

## Decision Notice

**Note:** Decisions in **bold** type indicate a decision differing from the recommendation in the report.

The following decisions were approved by the Runnymede Joint Committee on Tuesday, 6 July 2021 and will take effect on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2021 unless the call-in procedure has been triggered. The call in procedure applies to executive functions of the joint committee only. **CALL-IN DEADLINE: 15<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

The following represents a summary of the decisions taken by the Committee. It is not intended to represent the formal record of the meeting but to facilitate the call-in process.

*[The alternative options considered and rejected by the Committee in taking the following decisions are set out in the reports circulated with the agenda for the meeting.]*

To request a call-in on any of these matters, please contact **Gregory Yeoman** on [gregory.yeoman@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:gregory.yeoman@surreycc.gov.uk)

6	PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES	<p>For Petition 1, requesting a 20mph speed limit in Rosemary Lane, Thorpe, the Runnymede Joint Committee NOTED:</p> <p class="list-item-l1">(i) A speed survey will be undertaken to measure vehicle speeds in Rosemary Lane. The results of the survey will then be assessed in conjunction with the road safety record for the location.</p> <p class="list-item-l1">(ii) If the assessment identifies a problem with excessive speeds and poor road safety relative to other sites on the Runnymede speed management plan then Rosemary Lane would be categorised as a high priority site. Options for reducing vehicle speeds would then be assessed to determine what type of measure(s) would be most appropriate and effective.</p> <p>Reasons for recommendations:</p> <p>Rosemary Lane is not an existing site on the Runnymede speed management plan and vehicle speeds have not previously been monitored. In response to the concerns raised by the petition, a speed survey will therefore be undertaken in Rosemary Lane. The results of the survey will then be assessed by specialist road safety officers from the county council and Surrey Police.</p> <p>For Petition 2, requesting a 20mph speed limit and traffic calming measures in Victoria Street,</p>
---	----------------------------------	---

## Decision Notice

	<p>Englefield Green, the Runnymede Joint Committee NOTED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) The results of a speed survey and an examination of collision data indicate Victoria Street has both a good level of compliance with the speed limit and a good safety record relative to other locations on the Runnymede speed management plan.</li><li>(ii) There are currently no proposals to introduce traffic calming measures or a reduced speed limit in Victoria Street, and the introduction of such measures would be difficult to justify as a priority when many sites on the speed Runnymede speed management plan have a significantly lower level of compliance with the speed limit and a much poorer safety record.</li><li>(iii) <b>Victoria Street will be retained on the Runnymede speed management plan and vehicle speeds and collision rates will be monitored within the next six months.</b></li></ul> <p>Reasons for recommendations:</p> <p>Given both the good level of compliance with the speed limit and good safety record relative to so many other sites on the Runnymede speed management plan, it would be difficult to justify the introduction of measures at the location as a priority. Furthermore, the introduction of measures such as traffic calming and a 20mph speed limit would be unlikely to have any significant impact given the already relatively low average speed.</p>
9	<p>RESULTS OF INFORMAL PARKING CONSULTATION IN ENGLEFIELD GREEN (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION)</p> <p>The Runnymede Joint Committee AGREED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) <b>That the Joint Committee asks the Englefield Green Parking Task Group to reconvene to discuss the results, look at how we can better engage with the local community and what other parking controls options would be suitable for the area.</b></li></ul> <p>Reasons for recommendation:</p> <p>The total number of responses, 117 out of a total of 533 properties invited to participate (22%),</p>

## Decision Notice

		<p>has provided insufficient data to progress with a permit scheme with any confidence. We would have liked to see a much higher response rate to get a good representation of resident's views from across the whole consultation area, with a significant majority expressing support.</p>
10	2021 PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION)	<p>The Runnymede Joint Committee AGREED that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) the proposed amendments to on-street parking restrictions in Runnymede as described in this report and shown in detail on drawings in annexes A - F and I (EV Bays) are approved.</li><li>(ii) the joint committee agrees the funding approach as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report.</li><li>(iii) the intention of the county council to make an order under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose the waiting and on street parking restrictions in Runnymede as shown on the drawings in annex A - F is advertised and that if no objections are maintained, the orders are made.</li><li>(iv) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager is delegated authority to adjust the positions of the on-street Electric Vehicle charging bays in consultation with the Chair, Vice-Chair and Local Member prior to statutory consultation. These locations are listed in each County Councillors division of this report, and displayed in their own set of drawings (Annex I)</li><li>(v) That the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team manager is delegated authority in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Local Members to replace the existing clearway on the A30 between the Windsor and Maidenhead boundary and the crossroads of the A30, St Judes Road and Bakeham Lane and to replace it with either 'no waiting at any time' restrictions or a red route clearway (which would also cover the highway verge) subject to the outcome of a statutory consultation.</li><li>(vi) If there are unresolved objections, they will be dealt with in accordance with the county council's scheme of delegation by the parking strategy and implementation team manager, in consultation with the chairman/ vice chairman of this committee</li></ul>

## **Decision Notice**

	<p>and the appropriate county councillor.</p> <p>Reasons for recommendations:</p> <p>It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annexes A - F. They will make a positive impact towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Road safety</li><li>• Access for emergency vehicles</li><li>• Access for refuse vehicles</li><li>• Easing traffic congestion</li><li>• Better regulated parking</li><li>• Better enforcement</li></ul> <p>This will help us achieve our 2030 Community Vision objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Residents live in clean, safe, and green communities where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities.</li><li>• Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable, and safer.</li></ul>
--	---