton to Halliford Transport Study.
Buckland School	Feasibility study for Road Safety Outside Schools scheme.	£3,500	New feasibility study for measures to follow on from improvements funded by Divisional Member in 2018-19.
Total – noting that costs are approximate		Approximately £110,000 Including £10,000 from the Walton to Halliford Transport Study	

2.2.7 Annex A also lists 33 schemes that are recommended for removal from the prioritisation list:

- Nine schemes that are now complete, or due to be completed imminently.
- Three schemes for which feasibility studies have been completed, and where no action was recommended.
- Five schemes to be put on the back burner as it is expected that these will be addressed as part of another project.
- Sixteen schemes to be removed for other reasons – the predominant reason being that there is no technical justification to pursue these schemes.

2.2.8 Officers will keep the Chairman, Vice Chairman and appropriate Divisional Member updated as these schemes are delivered, taking decisions as necessary to ensure the programmes are delivered, and cost variations managed

2.3 Joint Committee revenue works programme

2.3.1 The £168,000 revenue allocated for day to day maintenance works is now fully committed to patching of footways and carriageways, kerb repairs, vegetation management, and replacing damaged posts.

2.3.2 Of the £18,000 allocated to develop strategic schemes for CIL bids, there has been no expenditure so far. Monies from the parking surplus do not have to be spent by the end of the Financial Year; they can carry forward indefinitely.

- 2.3.3 Of the £52,500 Members' allocations, £47,500 has now been committed to various schemes, including contributions to ITS schemes, carriageway patching, vegetation management, new posts and railings. Officers will continue to work with Members to ensure these allocations are invested fully.
- 2.3.4 The £30,000 allocated to re-validation of the Staines Town Centre SCOOT region is being used to review, improve, repair, and re-validate traffic signal controlled junctions in the town centre area. The original intention to complete the revalidation by Spring 2018 was delayed due to technical issues following the upgrade of the central Urban Traffic Control (UTC) system earlier this year, and also by capacity limitations in the Traffic Signals Team due to vacancies.
- 2.3.5 Significant progress has now been made with this project – Annex B provides details of work completed to date, further work that is planned as part of this project, and observations for consideration for future extensions to this project. Members are encouraged to read Annex B in detail. What is becoming clear is that to optimise traffic movement through Staines Town Centre will take considerably more effort than a revalidation of the SCOOT region. It is recommended that the Area Highway Manager review this project with the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Staines Division and Ward Members, to review the observations of the project team and prioritise suggestions for further work.

2.4 Parking

- 2.4.1 The 2017 review is complete apart from some snagging.

Other highway related matters

2.5 Customer services

- 2.5.1 The total number of enquiries received for the nine months between January and September 2018 is 118,041 – an average of 13,115 per month. This is a slight reduction in the average for the first six months of 2018 which was 15,208 per month and is line with the seasonal trend where the summer months generate less enquiries. This also reflects the work undertaken to deal with the severe weather and subsequent defects.
- 2.5.2 For Spelthorne specifically, 7,882 enquiries have been received since January of which 3,783 (48%) were directed to the local area office for action, of these 91% have been resolved. This response rate is below the countywide average of 95%.
- 2.5.3 Since January, Highways & Transport have received 247 Stage 1 complaints (down 16% from the same period in 2017) of which 24 were for the Spelthorne area. In addition five have been escalated to stage 2 of the complaints process where the service was found to be partially at fault in one but with no injustice to the customer.

2.6 Major schemes

- 2.6.1 The **Wider Staines Sustainable Transport Package (STP)** schemes are progressing. The construction of the Town Lane shared cycle route has been completed between the Tesco junction to High Street, Stanwell.

- 2.6.2 Construction of the Stanwell Moor Road route is currently underway with works due to be completed by March 2019. This scheme includes improving pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities and improving accessibility of the route between Horton Road to the Crooked Billet roundabout via Stanwell New Road. The scheme also involves improvements to the bus stops on Stanwell Moor Road including providing waiting shelters and making the bus stop more accessible for users.
- 2.6.3 Wider bus facility improvements are also in progress across the project area including the installation of Real Time Passenger Information display screens at certain bus stops, installing raised kerbs to make alighting and boarding the bus easier as well as improving waiting facilities such as installing shelters.
- 2.6.4 Further information on the Wider Staines STP scheme is published on our website here <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/policies-plansconsultations/major-transport-projects/spelthorne-major-transport-schemes>.
- 2.6.5 Officers are preparing a briefing note to summarise the findings of the **Walton to Halliford Transport Study**, in preparation for a meeting with the Member Task Group in autumn 2018. The aim of this meeting would be to review the findings of the study and agree what, if any, schemes should be promoted on the basis of the available evidence.

2.7 Centrally funded maintenance

- 2.7.1 Operation Horizon reports for 2018-19 are available on the Surrey County Council website. These reports list road that are due to be treated in the current Financial Year 2018-19. Also on the same page of the Surrey County Council website is the latest information regarding the Winter Damage programme, and lists of roads for consideration for future Financial Years or the Horizon programme. For more information please see here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/highways-information-online/horizon-highway-maintenance-investment-programme>.

2.8 Road safety

- 2.8.1 There was no update at the time of writing.

2.9 Passenger Transport

- 2.9.1 No update at the time of writing.

2.10 Other key information, strategy and policy development

- 2.10.1 The Cold Weather Plan has been updated for 2018-19 and is on the website here: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/salting-and-gritting>. Salting Routes can be seen on the map by following link on this page: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/roadworks-and-maintenance/salting-and-gritting/salting-routes-in-surrey>.
- 2.10.2 The Spelthorne Local Transport Strategy (LTS) forms part of Surrey County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) and was adopted in 2015; it has not been formally updated since. The strategy is intended to support the growth set out

www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorne

within Spelthorne Borough Council's Local Plan and provide a programme of transport infrastructure required to deliver this growth. It draws together a broad evidence base together with a forward programme of aspirational infrastructure improvements to provide a basis for future funding bids. The Spelthorne Local Transport Strategy is published online here: www.surreycc.gov.uk/localtransportstrategies.

- 2.10.3 The Forward Programme is an annex to the LTS and it has been reviewed by officers in the last 3-4 months to update details of identified infrastructure schemes. The draft reviewed Forward Programme has been included as Annex B to this report. This is the first review of the forward programme since it was published in 2015; the forward programme will be reviewed annually going forwards to ensure it remains up to date and relevant.
- 2.10.4 The forward programme currently published was based on the 2007 Transport Evaluation for Spelthorne Borough Council's Core Strategy which took into account developing needs within Spelthorne based on the Core Strategy 2009. A full review of the LTS will take place in line with the emerging Spelthorne Local Plan to take account of changes.
- 2.10.5 This first annual update reviews each scheme, recognising that some schemes within the original forward programme have now been completed, and that others may have been re-scoped.
- 2.10.6 The Joint Committee is asked to note the revised Forward Programme and is invited to provide feedback on this updated Forward Programme through the Area Highway Manager, copied to tamsin.ward@surreycc.gov.uk, by 10th January 2019. After this date, the Forward Programme will be uploaded to our website to replace the previous version at www.surreycc.gov.uk/localtransportstrategies.

3. OPTIONS:

- 3.1 None at this stage. Officers will revert to the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Member, or indeed the Committee as appropriate, whenever preferred options need to be identified.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 None at this stage. Officers will consult the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Divisional Members as appropriate in the delivery of the programmes detailed above.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The financial implications of this paper are detailed in section 2 above.

6. WIDER IMPLICATIONS:

Area assessed:	Direct Implications:
Crime and Disorder	A well-managed highway network can contribute to reduction in crime

	and disorder as well as improve peoples' perception of crime.
Equality and Diversity	It is an objective of Surrey Highways to take account of the needs of all users of the public highway.
Localism (including community involvement and impact)	The Joint Committee prioritises its expenditure according to local priorities.
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.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 7.1 This Financial Year's programmes are being delivered.
- 7.2 Members are asked to approve the strategy for spending next Financial Year's budgets.
- 7.3 Members are asked to approve a programme of ITS schemes for next Financial Year.
- 7.4 Members are asked to provide feedback on the draft reviewed Local Transport Strategy Forward Programme.
- 7.5 Members are encouraged to work with Officers to maintenance works for next Financial Year's Divisional revenue allocations.

8. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

- 8.1 The Area Team Manager will work with Divisional Members, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman to deliver this Financial Year's Divisional Programmes, and to develop next Financial Year's programme of investment.

Contact Officer: Nick Healey, Area Highway Manager (NE)

Consulted: N / A

Annexes: 3

Sources/background papers: None

This page is intentionally left blank

SPELTHORNE LTP SCHEMES RANKING - NOV 2018				Congestion					Accessibility					Safety					Environment			Economy																	
Rank	Scheme / Title	County Division	Developer funding £(k)	Vehicle delay impact	Traffic growth impact	Support travel plan	Technological congestion management	Parking management	Con. Score	Wgtd. Adj.	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	20%	Econ. Score	Wgtd. Adj.	FINAL SCORE	Cost	Benefit/ Cost		
<p>Factors should be assessed considering whether the proposed scheme will have a positive or negative effect, using the range of (-5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5), with negative figures being a negative effect, and positive ones beneficial. The score given should reflect factors such as the type of road, traffic volumes, likely impact of scheme etc.</p> <p>For KSI and accident statistics, the number of accidents over the preceding three year period should be entered, but only if these are directly relevant to the purpose of the scheme.</p>																																							
<p>Schemes with feasibility or detailed design complete These are schemes that Committee could consider for construction next Financial Year 2019-20, subject to funding being available.</p>																																							
<p>Key: Detailed design complete or in progress. Feasibility study complete or in progress.</p>																																							
1	Worple Road, Staines, Pedestrian Crossing (Detailed design complete for minor accessibility improvements)	Staines South and Ashford West		0	0	2	0	0	2.00	30.00	3	0	2	0	0	5.00	75.00	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3.00	105.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	210.00	15	14000.000
2	French Street - extend 20mph northwards and improved pedestrian / cycle crossing at Hawke Park (Feasibility study in progress.) (Relates to Lower Sunbury area wide study.)	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	1	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	0	2	0	1	4.00	60.00	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	6.00	210.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	300.00	30	10000.000
3	Pedestrian improvements in Halliford Road (Detailed design complete for minor accessibility improvements)	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		0	0	1	0	0	1.00	15.00	3	1	2	0	0	6.00	90.00	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3.00	105.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	210.00	30	7000.000
4	Laleham Village speed and traffic management; pedestrian improvements (Feasibility study in progress.)	Laleham and Shepperton		0	0	1	0	0	1.00	15.00	2	1	1	0	0	4.00	60.00	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.00	70.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	145.00	25	5800.000
5	A308 / A244 Staines Road West / Windmill Road / Cadbury Road pedestrian improvements (Feasibility study complete)	Ashford & Sunbury Common and Ashford Common		-1	0	2	1	0	2.00	30.00	4	0	4	4	4	16.00	240.00	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	4.00	140.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	410.00	170	2411.765
6	A308/ B378 School Road junction improvement (Detailed design complete for substantial junction improvements)	Ashford & Sunbury Common and Ashford Common		2	0	2	3	0	7.00	105.00	4	0	4	4	4	16.00	240.00	4	1	7	0	2	0	0	14.00	490.00	0	1	0	0	1.00	15.00	1	1	2.00	40.00	890.00	450	1977.778
7	Horton Road, Stanwell Moor Village - new width restriction to back up the environmental weight restriction (Feasibility study in progress.)	Stanwell and Stanwell Moor		0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.00	35.00	0	0	0	4	4.00	60.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	95.00	50	1900.000
8	A308 junction with Chertsey Road (Bulldog junction) - improved pedestrian facilities (Feasibility study in progress.)	Sunbury Common and Ashford Common		-1	0	1	1	0	1.00	15.00	4	0	4	4	4	16.00	240.00	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3.00	105.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	360.00	200	1800.000
9	Cadbury Road junction with Chertsey Road - pedestrian facilities (Feasibility study complete)	Ashford & Sunbury Common and Ashford Common		0	0	3	2	0	5.00	75.00	4	0	4	4	4	16.00	240.00	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4.00	140.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	455.00	450	1011.111
10	Garrick Close parking (Options developed in consultation with Divisional Member.)	Staines		0	0	0	0	2	2.00	30.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	-1	0	0	0	-1.00	-15.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	15.00	15	1000.000
<p>No feasibility or detailed design to date This means that cost estimates for ranking purposes are VERY approximate. These are schemes Committee could consider for feasibility studies next Financial Year 2019-20.</p>																																							
1	Shepperton High Street - replace existing zebra lights with Halo Lights	Shepperton		0	0	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	1	2	0	0	4.00	60.00	0	0	5	1	2	0	0	8.00	280.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	370.00	8	46250.000
2	Walton Lane - amend one-way system	Laleham and Shepperton		1	0	0	0	0	1.00	15.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.00	105.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	120.00	10	12000.000
3	Lower Hampton Road, Sunbury (Darby Crescent – Harfield Road) - amendments to speed limit terminals plus entry treatments	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	0	0	0	0	-1.00	-15.00	0	0	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	6.00	210.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	225.00	20	11250.000
4	Church Street/Green Street-extend 20mph zone to start of one way system (Relates to Lower Sunbury area wide study.)	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	1	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	0	2	0	1	4.00	60.00	2	0	1	2	2	1	0	8.00	280.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	370.00	35	10571.429
5	Gresham Road - speed reducing measures - ref petition to Committee in March 2017	Staines		-1	1	2	0	2	4.00	60.00	1	2	1	0	1	5.00	75.00	1	0	4	2	3	1	0	11.00	385.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	520.00	50	10400.000
6	Walton Bridge Road pedestrian crossing x 2	Laleham and Shepperton		0	0	1	0	0	1.00	15.00	2	2	2	1	0	7.00	105.00	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.00	70.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	190.00	20	9500.000
7	Buckland School (RSOS scheme)	Ashford		0	0	1	0	2	3.00	45.00	2	0	2	0	0	4.00	60.00	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	5.00	175.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	280.00	30	9333.333
8	Link from Hawke Park cycle route to Green Lane Toucan	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		0	0	2	0	0	2.00	30.00	2	0	2	0	2	6.00	90.00	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2.00	70.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	190.00	30	6333.333
9	Feltham Hill Road near Woodlands Parade - new pedestrian crossing	Ashford & Sunbury Common and Ashford Common		-1	0	1	0	0	0.00	0.00	2	0	1	0	0	3.00	45.00	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3.00	105.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	2	2.00	40.00	190.00	30	6333.333
10	Lower Sunbury area wide road safety and speed management study to include Nursery Road, Green Street, Manor Lane, The Avenue, French Street and adjoining side roads.	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	1	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	0	2	0	1	4.00	60.00	7	3	18	2	2	1	0	33.00	1155.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	1245.00	200	6225.000
11	Church Street / Wraysbury Road HGV management	Staines		1	0	0	0	0	1.00	15.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	3	3.00	45.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	60.00	10	6000.000
12	Extend Thames Street 20mph Zone into The Avenue (Relates to Lower Sunbury area wide study.)	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	1	1	0	1	2.00	30.00	1	0	2	0	1	4.00	60.00	0	1	5	2	2	1	0	11.00	385.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	475.00	100	4750.000
13	A244 Upper Halliford Road/Nursery Road junction - improvements for pedestrians	Lower Sunbury and Halliford		-1	0	3	2	0	4.00	60.00	4	3	4	4	4	19.00	285.00	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2.00	70.00	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	415.00	100	4150.000
14	Feltham Road - HGV mitigation inc traffic calming, ped crossing near Verona Court, road surface improvement and iron work relocation - Also speed management in response to residents' concerns over the speed of traffic and consequent risk of casualties	Ashford		-1	0	0	0	0	-1.00	-15.00	0	0	1	0	0	1.00	15.00	2	0	9	1	1	0	0	13.00	455.00	0	1	2	2	5.00	75.00	1	0	1.00	20.00	550.00	150	3666.667

This page is intentionally left blank

Staines SCOOT region revalidation update report, 20th November 2018

Short glossary

SCOOT: **S**plit **C**ycle **O**ffset **O**ptimised **T**iming. A “region” of traffic signals junction working as a team)

UTC: **U**rbain **T**raffic **C**ontrol. The traffic signals are connected to a single computer, which controls all the traffic signals in real time, taking information from on street detectors, and sending control signals back to the traffic signal controllers. UTC enables SCOOT to operate.

VA: **V**ehicle **A**ctuation. This is a local control method where different junctions work in isolation from each other. The timings of each stage in the sequence are adjusted (up to maximum pre-set values) as vehicles pass over detector loops on the approaches.

J215, Junction of B376 Wraysbury Road with Hale Street (Two Rivers)

J215 Current works carried out

This site has been validated for SCOOT operation and we have altered the right turn into the Two Rivers site enabling better flow into Hale Street in an attempt to keep traffic moving away from the Staines Bridge. This does result in extended queues on the approach from Wraysbury. We are planning to visit during evening peaks to assess what traffic behaviour is resulting from this as there maybe issues for the wider network by promoting movements here which are mentioned in “network wide comments” section below.

We note that due to the age of the controller on older standards when this site is operating under UTC/SCOOT the pedestrian movements are always called, leading to some lost time, however the wider co-ordination we believe out weighs the lost time at this moment in time. In light of this the junction only runs in UTC/SCOOT mode during the peak morning and evening times. At all other times the site will run on VA and run to demand, we have also undated the VA timings which did not match the current traffic flows.

J215 Further works

The site is currently on the refurbishment list for 2019. We therefore expect further improvements operationally to come from this refurbishment.

J215 Observations for consideration

- We note that the road surface is poor in this location and lining is fair to worn, the integrity of some detectors is at risk in some locations and may not be repaired due to poor road surface potentially leading to less efficient traffic movement.
- On several occasions the right turners into the Two Rivers site were exit blocked, leading to vehicles rapidly congesting Hale Street. It would be beneficial to have a yellow box across the junction a keep clear to try and assist keeping Hale Street exit free flowing.

J226, Junction of Staines Bridge with Clarence Street

J226 Current works carried out

The site has been validated for SCOOT operation. SCOOT detectors have been retuned as these had been set incorrectly over time and providing “bad” data to the system. A main outcome of the project is to reduce queues on the bridge so this approach has been weighted to assist with this, see J226 observations below for more information. From the Clarence Street approach heading westbound the SCOOT detection is poorly sited across two lanes, where lane one is ahead and lane two is for right turning traffic. This resulted in the SCOOT model incorrectly viewing both lanes as ahead traffic. We have rewired the

SCOOT loop into one of the VA traffic loops somewhat closer to the junction's stop-line to test if this will allow for correct SCOOT modelling. This will save re-cutting the SCOOT loop for the time being and provide time savings at the initial and end ramps of peak traffic (start and end of a peak) with more accurate data. As with the previous site the VA timings have been updated and the site was found to be more responsive to the traffic flows during the off peak in VA mode.

J226 Further works

Peak time observations required to ensure test loop for westbound traffic is operating correctly.

J226 Observations for consideration

- It was noted that driver awareness at this site is very low on Staines Bridge, regularly gaps of several bus lengths appear due to driver on phones or generally not paying attention, causing signals to incorrectly gap change and move to next stage, resulting in lost potential green time.
- Clarence Street road markings misleading resulting in poor lane discipline, suggested adding ahead arrow to lane 1 with different destination to assist driver to pick a lane early.
- More poor driver behaviour where drivers use lane one to bypass lane two at red and wait within junctions to turn right, sometimes through the red light.
- Right turn into Bridge Street has a banned U-Turn movement in force. It is not upheld well (especially taxis) resulting in pedestrian vehicle conflict on the Eastbound Clarence Street pedestrian crossing on the exit of the junction. Additional enforcement could improve safety, or better marking of U turn area on Clarence Street further to the east.

P219 Clarence Street Pedestrian Crossing

J219 Current works carried out

We connected this site into the UTC system. It previously had the correct equipment but had never communicated to our UTC in station. Site now configured and able to operate UTC.

J219 Further works

We need to test the crossing under UTC/SCOOT control. There is a damaged SCOOT detector at this site which may need to be repaired, we are testing whether the loop has any future value to see if we can abandon it.

J219 Observations for consideration

None

J217 Clarence Street junction with High Street

J217 Current works carried out

Retuned detectors as these had incorrect values. Site found to be running VA and very low traffic demand suggested UTC/SCOOT intervention would be detrimental to pedestrian movements and low demand right turners. VA timings altered slightly.

J217 Further works

Site has some UTC database errors which are none critical to clear up.

J217 Observations for consideration

- Bollards to High Street not operational, however enforcement seems to be upheld by public well.

- Potential for U-turning conflict with pedestrians across south bound Thames Street. Could add box signs to signals with an order to improve safety at this location for pedestrians.

J221 Thames Street junction with Elmsleigh Road

J221 Current works carried out

Site UTC data updated to current standards and SCOOT validation completed. The site has had its VA timings updated and only runs UTC/SCOOT during the peaks, allowing for better service to side roads and pedestrians during the off-peak.

J221 Further works

Improve peak co-ordination and modelling data to ensure the right movements from J216 (Thames Street junction with South Street) are getting a fair bit of green time, issue is inconsistent so it maybe a database issue or the model is trying too hard and getting itself confused. SCOOT does not cope well with sudden alterations to traffic patterns generally and J216 is a little inconsistent with traffic arrival from outside the signal network.

Investigate pedestrians appearing in UTC without demands, possible prom change required, which would give an opportunity to improve programming standards to current levels at the same time.

J221 Observations for consideration

- A lot of traffic passes through this junction two to three times in the same direction. Suggests hunting for parking or generally lost? Believe they are accessing car park from South Street and circling back to Thames Street. How and why not known.
- Pedestrian crossings are single stage crossings (not staggered) resulting in quite a large amount of wasted time, especially if pedestrians cross in a gap in traffic and no longer require the crossing to operate. Altering crossings to puffin style or staggered crossings may improve this.

J216 Thames Street junction with South Street

J216 Current works carried out

UTC database corrected to enable SCOOT operation. Implemented composite links in SCOOT to try and get better modelling of traffic patterns with existing loop layout. Composite loops have not been used in Surrey before and documentation on their use is poor at best. Having observed our settings we believe the links are operating much more efficiently than before the project and the model does appear to be more accurate to on site conditions. Composite links use several loops and algorithms to calculate the traffic flow, typically normal links use one loop to count a movement, Staines network and existing infrastructure lend itself to using composite loops.

J216 Further works

Monitoring of the right turn movement from Laleham Road, this movement is very inconsistent due to the type of link used to model it. Initial observations seem promising.

J216 Observations for consideration

- Distracted drivers for the ahead movement from Laleham Road result in a lot of horn usage between drivers. They tend to look ahead at the signal crossing downstream or the secondary head for the right turn movement and miss their signal turning green. We could review the signal head and pole arrangement to decrease this happening.
- We believe we could re allocate some of the phases within the existing stages to improve traffic flow around the u-bend comprising Thames Street and South Street,

with minimal impact to pedestrians. This would need to be investigated further and modelling would help look at the benefits/impacts. This would require traffic count data.

J214 South Street Bus Station Access

J214 Current works carried out

Identified which SCOOT loops feed which sites, errors in asset records resulting in multiple loops present at site either appearing in use when they had been abandoned or lost during other carriageway works. Updated database to match on site assets. We have not validated this site as the bus movements are very low during our visits and had minimal impact on conflicting main road traffic.

J214 Further works

None

J214 Observations for consideration

- Several pedestrians crossed at this location where no facility is provided, perhaps suppressed demand?
- Site is a prime candidate for bus priority in UTC to enable buses to forwards call to gain access to the bus station under busy conditions.
- On occasion vehicles would use Bus Station Lane to overtake small queues. Although right turn does not appear to be an official bus lane this behaviour may cause issues in the peaks when congestion forms, will need monitoring.

J218 South Street junction with Bus Station exit / car park entrance & exit

J218 Current works carried out

Bus Station Exit road is in poor condition and the detection for this approach is damaged, we are unable to repair it so some funding used to purchase two new above ground detectors to bring this approach back into good operation. Until these detectors are fitted the bus station exit is coming up every cycle, which is wasting time. The detectors have been ordered and we are hopeful they will be installed and operational before the end of December. There were a lot of loops on the car park side of the junction with no described function, we have investigated their potential use and have retained some that are operational and will be abandoning others. This will make the junction simpler to handle in the UTC system. Partial validation has been carried out. We encountered problems on our last visit with the use of composite links at this site (working from the success of J216) but traffic flows were too low to facilitate a good validation period. Equally the car park exit and bus station require validation once detection issues are sorted and wired into use. VA timings have been reviewed and again are in use during the off peak times to make them more responsive to local need. This may need to be monitored during the Christmas period to ensure this remains the best mode of operation for the site.

J218 Further works

Waiting for detection issues to be repaired to complete validation exercise.

J218 Observations for consideration

- Road and lane layout is confusing when approaching from the north. The lanes only have arrows in them with no destination guidance. Recommend additional signage is provided.
- Heavy pedestrian movement to and from car park resulted in a lot of false demands to the pedestrian crossings during periods of light traffic, resulting in wasted time.

J213 South Street Junction with High Street/Mustard Mill Road

J213 Current works carried out

Site is in a substandard condition equipment wise, but functional. Found loop designation for SCOOT were not the same as the UTC database, investigated what loop had which function and altered database to match. Also altered the database's core information for the loops as it was dated in its standards usage. Validation has been carried out and VA timings altered to match in with the local traffic better. We noted a lot of traffic leaves the junction heading to Two Rivers shopping centre, roughly 85% of the traffic made this movement, which suggests the network is not operating how the wider UTC system and our strategic views would desire. We discuss this in more detail in "network wide comments" section below.

J213 Further works

The pedestrian legends at site require altering as they do not match the crossing type on the South Street arms.

J213 Observations for consideration

- Driver guidance is very poor at this location and it is not clear where the main traffic flow is meant to head, this may explain heavy right turn into Two Rivers.
- Very heavy pedestrian flows East to West and vice versa, at times the East footpath became very crowded.
- Access next to the Iron Bridge serving businesses can cause major blockages to the through traffic in both directions. It is a very narrow access but at time we saw it used by Large Goods vehicles both in and out. This also caused issues for pedestrians. Is a more suitable access for larger vehicles available?
- Bridge is narrow and constrains capacity at the junction.

J211 London Road junction with Kingston Road & Fairfield Avenue

J211 Current works carried out

This site is a TM-150-2 model type controller which is unfamiliar to both officers working on this project. The controller was installed some years again as part of a controller trial site. It therefore does not conform with our current standards entirely and its operation overall appears to have inherited a lot of old data that should have been reviewed before the controller was installed. The UTC database was altered to match the data provided however it became apparent that there is an issues between manufacturer products which need to be reviewed. Loop detectors where investigated to check they were operating correctly.

J211 Further works

Approach controller manufacturer to investigate product conflicts/issues resulting in UTC drop out issues. We will also request and co-ordinate the design of a new controller configuration to alter the data currently held to conform to our current standards. Carry out full SCOOT validation work once this is complete, checking neighbouring sites are not adversely affected by alterations.

J211 Observations for consideration

- Road condition is poor in areas around this location putting some loop infrastructure at risk of failure without being able to repair, leading to inefficient traffic signal timing.
- Road is heavy cambered which can result in slower vehicle speeds for larger/longer vehicles to navigate the undulations.
- Driver guidance is confusing in this area and leads to very poor lane discipline between the staggered T junctions. Regularly people in the ahead lanes are cut up by people using lane 2 either by accident or to jump the congestion by several cars.

J229 London Road junction with Fairfield Avenue

J229 Current works carried out

UTC and SCOOT validation on the main road was abandoned due to parking and construction issues from local businesses. It was noted that nearly all loop detection was destroyed or damaged in Fairfield Avenue. Site had also had a recent road traffic accident resulting in damage to one of the signal poles. UTC database was altered to match the existing site information and the SCOOT model is set up and ready to go when the health of the site is improved.

J229 Further works

Fully validate the site and co-ordinate with J211 once issues are resolved.

J229 Observations for consideration

- Road surface has failed on Fairfield Avenue and need urgent attention, however we accept this may be undertaken by the developer of the local site. London Road is ok.
- The “network wide comments” section details issues that affect this site.

Network Wide Comments

There were several noted worth issues witnessed during our initial works in the Staines town area briefly outlined below:

- Overall the driver guidance around the area is poor with a mixture of relevant and outdated signage. It was noted that some signs appear to contradict one another. A comprehensive review and upgrade of the signs and road markings would be beneficial, especially for drivers who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The car park guidance system is now defunct and obsolete. The static car park signs are not coherent and there are significant gaps. For example there are no car park signs at all on the London Road approach to the town centre. Renewal of the electronic guidance system would assist drivers in their decision making on the approaches to the town centre, and might reduce the volume of hunting traffic. At the very least provision of a comprehensive scheme of static car park direction signs would assist drivers in finding car parks.
- The weight restriction on Staines Bridge does not appear to be being enforced.
- There is evidence to suggest that significant numbers of drivers are using Bridge Street / Hale Street / Mustard Mill Road as their preferred through route through the town centre. The Hale Street / Mustard Mill Road route is 200m shorter than the Clarence Street / Thames Street / South Street route and has four fewer traffic signal controlled junctions. We need a wider discussion on whether this is the desired route to actively encourage as this has reduced efficiency at both Staines Bridge and Mustard Mill Road junctions, which are not currently geared to favour these movements.
- Generally around the southern U bend section of Staines (Clarence Street round to South Street & the Iron Bridge) congestion is rather sporadic resulting in periods of underutilised capacity. The reason for this is not known but while validating sites it was noted on several occasions traffic flow was greatly reduced to sometimes no traffic at all, when the entries to this network were congested. It may suggest loading or blocking issues are occurring on the network out of our sight during our visits. When these events occur it causes the model to react to the drop in traffic and

distorts its accuracy. When the traffic returns suddenly the system can struggle to recover, taking 5-10 minutes to compensate for this wide variation.

- London Road has significant parking issues between the junction of Kingston Road and Fairfield Avenue. While validating we had to abandon the site on numerous occasions due to parking outside the business on the double yellow lines. The worst occasions involved lorries that blocked lane one close to the stop line, leaving only one car length to get round and continue straight ahead. If one vehicle wished to turn right into Fairfield Ave then the whole stretch of London Road and Kingston Road was brought to a standstill. The longest recorded time of a parked lorry was roughly 45 minutes. Consideration of further enforcement or catering for parking elsewhere for business traffic would have a huge positive impact on the through traffic in this location.
- In several locations low pedestrian demand was satisfied within gaps in traffic. The signals around the town are unable to cancel the pedestrian demand and as such inadvertently waste time running the pedestrian stage when no longer required. Should future funding be available then efficiencies could be gain at some sites with the implementation of crossings with cancellable demand, ie, Puffin style crossings.
- It was noticed that buses heading into town are quite often trapped in the queues. The town may benefit from bus priority systems on the buses depending on which provider is being used. Currently no signals in the Staines area have bus priority fitted and it would be a useful addition to promote modal shift. This would need further investigation with SCC public transport team and partners.
- At the junction of London Road and Kingston Road it would be worthwhile testing scenarios to allow vehicles from Kingston Road to turn right to reduce the number of conflicting traffic movements along London Road. The impact of such an alteration is not fully understood so would need investigation. It could lead to a reduction of traffic into Fairfield Ave and improve main road flow because of this lowering in demand.
- A common theme is the condition of the carriageway, which is so poor in places that there is a significant risk of detector loop failure that may not be repairable without carriageway resurfacing.

Comments for the future work

- With Christmas approaching validation work will not be practical to carry out due to abnormal traffic flows. It will be a chance to progress the more physical element of the work and engage external parties where required. This should put us in a good position to come back in the New Year with the polish required at select sites.
- We will need to monitor the traffic behaviour with our recent alterations to the SCOOT model to see if traffic behaviour is trying to do something different to our model. As mentioned at Hale St we are concerned vehicles are using this part of the network to bypass the rest of our signals. It may be difficult to persuade users to use the more heavily signalled side of the network, which would result in network wide efficiencies.

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
Borough wide schemes							
BW 1	Support for delivery of emerging Surrey-wide Electric Vehicle strategy	Encourage uptake and provision for low emission vehicles, to reduce harmful pollutants and impact of traffic on human health.	Low emission vehicles	Strategy development	Varies depending on specific scheme	CIL Defra Air Quality Grant	Strategy to be published in Autumn 2018
BW 2	Introduction of infrastructure to support car sharing clubs	Improve air quality	Air Quality	Scheme Identification	Varies depending on specific scheme	Developer funding	Short
BW 3	Borough wide behaviour change programme - building upon the Travel SMART Surrey programme (2012-2016) to support people to take up sustainable and active transport modes (e.g. walking, cycling, public transport, electric vehicles). Revenue funding to support infrastructure delivery.	To provide measures which encourage or facilitate modal shift towards sustainable transport modes. This would build upon the Surrey Travel SMART programme which ran between 2012-2016. Measures could include: campaigns, themed events, business engagement, community engagement programmes, information e.g. maps and bus information, personalised travel planning. See: www.travelsmartsurrey.info	Multiple	Varies depending on specific scheme	Varies depending on specific scheme	Defra Air Quality Grant, Department for Transport, Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Access Fund, CIL, LEPs	Varies depending on specific scheme
Passenger transport schemes							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
PT 1	Partnership working with TFL & London Buses to meet common objectives for residents of Spelthorne.	Working with TFL & London Buses to maintain and enhance bus services and infrastructure across Spelthorne.	Passenger Transport	In delivery	n/a	n/a	n/a
PT 2	Quality bus corridor improvements to Route 555 (Sunbury Cross, Ashford and Heathrow)	Encourage more sustainable transport choices and improve bus service reliability and accessibility.	Passenger Transport	Feasibility	£250,000 (2017)	Bus operators, CIL, s106, LEP	Short/Medium
PT 3	Quality bus corridor improvements Route 8 (Windsor, Englefield Green, Egham and Heathrow)	Encourage more sustainable transport choices and improve bus service reliability and accessibility.	Passenger Transport	Feasibility	£500,000 (2018)	Bus operators, CIL, s106, LEP	Medium
PT 4	Quality bus corridor improvements Route 441/442 (Englefield Green, Egham and Heathrow)	Improve reliability and accessibility along route to improve bus use.	Passenger Transport	Feasibility & Design	£250,000 (2017)	Bus operators, CIL, s106, LEP	Short/Medium

PT 5	Northwest Surrey smart travel card project - Provide a transferable travel card for Spelthorne bus operators (including Runnymede & Elmbridge)	Improve accessibility for users, speed up journey times (reduced ticketing delays) and reduce penalty fares.	Passenger Transport	Summer 2018 -Paper product (Acorn Card), Smart card - feasibility underway, launch 2019/20	£200,000 (2017)		Short
PT 6	Staines Bus Station Improvements. Better access to and from bus station. Station is a major interchange and current facilities are inadequate.	Improve safety for users of the bus station and improve facilities to aid travel. Make service more attractive to encourage use.	Passenger Transport	Feasibility / Outline Design	£250,000 (2018)	s106, LEP	Short
PT 7	Staines bus station - Redevelopment	Total redevelopment of bus station to improve safety and access for passengers. Make bus service more attractive to encourage use.	Passenger Transport	Outline design complete (2013)	£2.5m (2018)	s106, Landowner	Medium
Rail							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
R1	Southern rail access to Heathrow Airport.	To improve current access to Heathrow from Surrey.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	Heathrow Airport, Network Rail	Long
R2	Access to and from Staines Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)
R3	Access to and from Ashford Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)
R4	Access to and from Sunbury Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)
R5	Access to and from Shepperton Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)
R6	Access to and from Upper Haliford Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)
R7	Access to and from Kempton Park Railway Station via all modes including bus integration, cycling, car park and walking.	To improve accessibility to the railway station and encourage more sustainable modes of travel choices.	Passenger Transport	Scheme Identification	TBC	SWR, CIL, s109, LEP	Within life of franchise (2024)

Staines-upon-Thames area							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
STS 1	Staines accessibility improvements (all modes of transport) . (Feasibility work needed to indentify scheme to make transport improvements to Staines as a whole)	Needs holistic study to identify transport needs and potential solutions. Previously scheme focused on Staines Bridge capacity - but the study needs to cover the wider area to find solution to improve capacity for all modes, improve air quality and reduce congestion.	Multiple	Expression of interest submitted to LEP in 2016 for Staines bridge capacity scheme	£25m (2016)	LEP, Local Contribution	Long
STS 2	Off carriage cycle way starting at High Street (London Rd) finishing at Ashford Rd. Scheme would not be part of Fordbridge roundabout . The route would connect Knowle Green to Ashford Road:- Cycle way along Kingston Rd that would complement existing routes into Staines Town Centre and create a high quality link between Ashford and Staines Town Centre.	To improve cycle safety and accessibility between Ashford and Staines town centre.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£1.5 m (2017)	Included in LEP bid for up to 75% funding. Potential Knowle Rd development funding.	Short
STS 5	Worple Road, Staines - Pedestrian crossing	Improve access and safety for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Feasibility and detailed design complete	£20,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
STS 6	Staines Town Centre - Cycle provision on Bridge Street, Thames Street and Clarence Street. Shared use cycle paths linking to existing provision.	Improve cycle environment in Staines Town Centre	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£500,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
STS 7	Staines to Laleham cycle route along B376. Provision of a commuter quality route.	Improve cyclist accessibility between Staines and Laleham. Current provision is poor.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£500,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
STS 8	Shortwood Common cycle route. Crooked Billet roundabout to Woodthorpe Road or Queens Walk (avoiding bridge). Current footpath would need widening, station to be signed from crossing point.	Connect Ashford to Staines (phase 2).	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£80,000 for infrastructure (+ potential land costs) (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
STS 9	Crooked Billet roundabout to Fordbridge roundabout along A308. Shared use cycle track on northern side of carriageway.	Improve cyclist and pedestrian accessibility between Staines and Ashford	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£900,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
STS 10	Gresham Road, Staines. Traffic calming on length of the road and additional speed cushions by school.	To reduce accidents at the junction and improve safety for other road users.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£5,000 (2018)	Locally funded	Medium

STS 12	Cycle improvements to M25 route Stanwell Moor. Improvements to bridleway 50, resurface northern end to provide year round commutable cycle access.	Improve access for cyclists and pedestrians from Stanwell Moor to Staines.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£200,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
Wider Staines STP							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
STP 1	A308 London Road - from Crooked Billet roundabout to the Iron Bridge	Very congested area. Widen pavements and create shared route for pedestrians and cyclists. Improve pedestrian safety and install a new crossing at Fairfield Avenue.	Multiple	In delivery	£4.95 m (2017)	75% LEP funding - 25% match funding secured	2017-2020
STP 2	Crooked Billet Roundabout (HE scheme)	Roundabout is a barrier to walking and cycling. Instillation of toucan crossing, cycle gutter and step free crossing will improve accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians.					
STP 3	Station Link - access into station from Rosefield Road and Kingston Road.	Direct route for cyclists to get from Staines station to Crooked Billet roundabout. Directional signage from to station to improve cyclist route finding. Folding bike hire scheme.					
STP 4	Stanwell Moor Road - upgrade existing shared path and improve links and crossing points.	Improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians.					
STP 5	Park Road - Improve current cycle facilities	To connect Stanwell Moor Road to Town Lane. This links Stanwell Moor and Staines to the Heathrow complex and the businesses on Bedford Road.					
STP 6	Town Lane / Oaks Road - begins at Bulldog junction, continues along Town Lane & High Street onto Oaks Road	Direct route for pedestrians and cyclists from Ashford and Stanwell.					
STP 7	Stanwell Residential - routes on quiet residential streets and recreation ground. (signage etc.)	Routes to form a continuous network radiating from Stanwell out to Heathrow, Staines town centre and Ashford Hospital.					
STP 8	Bus corridor improvements - Improvements along 2 main corridors	Improvements at bus stops to improve passenger use/experience					

Ashford area including Ashford & Sunbury Common and Ashford Common							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
ASH 1	Clockhouse Lane footbridge:- The route is one of the main local cross-county traffic routes to Heathrow and currently has no pedestrian route over the railway line from Ashford to Bedfont Lakes. NB: Costs for this scheme would need to be split with Hounslow.	Improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians	Pedestrian/Cycling	Feasibility study conducted by SCC. Local Committee has formally supported this scheme, which is being led by LB Hounslow	£2m This is the total cost to be split between Spelthorne BC and LB Hounslow (2017)	Included in LEP bid for up to 75% funding.	Short
ASH 2	Improvement to A308 Staines Road West/Ashford road in Ashford: Controlled pedestrian phases, right turn improvement A308 Staines Road West/School Road.	Improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification - detailed design complete	£500,000 (2017)	Included in LEP bid for up to 75% funding, s106, CIL	Medium
ASH 3	Church Road, Ashford. Road, cycle and public realm improvements. From before or after bridge by Ashford station to Fordbridge Rd junction. Town centre scheme involving traffic calming and shared cycle way.	Improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians and improve appearance and environment around rail station and town centre.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£5m (2017)	CIL; Local Committee; LTB. Brooklands College development funding.	Long (5-6 years)
ASH 4	Stanwell Road congestion improvements (Bulldog Jct) and toucan crossing facility at Town Lane junction.	Increase capacity at junction and provide improved crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.	Local Highways	Detailed design, being led by HA	£400,000 (2014)	Likely to be funded as part of other schemes.	TBC
ASH 5	A308 Staines Road West junction with Chertsey Road - New pedestrian crossing facility.	Improve safety and access for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	TBC	Local funding for scheme development, thereafter CIL funding to deliver	Medium
ASH 6	RSOS Spelthorne School (Feltham Hill Rd): Humped zebra crossing and other measures including parking restrictions.	Improve safety around Spelthorne school.	Road Safety	Design complete	£50,000-£100,000 (2018)	Section 106	Short
ASH 7	Kings Head roundabout Feltham Road pedestrian crossings on 3 approaches.	Improve pedestrian safety.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£150,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
ASH 8	A308 / A244 Staines Road West / Windmill Road / Cadbury Road pedestrian improvements.	Improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.	Local Highways	Feasibility study complete	£250,000 (2017)	CIL	Short
ASH 9	Improved pedestrian crossing in Clockhouse Lane near Parkland Road.	To improve access for pedestrians south of Clockhouse Bridge.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£150,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC

ASH 10	Introduce traffic signals at Fordbridge roundabout for pedestrians and cyclists.	Improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£300,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
ASH 11	Feltham Hill Road junction with School Road & Convent Road - Improved pedestrian facilities.	Improve access and safety for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£400,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
ASH 12	Cadbury Road junction with Chertsey Road - Pedestrian facilities.	Improve access and safety for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Feasibility study complete	£400,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
ASH 13	Off carriageway cycle track along Fordbridge Road starting at Fordbridge roundabout running to Church Road.	Compliment current cyclist provision in Ashford.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£400,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 14	Ashford Key corridors: Feltham Hill Road, Chertsey Road, Stanwell Road, Woodthorpe Road.	Improve access and safety for cyclists around Ashford	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£1m (2017) For all routes	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 15	Feltham Road off carriageway cycle route to borough boundary.	Improve access and safety for cyclists along Feltham Road. Currently no cycle provision.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£500,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 16	Cycle path on verge of Ashford Road - Running from Laleham to Fordbridge roundabout.	Improve cyclist accessibility from Laleham to Ashford.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£900,000(2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 17	Fordbridge roundabout to Sunbury Cross cycle route. Widen current of carriageway cycle facilities between Fordbridge roundabout and School Road Jct and extend route to Sunbury Cross Jct.	Improve safety on current route and improve access between Ashford and routes off Sunbury Jct.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£1.5m (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 18	B378 Stanwell Road Jct with Kenilworth Road, Ashford. Install anti-skid surfacing.	Reduce risk of shunt accidents at junction.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£5,000 (2018)	Non identified	Medium / Long
ASH 19	Cycle route from Bulldog junction to before bridge at Ashford station or just after.	Improve access for cyclists on Stanwell Road.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£500,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 20	Upgrade cycle route on Bedfont Rd and create flat crossings over the river. Starting at Clare Road running to Borough boundary.	Road used by HGVs and link to cargo terminal. Improve safety and access for cyclists.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£500,000 or £300,000 without bridges (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
ASH 21	B378 Stanwell Rd junction with Church Rd improvements (just south of Station Crescent). Cycle route improvements and signalling Stanwell Road junction.	Improve safety at junction for pedestrians and cyclists.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£250,000 (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long

ASH 22	B377 Feltham Rd, Ashford - Single VAS replacement and minor signing improvements.	To reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety on Feltham Rd.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£2,500 (2018) (excluding signing improvements)	Non identified	Medium
ASH 23	B377 Feltham Rd junction with Clockhouse Lane: reduce 3 or 4 approaches to a single lane and reduce circulatory area with hatching.	To improve safety for all users of the junction.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£5,000 (2018)	non identified	2019/20+
ASH 24	Cadbury Rd junction with Grovely Rd and Chertsey Rd - feasibility study into additional right turn phases and pedestrian facilities.	To improve safety for pedestrians and reduce congestion.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£5,000 for feasibility (2018)	s106	Medium
ASH25	Feltham Hill Road near Woodlands Parade - new pedestrian crossing	To improve safety for pedestrians	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	20,000 (2018)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Short
ASH26	Feltham Road HGV mitigation scheme	Key HGV route to industrial area. Scheme would include HGV mitigation inc traffic calming, ped crossing near Verona Court, road surface improvement and iron work relocation Also speed management in response to residents' concerns over the speed of traffic and consequent risk of casualties	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£300,000 (2018)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium - Long
ASH27	Cadbury Road - HGV mitigation	HGV mitigation inc traffic calming, ped crossing near Meadhurst, road surface improvement and iron work relocation	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£200,000-£300,000 (2018)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium - Long
ASH28	Woodthorpe Road pedestrian crossing at Station Approach	To improve accessibility for pedestrians	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£50,000	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	No timeframe identified
Shepperton, Sunbury-on-Thames, Laleham and Halliford							
Scheme ID	Location and scheme / package description	Scheme purpose	Transport type	Current delivery stage	Estimated cost, with base year	Potential funding sources	Estimated timeframe for start of construction
SHP 1	Roundabout at Charlton Lane/Charlton Road: Construction of a roundabout to reduce congestion at the Charlton Lane junction with Charlton Road.	Reduce congestion at this junction.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£400,000 (2014)	None at present	Medium
SHP 2	Thames Bridge at Lower Sunbury - New pedestrian / cycle bridge.	Provide safer journeys than alternative bridges, improve access / reduce journey times and encourage less journeys by car.	Local Highways	Initial feasibility study complete	£5m - £8m (2017)	Local funding for scheme development, thereafter CIL funding to deliver - there is support in principal on the Elmbridge side too.	Long (5-6 years)
SHP 4	Upper Halliford Road - pedestrian crossing / speed management study	Improve safety for pedestrians and improve access to local shops on opposite side of the road.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£150,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
SHP 5	Church Street / Green Street - extend 20mph zone to start of one way system	Improve safety for drivers and pedestrians.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£50,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC

SHP 7	Littleton Village (Squires Bridge Road) speed and traffic management	Improve safety and reduce congestion.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£20,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
SHP 8	Laleham Village speed and traffic management	Improve safety and reduce congestion.	Local Highways	Feasibility study complete	£20,000 (2017)	Locally funded	Short
SHP 9	Extend Thames Street 20 MPH zone into The Avenue	Improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	£50,000 (2017)	None at present	TBC
SHP 10	Pedestrian improvements in Halliford Road - Drop curb etc.	Improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians.	Local Highways	Feasibility and detailed design complete	£20,000 (2017)	Currently no funding available	TBC
SHP 11	Shepperton High Street off road cycle track connecting to Russel Road. Russel Road cycle track. Improvements to safety on roundabout connecting routes.	Improve cyclist safety on routes.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£0.6 m (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
SHP 12	Improved cycle conditions in Sunbury. Convert school walk (FP 21) to cycle track and traffic calming on key streets.	Create a cycle friendly environment on key streets.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£0.4 m (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
SHP 13	Laleham to Lower Haliford (A244) cycle route. Shared use path in Laleham to join existing path on B376. Continuation of shared use path along Green Lane and increased shared use signage.	Improve safety on current route and improve pedestrian and cyclist access between Laleham and Shepperton.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£1.3 m (2017)	CIL, s106, LEP Funding	Medium / Long
SHP 14	A308 Staines Road East cycle facilities. Off carriageway shared cycle track from Sunbury cross to borough boundary.	Reduce congestion and improve safety and access for cyclists.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£1m (2017)	Potential funding from Kempton Park development (no info until Spelthorne local plan is submitted)	Medium / Long
SHP 16	Fordbridge Road cycle facilities connecting from Marshall roundabout to Haliford Road. End of route at Thames street that is being traffic calmed to 20 MPH.	Reduce congestion, improve safety and access.	Cycle	Scheme Identification	£0.8m (2017)	Land from water splash (no money)	Medium / Long
SHP 17	Charlton Road Jct with Ashford Road, Charlton. Mini Roundabout redesign.	To reduce the frequency of accidents at the mini-roundabout.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£20,000 (2017)	Non identified	Long
SHP 18	B375 Russell Road Jct with High Street & Church Road, Shepperton. Redesign roundabout for pedal cyclists - Hatching out pedal cycle lane and reducing vehicle area.	Reduce pedal cyclist accidents.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£10,000	RS schemes budget	Short (18-19)
SHP 19	Vicarage Road Jct with Groveley Road, Sunbury. Upgrade right turn and provide island for crossing. Two new pedestrian islands and upgrade existing island in gravelly road, junction realignment and right turn lane into gravelly road.	To improve safety for other road users and reduce accidents at the junction.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£100,000 (2018)	Developer funding	short/medium

SHP 20	Major improvements to Sunbury Cross Roundabout - Improvements to signals with provision for cyclist and pedestrian surface crossing.	Reduce congestion by improving capacity, improve safety for cyclists.	Local Highways	Scheme Identification	Approx. £30,000 to conduct modelling and feasibility study (2014) Didn't take place. £5-10m (2017) for improvements.	None at present	Long
SHP 22	A244 Windmill Rd junction with Dolphin Rd, Sunbury. Right turn improvements.	To improve safety and congestion at junction.	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£5,000 (2018)	None identified	2019/20+
SHP 23	A244 Walton Bridge Road near junction with Walton Lane, Shepperton (near Windmill Common). Move carwash sign higher or further from road and remove trees for this option. Additional hatching at roundabout to reduce vehicle area.	To improve visibility to reduce risk of pedal cycle accidents on road	Road Safety	Scheme Identification	£10,000 (2018)	None identified	No timeframe identified

This page is intentionally left blank

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

JOINT COMMITTEE (SPELTHORNE)



DATE: 10 December 2018

**LEAD OFFICER: David Curl – Parking Team Manager (SCC)
Jackie Taylor Group Head of Neighbourhood Services
Spelthorne Borough Council**

SUBJECT: On Street Parking Enforcement Update Spelthorne BC

DIVISION: All areas of Spelthorne Borough Council

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

Joint Committees have a scrutiny role for the on street parking enforcement service in their area and a share of any surplus income that is raised.

This report sets out the background for these arrangements and provides an overview of the enforcement operation in Spelthorne.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Joint Committee is asked to:

- (i) Note the contents of the report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

Waiting and parking restrictions that are suitably/adequately enforced will help to:

- Improve road safety
- Ensure access for emergency vehicles
- Improve access to shops, facilities and businesses
- Increase footfall into Town Centres
- Ensure access for refuse vehicles and service vehicles
- Ease traffic congestion
- Ensure turnover of parking space use across the borough

The Joint Committee can contribute towards these objectives in partnership with the enforcement team.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:

- 1.1 Joint Committees make decisions about new parking restrictions and have an oversight role in terms of the enforcement of them.
- 1.2 The aim of parking enforcement is to achieve compliance with the restrictions that are in place across the district. Restrictions must be enforced fairly and in accordance with the operational guidance for Civil Parking Enforcement contained in the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 1.3 Spelthorne Borough Council (SBC) undertake parking enforcement within Spelthorne under an agency agreement with Surrey County Council. SBC is currently solely liable for any financial deficit. The current agreements run until 31 March 2020 whilst discussions take place about future arrangements.
- 1.4 SBC achieve operational efficiency and value for money, providing a fair and adequate enforcement service whilst providing a surplus year on year.

2. ON STREET ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

- 2.1 SBC undertake a range of enforcement activities under the agency agreement including:
 - Waiting restrictions
 - Designated parking bays (Disabled bays, Limited waiting bays, Permit Bays, etc)
 - School Keep Clears
 - Pedestrian crossings
 - Loading, bus stops and taxi ranks
 - Temporary suspensions for events, essential works, highway maintenance and other planned activities likely to impact roadside space
 - Drop kerbs
- 2.2 Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO's) are deployed across the District, covering core enforcement hours from 7:00am until 7:00pm, Monday to Saturday, and 9:30am to 6:30pm Sunday). Enforcement activity outside of these hours is possible only through staff overtime, which is at a higher cost.
- 2.3 Some restrictions, such as yellow lines with loading restrictions and white zig zags (approach to pedestrian crossings), can be enforced immediately; the vehicle will be in clear violation of a restriction by parking on them.
- 2.4 Limited waiting bays are used in commercial and residential areas to ensure turnover and deter commuter parking. Enforcement cannot be undertaken immediately as no ticket is displayed to show the arrival time for each vehicle. Instead the CEO is required to log all the vehicles in a particular area and then return after the limited waiting time for the bays has expired. Only then can they undertake enforcement if it

is clear that the vehicle has overstayed the waiting limit (evidence of vehicle position and tyre valves). This is a time consuming process for the CEO's.

- 2.5 Patrols are undertaken at varying times of the day and week to reduce awareness about exactly when CEO's will be in the area.

Staines upon Thames Town Centre

- 2.6 This is where the majority of enforcement is undertaken because there are a higher proportion of restrictions in the town centres and these consequently require a larger proportion of enforcement resource in the borough.
- 2.7 Parking enforcement is carried out in the town centres to achieve compliance with parking and waiting restrictions that will help maintain traffic flows and support access to businesses and services. This service is particularly important to small business owners, as the restrictions ensure turnover in parking spaces along the main High Streets.

Villages and local shopping parades

- 2.8 Parking enforcement in outlying areas and villages is important; however the greater travelling time required means less frequent enforcement is possible.
- 2.9 As these areas do not have the same level of resources as the town centres, it is recognised that there is a perception that they are forgotten. Each area receives regular visits and the times and roads visited are logged by the enforcing officer. Additional targeted enforcement is also undertaken when evidence of any parking issues are reported to the team.
- 2.10 However, it is important that resources are targeted where they are most impactful, in order to improve the cost effectiveness of enforcement activities. The ability to deploy staff in a smart way without having an impact of normal enforcement duties will assist in reducing the perception of lack of enforcement.

Schools

- 2.11 We work with schools, Surrey Highways and Surrey Police whenever possible to target parking enforcement outside schools where it is needed.
- 2.12 The team seeks to provide advice and guidance when visiting schools, however, penalty charge notices will be issued where appropriate, particularly where vehicles are parked on zig zag markings.
- 2.13 School enforcement has some unique challenges. The presence of the enforcement officers often disrupts usual parking patterns, which resume when the team is not present. It is not possible to provide enforcement outside every school, every day, due to the extremely high resourcing requirements it would involve, as well as having the normal enforcement requirements at the same time. We do however have a School rota in place that ensures each reported school is visited by an officer at the

shortest intervals possible. When there are wider traffic/parking issues highlighted, the enforcement team will work with Surrey County Council to identify causes and potential solutions (travel plans, alternative travel transport).

Residential areas

- 2.14 Parking restrictions in residential areas, including permit areas, will be patrolled as required or in response to reported problems. Councillors and residents are encouraged to report any hot spots to the enforcement team.
- 2.15 CEO's can enforce obstruction of 'official' drop kerb crossovers and pedestrian crossing points. This will require the permission of the property owner to request enforcement action (except pedestrian crossing points which can be enforced without a request). If the property owner does not contact the enforcement team to request enforcement action, they will not take action (except pedestrian crossing points which can be enforced without a request). SBC seek to respond to these requests as soon as possible.
- 2.16 Both the Joint Committee and enforcement team have improved communication with residents to ensure that they are clear what can be enforced and giving them the options to contact the Police where the use greater or immediate powers of enforcement are required.

Suspensions and Waivers

- 2.17 There may be occasions, such as utility works or home improvement schemes, where a company or individual requires an existing parking restriction to be suspended or waived for a fixed period.
- 2.18 SBC undertakes all the administration in relation to these requests, including application, payment and issuing of suspensions and waivers. These are being processed in a timely manner and we are continually looking to improve the method in which customers apply, pay and have the approval for suspensions and waivers processed.
- 2.19 This is undertaken in accordance with the scale of charges set out in the county councils parking strategy.
- 2.20 In order to operate this process effectively a notice period is needed. A minimum period of 10 working days from request of application is needed to allow processing and cleared payment prior to the suspension period.

Events affecting the highway

- 2.21 Where community events are arranged that will affect parking on the highway, the enforcement team will work with the organiser or highways to assist with traffic management arrangements.

2.22 Event organisers may be charged for this assistance if it requires out of hours working or distracts from the normal day to day enforcement activity in the borough. Clear requirements of the time required to assist in this is necessary to ensure adequate staff are available.

Lines and Signs

2.23 It is the responsibility of Surrey County Council to ensure that the lines and signs are enforceable. SBC will undertake unforeseen emergency work on behalf of Surrey County Council.

2.24 Enforcement activity cannot be taken if the lines and signs are not visible (i.e. faded or covered by detritus). This is particularly challenging in the autumn/winter when leaves fall or snow can be present.

1.

2.25 To reduce the potential for this to occur our parking and cleansing teams work together closely and action sweeping requests as a priority.

3. ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES AND IMPROVEMENTS

3.1 Extra CEO's resources have been temporarily allocated to enforcement activities in Ashford in tandem with a parking study which is being carried out by SBC. Results of this study will be available in 2019.

3.2 Information is available in Annex 2 and 3 showing where PCN's were issued and for what type of offence. KPI's are shown in Annex 4.

3.7 SBC continue to seek new ways of improving the enforcement service they provide. This includes:

- Using additional enforcement officers as described in 3.1.
- The introduction of small motorbikes to enable faster, more flexible deployment of enforcement resources.
- A review and improvement of the back office systems to enable a more efficient service. Improved information and guidance has been provided on the website and the wording on penalty charge notices has been reviewed to promote online appeals above other channels. SBC also offer online and automated telephone payments services, which are available 24 hours a day.
- The online system enables customers to view their cases in real time and appeal on-line. It also enables the customer to appeal on-line.

3.8 The efficiency of the on street enforcement service would increase significantly if vehicles were required to display a ticket showing their arrival time, in the same way as parking in off street car parks. This would enable enforcement offers to immediately determine if vehicles had overstayed and carry out enforcement. At present at least two visits are required, and as stated earlier in the report, the process

is resource intensive. In particular high traffic areas we can also explore new technologies to remotely monitor traffic and bay occupancy.

- 3.9 There is an ongoing review of the parking enforcement arrangement in the County that could also lead to cost savings. These could start to materialise during 2019/2020 if there is progress.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

- 4.1 Feedback and intelligence from local Councillors is extremely helpful in identifying enforcement priorities. The fastest way to report illegal or inconsiderate parking, and request enforcement activity, is through the online form, with information sent immediately to the parking enforcement team:

5. FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The purpose of enforcing waiting restrictions is to help achieve compliance with restrictions and not to raise income although we try to manage the service without operating at a deficit.
- 5.2 If a surplus is generated for the District parking account it has been agreed that it will be split:
- 60% to the Joint Committee
 - 20% to the enforcement authority (district council)
 - 20% to the county council
- 5.3 Any surplus generated from managing on street parking can only be used as defined under S55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended). This restricts use of any surplus for the maintenance and/or improvement of the Highway including environmental works or additional parking provision.
- 5.4 The surplus generated by SBC in 2017/18 was £14,166 giving the Joint Committee a share of £8,500.

6. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS:

- 6.1 Effective parking restrictions and enforcement can assist accessibility for those with visual or mobility impairment by reducing instances of obstructive parking. Parking restrictions also allow blue badge holders better access to shops and services through the provision and enforcement of disabled bays.

7. LOCALISM:

- 7.1 Communities are represented by local Councillors, who are involved in the decision making process to change or introduce new parking restrictions via the parking task groups.

8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATION:

Area assessed:

Direct Implications:

Spelthorne BC

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 Changes to the use of the highway network, the built environment and society mean that parking behaviour changes. It is necessary for a Highway Authority to carry out regular reviews of waiting and parking restrictions on the highway network and provide adequate enforcement. This will help to:

- Improve road safety
- Increase access for emergency vehicles
- improve access to shops, facilities and businesses
- Increase access for refuse vehicles and service vehicles
- Ease traffic congestion
- Better regulate parking
- Increase on-street compliance

9.2 This report provides a summary of the enforcement activities undertaken by Spelthorne Borough Council Borough Council, under agreement with the County Council. The report focuses on the operational performance during 2017/18. The committee is asked to note the report.

10. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

10.1 Joint Committee can consider these arrangements and comment as appropriate.

Contact Officer: Jackie Taylor Group Head of Neighbourhood Services Spelthorne Borough Council
David Curl, Team Manager, SCC Parking Team

Annex 1 – Annual accounts

Annex 2 – PCN’s issued by town/streets and visits

Annex 3 - On Street Parking Key Performance Indicators

This page is intentionally left blank

Annual on-street carparking return**Authority name**

Spelthorne

Financial year

2017/18

REVENUE EXPENDITURE

£

142,433.10

REVENUE INCOME

-156,599.66

NET (SURPLUS)/DEFICIT**-14,166.56**

Surplus share:		£
SCC	20%	-2,833.31
Local Area committee	60%	-8,499.93
Local Authority	20%	-2,833.31

Total due to SCC (accruals required)

-153,766

T Collier 17/4/18

Terry Collier
 Deputy Chief Executive
 S151 Officer
 Spelthorne Borough Council
 Council Offices, Knowle Green
 Staines-upon-Thames
 TW18 1XB
 Tel. 01784 446296
 Mob 07809 665996

Annual on-street carparking return

Authority name	Spelthorne BC
Financial year	2017-18

£

REVENUE EXPENDITURE

DIRECT COSTS

Staff costs
Enforcement staff

89,723.19

Should include all costs e.g. Salaries,wages, agency costs, oncosts, FRS17/IAS19 adjustments, employers insurance, cars, mileage allowances , training , etc. for all **ENFORCEMENT STAFF** i.e , CEOs, notice processors , Appeals staff,etc

Non-enforcement staff

25,846.00

Should include all costs e.g. Salaries,wages, agency costs, oncosts, FRS17/IAS19 adjustments, employers insurance, cars, mileage allowances , training , etc. for all **NON ENFORCEMENT STAFF** i.e Head of parking / service, Managers,

Contracted out enforcement staff

0.00

Should include staffing element of contracted out enforcement services

Contracted out cash collection staff

0.00

Should include staffing element of contracted out cash collection services

Operating costs

Contracted out services

0.00

Should include non-staffing element of contracted out service costs

Notice processing software and Handheld Computers

3,543.48

Only include costs related to dedicated parking services. All other software / hardware/ IT support etc costs should be included in the overheads section.

Maintenance of equipment (pay and display)

0.00

Maintenance of signs and lines

Adjudication and debt registration

2,500.00

Consumables (printing materials /stationary etc)

6,177.37

other (please list)

0.00

offset by income below

Include court fees, adjudication costs etc

127,790.04

OVERHEAD COSTS

Indirect staff

0.00

Should include: All cost types listed as per notes 1 and 2, but for any costs incurred relating to admin support staff shared with other services in the division, share of head of directorate cost etc.

IT

0.00

Internal IT recharge: Hardware and software, corporate systems, helpdesk etc

Office accommodation

2,559.38

Depot accommodation

0.00

Internal recharge

HR

1,800.00

Internal recharge (estimated) (include HR and payroll)

Audit

0.00

Internal recharge

Finance	2,600.00	Internal recharge (estimated)
Office services	0.00	Internal recharge (include Post room / asset mgmnt/ print room/scanning etc)
Cashiers/Creditors/Debtors	0.00	Internal recharge
Customer services	5,700.00	Internal recharge (estimated)
other (please list)	1,983.68	any overheads not identified above
	14,643.06	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	142,433.10	

*All income should be entered as a negative figure

REVENUE INCOME*	
Pay and Display	0.00
Penalties	-144,714.60
Resident permits	-10,138.37
Maintenance of signs and lines recharge	0.00
Suspensions and Waivers	0.00
Visitor permits	-1,746.69
Other receipts	0.00
	-156,599.66
TOTAL INCOME	-156,599.66
NET (SURPLUS)/DEFICIT	-14,166.56

Surplus share:	£
SCC	0.20
Local Area committee	0.60
Local Authority	0.20
	-2,833.31
	-8,499.93
	-2,833.31

Total due to SCC (accruals required) -153,766.00

This page is intentionally left blank

Penalty Charge Notices Issued for On Street Parking Contraventions and number of visits.					
Spelthorne Borough Council comparison between financial year 2017/18 and 2017/16					
Street	Town	2017/18		2016/17	
		Visits	PCNs	Visits	PCNs
Adelaide Road	Ashford	235	0	33	0
Albert Road	Ashford	101	0	14	1
Alexandra Close	Ashford	29	0	1	0
Alexandra Road	Ashford	12	1	9	3
Arlington Road	Ashford	4	1	2	1
Ashford Avenue	Ashford	2	0	6	3
Ashford Close	Ashford	3	1	6	1
Ashford Crescent	Ashford	4	0	6	2
Ashford Road	Ashford	18	10	19	8
Ashview Gardens	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Avondale Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Brookside Avenue	Ashford	4	1	6	0
Brownrigg Road	Ashford	16	4	28	6
Burleigh Gardens	Ashford	2	1	6	1
Buxton Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Cambridge Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Carew Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Caroline Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Cecil Close	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Cecil Road	Ashford	31	23	6	4
Celia Crescent	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Chalmers Road	Ashford	4	0	6	3
Chalmers Road East	Ashford	8	3	3	1
Chattern Hill	Ashford	1	0	1	1
Chattern Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Chaucer Road	Ashford	27	13	31	10
Chestnut Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Chessholme Road	Ashford	5	4	3	3
Chester Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Chesterfield Road	Ashford	4	2	18	3
Cheyne Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Church Road	Ashford	370	191	458	200
Clarendon Road	Ashford	531	164	480	175
Clifford Grove	Ashford	1	1	1	0
Clockhouse Lane	Ashford	13	12	2	1
Coleridge Road	Ashford	11	7	19	8
College Way	Ashford	1	0	1	0
Connaught Avenue	Ashford	2	0	1	0
Convent Road	Ashford	47	42	75	44

Conway Drive	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Coolgardie Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Copthorne Chase	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Cornerside	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Courtfield Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Cumberland Road	Ashford	0	0	6	2
Dane Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Denman Drive	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Dennis Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Desford Way	Ashford	3	3	2	0
Dingle Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Doris Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Dorset Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Douglas Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Dudley Road	Ashford	500	194	669	201
Dukes Close	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Echelforde Drive	Ashford	5	2	0	0
Edward Way	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Elgin Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Elmcroft Drive	Ashford	2	0	0	0
Elm Tree Close	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Elmsway	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Ethel Road	Ashford	1	0	0	0
Exeforde Avenue	Ashford	1	0	2	1
Fairholme Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Fairview Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Fairways	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Feltham Hill Road	Ashford	24	5	68	34
Feltham Road	Ashford	37	3	65	21
Fern Walk	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Ferndale Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Fernhurst Road	Ashford	1	1	0	0
Fifehead Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Fir Tree Place	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Fontmell Close	Ashford	1	0	0	0
Fontmell Park	Ashford	1	0	1	0
Ford Close	Ashford	1	0	1	1
Ford Road	Ashford	9	4	19	8
Fordbridge Road	Ashford	18	7	12	1
Gables Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Garden Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Gilmore Crescent	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Glen Avenue	Ashford	1	1	0	0
Glenfield Road	Ashford	2	1	0	0
Goffs Road	Ashford	0	0	5	2
Grays Lane	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Haven Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Hawley Way	Ashford	0	0	1	0

Hengrove Crescent	Ashford	4	2	0	0
Hensworth Road	Ashford	3	1	1	0
Hogarth Avenue	Ashford	2	0	1	0
Harrow Road	Ashford	26	10	0	0
Hughes Road	Ashford	2	0	3	1
Hyde Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Hyde Terrace	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Johns Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Junction Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Kenilworth Road	Ashford	2	1	5	1
Kingston Crescent	Ashford	104	8	68	12
Knapp Road	Ashford	28	9	7	3
Landon Way	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Limes Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Links Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Linkscroft Avenue	Ashford	5	2	9	2
Littleton Road	Ashford	4	2	0	0
Lucie Avenue	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Lynegrove Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Manor Road	Ashford	1	0	0	0
Marlborough Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Maxwell Road	Ashford	134	49	34	20
Mayfield Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Meadow Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Metcalf Road	Ashford	1	1	2	1
Mortaine Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Mornington Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Muncaster Road	Ashford	7	2	2	0
Napier Lodge	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Napier Road	Ashford	0	0	1	1
Napier Walk	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Neil Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Nelson Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
New Park Road	Ashford	4	1	6	1
New Parade	Ashford	3	0	0	0
Newhaven Crescent	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Norman Road	Ashford	1	1	3	2
Normanhurst	Ashford	145	68	97	70
Oakfield Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Old Nursery Place	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Orchard Avenue	Ashford	2	0	0	0
Orchard Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Orchard Way	Ashford	2	1	2	0
Oxford Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Park Avenue	Ashford	11	2	0	0
Parkland Grove	Ashford	37	8	15	12
Parkland Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Paterson Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0

Pear Tree Roads	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Perkins Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Perrin Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Pippins Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Poplar Road	Ashford	0	0	3	0
Portland Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Princes Road	Ashford	2	1	0	0
Queens Street	Ashford	5	1	0	0
Queens Walk	Ashford	5	1	0	0
Redleaves Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Reedsfield Close	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Reedsfield Road	Ashford	4	3	0	0
Rennie Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Rex Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Ripston Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Romney Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Rosa Avenue	Ashford	1	1	0	0
Rosary Gardens	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Rowland Way	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Roxeth Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Ruggles Brise Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Salcombe Road	Ashford	18	2	18	3
Sandells Avenue	Ashford	1	1	1	1
Sandringham Drive	Ashford	3	2	0	0
Saville Crescent	Ashford	0	1	0	0
Saxon Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
School Road	Ashford	47	22	50	25
Seaton Drive	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Selby Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Southfields Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Spelthorne Lane	Ashford	0	0	2	0
Springfield Road	Ashford	0	0	1	1
Squires Walk	Ashford	0	0	0	0
St Hilda's Avenue	Ashford	0	0	0	0
St Margaret's Avenue	Ashford	0	0	4	3
St Martins Court	Ashford	0	0	0	0
St Michaels Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
St Pauls Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Staines Road West	Ashford	14	5	51	5
Stainford Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Stanley Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Stanwell Road	Ashford	18	2	21	3
Station Approach	Ashford	135	32	202	49
Station Crescent	Ashford	21	5	28	18
Station Road	Ashford	12	3	40	15
Staveley Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Stroud Way	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Sundown Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0

Sydney Crescent	Ashford	1	0	0	0
Talbot Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Templecroft	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Tennyson Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
The Coppice	Ashford	0	0	3	3
The Drive	Ashford	0	0	0	0
The Orchards	Ashford	0	0	0	0
The Wickets	Ashford	0	0	0	0
The Yews	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Thetford Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Thorne Close	Ashford	1	0	1	0
Town Tree Road	Ashford	1	1	0	0
Townsend Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Tudor Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Tudor Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Village Way	Ashford	92	39	30	10
Warren Road	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Warwick Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Wellington Road	Ashford	0	0	1	0
Wentworth Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
West Close	Ashford	2	0	2	0
Windsor Drive	Ashford	10	3	1	0
Wolsey Road	Ashford	1	1	7	2
Woodlands Parade	Ashford	7	0	0	0
Woodthorpe Road	Ashford	456	182	599	183
Worcester Drive	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Wrens Avenue	Ashford	1	1	0	0
Wye Close	Ashford	0	0	0	0
Beech Tree Lane	Laleham	4	0	2	0
Cedar Close	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Chertsey Bridge Road	Laleham	1	0	4	5
Church Close	Laleham	3	0	1	0
Condor Road	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Grange Place	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Moorhayes Drive	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Thameside	Laleham	24	3	10	2
Shepperton Road	Laleham	118	23	123	33
Staines Road	Laleham	13	1	9	1
Thamesway	Laleham	24	2	2	2
The Broadway	Laleham	15	1	14	3
The Mallards	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Townquay	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Vicarage Lane	Laleham	9	1	7	5
Virginia Close	Laleham	0	0	0	0
Broadlands Avenue	Shepperton	9	7	4	2
Bruce Avenue	Shepperton	1	1	0	0
Burbridge Road	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Burchetts Way	Shepperton	3	0	4	1

Bush Road	Shepperton	3	1	0	0
Caesers Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Cassocks Square	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Catlin Crescent	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Cemetery Lane	Shepeperton	0	0	0	0
Charlton Lane	Shepperton	0	0	2	0
Charlton Road	Shepperton	1	0	1	0
Cherry Way	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Chertsey Road	Shepperton	35	10	46	37
Chestnut Walk	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Church Road	Shepperton	8	0	4	0
Church Square	Shepperton	10	0	5	0
Claremont Drive	Shepperton	2	1	6	4
Clerics Walk	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Cliveden Gardens	Shepperton	7	0	2	1
Cliveden Place	Shepperton	20	7	24	15
Copthorne Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Cranwell Grove	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Crescent Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Crosswell Close	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Cuckoo Pound	Shepeperton	0	0	0	0
Desborough Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Dockett Eddy Lane	Shepperton	26	20	57	22
Dorly Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Dunally Park	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Dunboe Place	Shepperton	1	1	2	1
Duppas Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Durrell Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Elliot Gardens	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Fairview Drive	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Felix Lane	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Ferry Lane	Shepperton	5	1	8	2
Ford Close	Shepperton	4	2	0	0
Francis Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Freeman Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Gaston Bridge Road	Shepperton	2	0	2	0
Gaston Way	Shepperton	3	3	4	1
Geneva Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Glebelands Gardens	Shepperton	12	3	6	3
Goddard Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Gordon Drive	Shepperton	10	8	7	6
Govett Avenue	Shepperton	11	12	11	9
Grant Close	Shepperton	1	1	20	14
Green Lane	Shepperton	6	3	13	5
Greeno Crescent	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Grove Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Halliford Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Halliford Road	Shepperton	4	0	0	0

Harrow Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Harvest Court	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Haslett Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Hermitage Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
High Street	Shepperton	135	45	167	62
Hitchcock Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Holmbank Drive	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Home Farm Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Horne Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Jessiman Terrace	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Kelly Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Kilmiston Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Korda Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Laleham Road	Shepperton	21	4	35	6
Linden Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Lindsay Drive	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Lion Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Lois Drive	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Littleton Lane	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Magdalene Road	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Mandeville Road	Shepperton	2	1	0	0
Manor Farm Avenue	Shepperton	12	4	39	10
Manor House Court	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Manygate Lane	Shepperton	15	11	13	6
Marion Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Mere Road	Shepperton	18	7	38	14
Mervyn Road	Shepperton	24	2	109	12
Milton Drive	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Mill Mead	Shepperton	0	0	6	2
Minsterley Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Mitre Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Mulberry Trees	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Nell Gwynn Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Nutty Lane	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Oberon Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Old Charlton Road	Shepperton	2	1	2	0
Old Forge Crescent	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Old Littleton Road	Shepperton	0	1	1	1
Pearmain Close	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Penny Lane	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Pentland Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Petts Lane	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Pool End Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Preston Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Queen Mary Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Range Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Rectory Close	Shepperton	7	1	0	0
Renfree Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0

Richmond Drive	Shepperton	7	6	4	3
Roseacre Close	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Rosewood Drive	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Roxford Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Russell Road	Shepperton	9	1	18	13
Russington Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Sandhills Meadow	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
School Lane	Shepperton	3	0	1	0
Sheep Walk	Shepperton	2	0	11	1
Shepherds Close	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Sherbourne Gardens	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Squires Bridge Road	Shepperton	0	0	2	0
Squires Road	Shepeperton	0	0	1	0
St Andrews Close	Shepperton	1	0	1	0
St Nicholas Drive	Shepperton	2	1	3	3
Station Approach	Shepperton	67	29	45	21
Station Road	Shepperton	10	2	1	1
Stewart Avenue	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Studios Road	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Swan Walk	Shepeperton	0	0	0	0
Tanglyn Avenue	Shepeperton	0	0	1	0
Thames Meadow	Shepeperton	1	0	0	0
Thamesfield Court	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
The Crofts	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
The Malyons	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Thornhill Way	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Thurlestone Close	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Thurlestone Parade	Shepperton	0	0	2	0
Towpath	Shepperton	5	4	39	29
Upper Halliford	Shepperton	2	0	0	0
Upper Halliford Green	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Upper Halliford Road	Shepperton	3	1	21	6
Vincent Drive	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Wadham Close	Shepperton	1	0	2	1
Wallace Close	Shepperton	1	0	1	1
Walnut Tree Road	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Walton bridge Road	Shepperton	1	0	0	0
Walton Lane	Shepperton	0	0	1	0
Watersplash Road	Shepperton	4	1	2	0
Westbury Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Western Drive	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
West Way	Shepperton	2	0	0	0
Wilcox Gardens	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Winchstone Close	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Windmill Green	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Wood Road	Shepperton	3	0	9	0
Yew Trees	Shepperton	0	0	0	0
Arnold Road	Staines	5	0	5	0

Aspen Close	Staines	1	0	0	0
Avondale Avenue	Staines	3	1	9	5
Augur Close	Staines	7	3	4	3
Beehive Road	Staines	16	2	15	6
Berryscroft Road	Staines	27	13	43	19
Billet Road	Staines	2	0	0	0
Birch Green	Staines	193	26	197	62
Bramley Close	Staines	9	3	23	7
Bremer Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Bridge Close	Staines	3	0	0	0
Bridge Street	Staines	81	0	19	0
Brightside Avenue	Staines	1	0	2	0
Broomfield	Staines	1	1	1	0
Budebury Road	Staines	18	11	30	7
Burges Way	Staines	135	59	167	79
Carlyle Road	Staines	0	0	1	0
Charles Road	Staines	1	0	1	0
Cherry Orchard	Staines	164	137	187	118
Cherry Tree Avenue	Staines	0	0	1	0
Chestnut Grove	Staines	6	5	1	1
Chestnut Manor Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Chilterns Close	Staines	14	9	19	9
Church Island	Staines	2	0	0	0
Church Street	Staines	1281	703	1252	683
Church Street (Shared Bays)	Staines	212	68	190	85
Clarence Street	Staines	183	25	78	26
Cleavelands Drive	Staines	0	0	1	0
Colnebridge Close	Staines	2	0	0	0
Commercial Road	Staines	1	1	1	0
Coopers Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Cotsworls Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Court	Staines	1	0	0	0
Dolphin Court North	Staines	0	0	0	0
Drake Avenue	Staines	0	0	0	0
Duncan Gardens	Staines	10	7	10	9
Edgell Road	Staines	50	20	47	19
Edinburgh Drive	Staines	1	0	3	0
Edward Court	Staines	0	0	0	0
Elmsleigh Road	Staines	161	37	94	36
Eton Court	Staines	48	12	29	12
Fairfield Avenue	Staines	231	67	249	111
Fairlawns Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Farm Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Farnell Road	Staines	1	0	2	0
Fenton Avenue	Staines	4	2	4	4
Florence Gardens	Staines	6	5	2	2
Garrick Close	Staines	1	0	3	2
George Street	Staines	241	68	189	78

Georgian Close	Staines	5	0	1	0
Glebe Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Glen Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Gloucester Crescent	Staines	2	0	1	0
Goodmans Place	Staines	0	0	0	0
Gordon Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Goring Square	Staines	0	0	0	0
Greene Field End	Staines	1	0	0	0
Greenlands Road	Staines	16	6	17	10
Green Park	Staines	0	0	2	0
Greenway Drive	Staines	0	0	0	0
Gresham Road	Staines	80	13	113	22
Grosvenor Road	Staines	0	0	1	0
Guildford Street	Staines	3	1	4	3
Hale Street	Staines	39	13	41	19
Hawks Way	Staines	55	11	31	12
Hazel Grove	Staines	0	0	1	0
Hereford Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
High Street	Staines	317	50	110	46
Homestead Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Honor Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Hurstdene Avenue	Staines	0	0	1	0
Island Close	Staines	36	17	81	32
Jamnager Close	Staines	1	0	1	1
Jubilee Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Kenilworth Gardens	Staines	0	0	0	0
Kent Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Kestral Avenue	Staines	41	15	13	4
King Acre Court	Staines	1	0	1	0
Kingfisher Drive	Staines	79	29	70	33
Kingston Road	Staines	170	26	84	19
Kings Close	Staines	1	0	0	0
Knightsbridge Crescent	Staines	0	0	0	0
Knowle Green	Staines	106	39	155	62
Knowle Green (opp leisure)	Staines	25	0	25	10
Knowle Park Avenue	Staines	5	0	8	4
Laleham Road	Staines	53	11	59	12
Lammas Close	Staines	23	4	8	2
Lansdowne Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Langley Road	Staines	2	0	18	7
Lark Avenue	Staines	137	53	75	37
Leacroft	Staines	13	13	17	5
Leacroft Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Link Way	Staines	0	0	0	0
London Road	Staines	19	5	56	8
Lucan Drive	Staines	0	0	0	0
Manor Place	Staines	0	0	0	0
Margaret Close	Staines	1	0	0	0

Market Square	Staines	138	60	72	54
Matthews Lane	Staines	1	0	0	0
Meadow Crescent	Staines	0	0	0	0
Meadow Court	Staines	2	0	6	2
Meadway Close	Staines	0	0	1	0
Middle Green	Staines	0	0	0	0
Mill Mead	Staines	46	2	0	2
Millers Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Moor Lane	Staines	52	8	42	14
Moormede Crescent	Staines	142	49	86	42
Monks Way	Staines	0	0	0	0
Montrose Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Murdoch Close	Staines	18	10	32	21
Mustard Mill Road	Staines	143	40	69	24
New Street	Staines	43	18	19	6
Norris Road	Staines	1	0	0	0
Northfield Court	Staines	0	0	1	0
Northfield Road	Staines	1	1	3	1
Octavia Way	Staines	0	0	0	0
Pavillion Gardens	Staines	2	0	1	0
Penton Avenue	Staines	2	0	1	0
Penton Road	Staines	4	1	15	6
Percy Avenue	Staines	7	7	16	6
Petersfield Avenue	Staines	0	0	3	4
Petersfield Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Philip Road	Staines	38	2	10	2
Pinewood Drive	Staines	0	0	0	0
Plover Close	Staines	7	1	8	4
Priory Green	Staines	0	0	2	1
Priory Mews	Staines	0	0	0	0
Prospect Place	Staines	6	4	24	11
Raleigh Court	Staines	2	0	0	0
Ravensdale Mews	Staines	0	0	0	0
Richmond Crescent	Staines	5	1	1	0
Richmond Road	Staines	72	25	83	36
River Road	Staines	3	0	1	0
Riverfield Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Riverside Close	Staines	1	0	1	0
Riverside Drive	Staines	0	0	0	0
Riverway	Staines	0	0	0	0
Robin Way	Staines	101	25	71	31
Rookery Road	Staines	5	1	8	3
Rosefield Road	Staines	38	14	26	21
Ruskin Road	Staines	1	0	1	0
Shaftesbury Crescent	Staines	0	0		0
Shortwood Avenue	Staines	1	0	7	4
Sidney Road	Staines	44	26	44	21
Silverdale Court	Staines	0	0	2	1

South Street	Staines	89	5	74	6
St Olaves Close	Staines	7	6	16	10
St Peters Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
St Pinnocks Avenue	Staines	0	0	0	0
Stainash Crescent	Staines	54	15	53	16
Stainash Parade	Staines	4	0	2	0
Staines Bridge	Staines	0	0	0	0
Stanwell New Road	Staines	1	0	2	1
Station Crescent	Staines	21	5	28	18
Station Path	Staines	0	0	0	0
Strodes Crescent	Staines	0	0	1	1
Stuart Way	Staines	0	0	0	0
Swallow Close	Staines	60	14	36	14
Sykes Drive	Staines	0	0	0	0
Tavistock Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Templedene Avenue	Staines	0	0	1	0
Thames Street	Staines	64	0	25	3
The Broadway – Parade	Staines	2	0	3	0
The Glade	Staines	0	0	0	0
The Oaks	Staines	0	0	0	0
The Sidings	Staines	0	0	0	0
Thickthorne Lane	Staines	1	1	8	5
Tillys Lane	Staines	0	0	0	0
Turners Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Vicarage Road	Staines	43	20	23	13
Victoria Road	Staines	4	1	2	0
Warwick Avenue	Staines	3	2	4	3
Waters Drive	Staines	321	86	244	119
Westbourne Road	Staines	0	0	0	0
Westbrook Road	Staines	0	0	1	0
Wheatsheaf Lane	Staines	3	0	19	5
Willowmead	Staines	0	0	0	0
Witheygate Avenue	Staines	1	0	0	0
Worple Road	Staines	0	0	7	1
Wyatt Road	Staines	12	8	35	15
Worple Avenue	Staines	3	0	1	0
Worple Road	Staines	3	0	7	1
Wrabness Way	Staines	0	0	0	0
Wraysbury Gardens	Staines	65	15	27	13
Wraysbury Road	Staines	5	1	3	0
Yeoveney Close	Staines	0	0	0	0
Atherton Close	Stanwell	2	1	1	0
Bedfont Road	Stanwell	8	2	11	4
Brook Close	Stanwell	14	6	29	7
Buttercup Square	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Caledonia Road	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Callis Farm Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Cambria Gardens	Stanwell	1	0	0	0

Canopus Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Cheltenham Villas	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Chesterton Drive	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Christlaine Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Church Approach	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Clare Road	Stanwell	98	5	114	55
Clay Lane	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Clyde Road	Stanwell	3	0	0	0
Colne Reach	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Comet Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Cordelia Gardens	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Cordelia Road	Stanwell	0	0	2	1
Corinthian Way	Stanwell	50	19	11	0
Corsair Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Corsair Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Crane Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Cranford Avenue	Stanwell	1	1	2	1
Cranford Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
De Havilland Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Deridene Close	Stanwell	0	0	2	0
Diamedes Avenue	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Dutch Barn Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Eddystone Walk	Stanwell	0	0	1	0
Elizabethan Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Elizabethan Way	Stanwell	22	22	32	21
Elm Close	Stanwell	5	0	0	0
Elsinore Avenue	Stanwell	1	0	2	2
Ensign Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Ensign Way	Stanwell	6	6	6	4
Everest Road	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Evergreen Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Explorer Avenue	Stanwell	2	0	0	0
Falcon Dive	Stanwell	30	19	41	19
Farm Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Flintlock Close	Stanwell	0	0	7	0
Foxglove Close	Stanwell	3	0	15	5
Frobisher Crescent	Stanwell	0	0	1	0
Frobisher Gardens	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Genesis Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Gibson Place	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Gleneagles Close	Stanwell	7	6	0	0
Hadfield Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Hadrian Close	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Hadrian Way	Stanwell	11	4	17	6
Hannibal Road	Stanwell	14	7	23	6
Haws Lane	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Hawthorne Way	Stanwell	2	0	1	0
Heath Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0

Heath Grove	Stanwell	3	1	10	7
Hendon Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
High Street	Stanwell	92	24	95	42
Hillingdon Avenue	Stanwell	0	0	2	0
Hithermoor Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Holywell Close	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Holywell Way	Stanwell	1	0	1	0
Horton Road	Stanwell	143	42	167	63
Jordans Close	Stanwell	0	0	1	0
Kingsway	Stanwell	1	0	1	0
Laburnum Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Lauser Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Leylands Lane	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Lindsay Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Lintott Court	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Longford Avenue	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Longford Way	Stanwell	1	0	1	0
Long Lane	Stanwell	58	28	209	86
Lord Knyvett Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Lowlands Drive	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Maise Webster Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Maple Gardens	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Masefield Way	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Meadow View	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Milton Gardens	Stanwell	0	0	1	0
Mountsfield Close	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Mulberry Avenue	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Northumberland Close	Stanwell	29	8	81	22
Nuthatch Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Oaks Road	Stanwell	1	1	2	1
Osbourne Avenue	Stanwell	1	1	2	1
Park Mews	Stanwell	0	1	0	0
Pinewood Mews	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Ravenbourne Avenue	Stanwell	11	3	7	1
Riverside Place	Stanwell	1	1	0	0
Roberts Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Rose Gardens	Stanwell	2	1	1	1
Russell Road	Stanwell	0	1	0	0
Russett Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Scots Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Selwood Close	Stanwell	1	1	0	0
Selwood Gardens	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Shellifield Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Short Lane	Stanwell	8	4	18	7
Spout Lane	Stanwell	29	19	45	12
St Annes Avenue	Stanwell	1	0	5	2
St Marys Avenue	Stanwell	1	1	4	0
St Marys Crescent	Stanwell	12	6	31	9

Stanhope Heath	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Stanhope Way	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Stanwell Close	Stanwell	2	0	0	0
Stanwell Gardens	Stanwell	1	1	0	0
Stanwell Moor Road	Stanwell	5	0	3	0
The Heathers	Stanwell	0	0	1	0
The Nightingales	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Thornbank Close	Stanwell	1	0	0	0
Town Farm Way	Stanwell	6	2	10	6
Town Lane	Stanwell	11	5	15	4
Trinity Close	Stanwell	1	0	2	1
Vibria Close	Stanwell	17	7	18	4
Vine Close	Stanwell	2	2	0	0
Viola Avenue	Stanwell	13	6	5	0
Viscount Road	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Western Drive	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Whatmore Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Whitley Close	Stanwell	0	0	2	2
Willowbrook Road	Stanwell	0	0	2	1
Windermere Close	Stanwell	0	0	0	0
Anvil Road	Sunbury	3	0	1	0
Ashridge Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Batavia Road	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Belgrave Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Benwell Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Belgrave Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Brakenwood	Sunbury	3	2	5	2
Bryan Close	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Bryony Way	Sunbury	7	4	3	1
Burgoyne Road	Sunbury	1	1	4	1
Cadbury Close	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Cadbury Road	Sunbury	0	0	3	3
Camilla Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cardinals Walk	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Carlton Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Castle Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Catherine Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cavendish Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cavendish Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cavendish Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cedar Way	Sunbury	2	2	7	1
Chaplin Crescent	Sunbury	2	0	0	0
Chessholme Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Church Street	Sunbury	14	0	6	3
Churchill Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Claremont Avenue	Sunbury	2	0	0	0
Cleves Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Crayonne Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0

Crossways	Sunbury	90	30	232	145
Croysdale Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Cumberland Place	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Cumbernauld Gardens	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Dale Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Darby Crescent	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Darby Gardens	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Road North	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Road South	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Road West	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Downside	Sunbury	21	19	60	32
Elizabeth Avenue	Sunbury	1	0	1	0
Elizabeth Gardens	Sunbury	12	6	6	4
Elmbrook Close	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Elm Drive	Sunbury	1	0	5	0
Escot Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Evelyn Crescent	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Evelyn Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Fairlawns	Sunbury	1	0	1	0
French Street	Sunbury	9	4	29	12
Falcon Way	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Farrier Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Forest Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Forge Lane	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Furzewood	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Grangewood Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Green Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Green Lane	Sunbury	20	11	7	4
Green Leas	Sunbury	1	1	0	0
Green Leas Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Green Street	Sunbury	37	24	65	44
Green Way	Sunbury	3	0	0	0
Groveley Road	Sunbury	8	0	2	0
Hamilton Place	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Hanworth Road	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Harfield Road	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Harris Way	Sunbury	4	1	1	0
Hawkewood Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Heathcroft Avenue	Sunbury	8	2	5	2
Heath Grove	Sunbury	3	1	0	0
Heatherlands	Sunbury	0	0	2	1
Heatherlands Close	Sunbury	3	2	3	1
Helgiford Gardens	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Highfield Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Homewaters Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Howard Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
liex Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0

Ivy Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Juniper Gardens	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Kempton Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Kempton Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Kenton Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Kenyngton Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Keywood Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
King George Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Kings Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	3	1
Kingsmead Avenue	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Kinross Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Kinross Drive	Sunbury	11	6	40	20
Laburnum Crescent	Sunbury	4	0	0	0
Laytons Lane	Sunbury	0	0	1	1
Lime Crescent	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Lincoln Way	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Loudwater Close	Sunbury	2	0	1	1
Loudwater Road	Sunbury	10	6	0	0
Lower Hampton Road	Sunbury	2	0	3	3
Lyndhurst Avenue	Sunbury	1	1	2	2
Manor Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Manor Gardens	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Manor Lane	Sunbury	7	0	8	2
Markway	Sunbury	2	0	0	0
Martigale Close	Sunbury	3	1	0	0
Maryland Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Meadows End	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Mill Farm Avenue	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Millfield	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Monks Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Montford Road	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Nursery Road	Sunbury	2	1	6	1
Oak Grove	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Oakhall Drive	Sunbury	4	4	2	2
Oakington Drive	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Old Orchard	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Old Rope Walk	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Orchard Road	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Park Road	Sunbury	12	0	40	4
Parke Road	Sunbury	2	0	1	0
Parkwood Grove	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Percy Bryant Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Peregrine Road	Sunbury	1	0	1	0
Pine Wood	Sunbury	0	0	2	1
Priory Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Queensway	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Ravendale Road	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Ravenscourt	Sunbury	1	1	2	2

Rooksmead Road	Sunbury	7	5	2	2
Saddlebrook Park	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Salix Close	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Saxonbury Avenue	Sunbury	199	90	282	130
Scotts Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Scotts Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Seymour Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Silverdale Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Spelthorne Grove	Sunbury	1	1	1	0
Springfield Grove	Sunbury	0	0	0	1
Staines Road East	Sunbury	3	2	9	2
Staines Road West	Sunbury	14	5	51	5
Station Approach	Sunbury	9	0	0	0
Station Road	Sunbury	12	3	8	15
Stile Path	Sunbury	0	0	3	3
Stratton Road	Sunbury	0	0	3	3
Summer Trees	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Sunbury Court Road	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Sunmead Road	Sunbury	1	1	10	5
Sauna Gardens	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Sutherland Avenue	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Sutherlands Garden	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Tadmor Close	Sunbury	2	0	0	0
Tasman Court	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Thames Street	Sunbury	28	10	23	3
The Avenue	Sunbury	277	124	406	146
The Chase	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
The Creek	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Haven	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
The Parade	Sunbury	51	10	104	44
The Pennards	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Pines	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Ridings	Sunbury	6	3	11	9
The Rowans	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Ryde	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Spinney	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Vale	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
The Walk	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Vereker Drive	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Vicarage Road	Sunbury	8	0	14	3
Willow Way	Sunbury	0	0	0	0
Windmill Close	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Windmill Road	Sunbury	2	0	0	0
Windmill Road West	Sunbury	40	63	0	0
Windsor Court	Sunbury	1	0	0	0
Windsor Road	Sunbury	2	0	3	1
Woodberry Close	Sunbury	0	0	1	0
Wychwood Close	Sunbury	1	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank

KPI's	Details	15/16	16/17	17/18
Total cost to administer The on-street parking service – the overall net cost of operating the on-street enforcement element of the parking service	These are set in attached for 2017/18.	£143,122.67	£130,041.57	£142,433.10
Civil enforcement officer (CEO) deployment efficiency – this measures the number of hours deployed CEO time spent on-street or travelling to sites as ratio of the total cost of the enforcement operation	Total net enforcement costs 2017/18 are £142,433.10 Total hours deployed on-street including travelling is estimated at 7606 for 2017/18 and 9870 for 2016/17.	Cannot provide for 15/16	£13.18ph	£18.73 ph
Penalty charge notices (PCN) issued per deployed hour – total number of CEO hours on-street.	The total number of penalty charge notices issued on-street was 4,193 in 2017/18.	(5559)	0.49 (4923)	0.42 (4193)
PCN cancellation rate – the total number of PCNs cancelled as a ratio of the total number of PCNs issued (All cancellations).	4,193 were issued.	17.18% (955)	18.01% (887)	17.31% (726)
PCN Appeal Rate – the total number of PCNs successfully appealed, as a ratio of the total number of PCNs issued. (Adjudication Cases)	Total number of PCN's issued was 4,193. 4 PCN's were successfully appealed at formal appeal stage.	0.51% (9)	0.51% (9)	0.09% (4)
Time taken to issue parking permits/dispensations/suspensions – measuring the average number of days taken to deal with general customer requests for service (excluding PCN appeals or comments on parking).	Permits Dispensations Suspensions	24hrs Instant – 24hrs 10 days	24hrs Instant–24 hrs 10 days	24hrs Instant–24 hrs 10 days

This page is intentionally left blank

Joint Committee (Spelthorne) - Forward Plan

Details of future meetings			
<p>Dates for the Spelthorne Joint Committee 2018/19: 13 March 2019, 15th July, 30th September, 16th December, 23rd March 2020 The Committee meeting commences at 6.30pm (Informal Public Question Time 6.30pm – approx. 7.00pm). This forward plan sets out the anticipated reports for future meetings. The forward plan will be used in preparation for the next committee meeting. However, this is a flexible forward plan and all items are subject to change.</p>			
Topic	Purpose	Contact Officer	Proposed date
Highways Update	Standing item for all Spelthorne Joint Committees	SCC Area Highway Manager	ALL
Decision Tracker	For information	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Forward Programme	Review the Forward Programme and consider further themes for Member briefings	Partnership Committee Officer	ALL
Early Help	Update for information	Alexis Hyndes	March 2019
Parking review	For decision on implementing parking changes.	Jack Roberts, SCC	March 2019
Highways	Update for info from Cabinet Member for Place		March 2019
Secondary shopping centres project	The lessons learned from the joint initiative between SCC & SBC in respect of the secondary shopping centres improvements project.	Keith McGroary SBC	March 2019
Fire service	Update on service provision across borough	Paula Hartwell, SCC - Asst Group Commander	July 2019

Suggested topics not yet confirmed

Topic	Purpose	Lead officer	Suggested date
Education update	For information. Updating on schools improvement transition work and future role of committees in education	Paula Evans SCC	Spring 2019
Emergency Management	Update for information	Ian Good	Spring 2019
LHR expansion	Update from Ann Biggs (following on from Oct 2018) to coincide with 2 nd consultation exercise	Ann Biggs / Heather Morgan	May 2019
Network management	A discussion / explanation of the management of the roadworks	Matthew Jezzard SCC	Winter 18/spring 19