

Minutes of the meeting of the
Runnymede JOINT COMMITTEE
held at 7.30 pm on 6 July 2021
at The Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone KT15 2AH.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

Surrey County Council Members:

- * John Furey (Chairman)
- * Marisa Heath
- * Jonathan Hulley
- * Robert King
- * Scott Lewis
- * Mark Nuti

Borough / District Members:

- * Borough Councillor Mark Maddox (Vice-Chairman)
- * Borough Councillor Alex Balkan
- * Borough Councillor Isabel Mullens
- * Borough Councillor Nick Prescott
- * Borough Councillor Peter Snow
- * Borough Councillor Donald Whyte

* In attendance

1/21 ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN [Item 1]

The Partnership Committee Officer announced Cllr John Furey as the new chairman and Cllr Mark Maddox as the new vice-chairman.

2/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 2]

No apologies were received.

3/21 MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 3]

The minutes of the meeting held on 29 March 2021 were approved as a correct record.

4/21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 4]

There were no declarations of interest.

5/21 DECISION TRACKER [Item 5]

The decision tracker was noted.

6/21 PETITIONS AND PETITION RESPONSES [Item 6]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions/Statements: 2 petitions were received. The text of each petition and the officer responses were published with the agenda pack.

Member Discussion – key points:

Petition 1: requesting a 20mph speed limit in Rosemary Lane, Thorpe. The lead petitioner, Mr Doran, addressed the committee, drawing attention to the narrowness of the lane, the lack of space for cars to pass, and the use of the lane by children walking to school.

The local Borough member stated that he had visited Rosemary Lane in the week prior to this meeting; he supported the completion of a speed survey to collect data on vehicle driver behaviour and to indicate the level of need for further work. He thanked Mr Doran for attending the committee and for meeting him on-site.

The question about possible effects of covid-related changes to driving habits was raised and whether the survey process would allow for this. Officers commented that the council's traffic studies team would be monitoring traffic levels countywide but they were confident that the results of the speed survey in this road would be accurate and reflect traffic activity at the time it was carried out.

Following consideration of collision data and the physical layout of the lane, committee members supported the recommendation for a speed survey.

The chairman thanked Mr Doran for attending.

For Petition 1 the Runnymede Joint Committee NOTED:

- (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.
- (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.

Reasons for recommendations:

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.

Petition 2, requesting a 20mph speed limit and traffic calming measures in Victoria Street, Englefield Green.

There was no-one present to address the committee about this petition.

A speed survey had been carried out in autumn 2020 and showed good compliance with the speed limit; however, members raised points about changes in driving habits because of covid-related restrictions and the fact that survey results showed average speeds rather than maximum speeds. The local Borough member described the road as wide and straight, with clear sight lines, and asked for innovative ideas to be considered when tackling issues of vehicle speed on local roads.

The chairman asked officers to provide information on how the surveys are conducted and data extrapolated.

It was noted that the County Council's policy on speed limits was being reviewed and he invited the local Member to submit her comments to the review.

A revision to recommendation (iii) was proposed by Cllr Heath and seconded by Cllr Mullens giving a deadline of six months within which to complete a speed survey, with members voting in favour of the revision.

For petition 2 the Runnymede Joint Committee NOTED:

- (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.
- (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.
- (iii) 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.**

Reasons for recommendations:

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.

7/21 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

A Member question was received from Cllr Marissa Heath – the question and officer response were published in the agenda pack.

Cllr Heath indicated that she was happy with the response and will welcome the ongoing work on LCWIP planning.

Following comments about the planned improvements at Runnymede Pleasure Grounds and the sense in tying these in with improved walking and cycling connections to the Grounds so that local residents can enjoy the full benefits, the Chairman clarified that the Grounds are held in trust and are therefore not under direct RBC control.

8/21 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 8]

No questions were received.

9/21 RESULTS OF INFORMAL PARKING CONSULTATION IN ENGLEFIELD GREEN (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager; Peter Wells, Parking Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

The Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager introduced the report and explained that the consultation referred to in the report came about because the University was increasing the amount of student accommodation in the area and developing a Travel Plan for staff and students including introducing parking charges on the campus. This could lead to more pressure on street parking nearby. The university was part of the Englefield Green task group that agreed to proceed with the consultation. However, the response rate was disappointing and too low to allow any recommendation that parking restrictions be introduced.

Cllr Heath thanked officers for their work on the consultation. She stated that it is a difficult problem to resolve with paid-for permits being the only real way to reduce parking on the roads; in addition, planned developments in Egham and the switch to electric cars will do nothing to reduce demand for space. The university has expressed its willingness to be help arrive at a workable solution and with their support this is a good basis for reconvening the task group.

A revised recommendation was proposed by Cllr Heath and seconded by Cllr Prescott using wording from Option 3.2 on page 16 of the agenda pack to

replace the three original officer recommendations. Committee voted in favour of the new recommendation.

Resolved:

The Runnymede Joint Committee AGREED:

- (i) 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.**

Reasons for recommendation:

The total number of responses, 117 out of a total of 533 properties invited to participate (22%), 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.

10/21 2021 PARKING REVIEW (EXECUTIVE FUNCTION FOR DECISION) [Item 10]

Declarations of Interest: None

Officers attending: David Curl, Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager; Peter Wells, Parking Engineer

Petitions, Public Questions, Statements: None.

Member Discussion – key points:

The chairman thanked officers for their detailed and comprehensive report.

In response to questions about how engagement with residents about proposals for new parking restrictions took place and whether greater use of social media and increased links with the Runnymede borough communications team might produce a larger response, officers explained that proposals agreed at this meeting would be put to residents for consultation using street notices and messages posted through doors, along with the statutory newspaper advertisement. The Parking Engineer explained how initial requests are prioritised taking into account how many requests are made in the same road, what will work within the highway rules etc, and then a visit to the sites on different days at different times. The relevant officers from SCC and RBC are in regular contact regarding parking restrictions and enforcement.

Using more channels for engagement, such as social media, could result in more requests and responses, but the Parking Team has finite resources with which to service the requests. A number of Members stated their satisfaction with the existing process and it was stressed that Members need to actively engage with residents and be a channel for information.

A discussion was had regarding the proposals for Electric Vehicle charging points. It was noted that installation of the points is part of a two-year trial in a number of boroughs and districts across Surrey, with the County Council

providing charging opportunities on-street in addition to those being installed by private operators, to help meet future demand and allow residents access to a charging point if they do not have off-street parking at home.

The chairman stated that he would prefer the two spaces proposed on Station Road in Addlestone be relocated into either the Tesco or Waitrose car parks. Other members commented on the use of residential versus non-residential roads; officers advised that the emphasis for the sites was residential locations and streets without off-street parking.

Enforcement was highlighted as a key aspect of the successful uptake of charging points. RBC's Corporate Head of Community Services stated that the planned appointment of two new parking enforcement officers would provide additional resource, and the SCC Parking Engineer explained that the charging bays would have associated Traffic Regulation Orders which would allow enforcement. The equipment at the bays would be able to detect a car that is parked and not charging. As the trial progresses, technology, best practice and policy will develop in line with the feedback.

Data on the usage of the bays will be provided as it becomes available.

Resolved:

The Runnymede Joint Committee AGREED that:

- (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.
- (ii) the joint committee agrees the funding approach as detailed in paragraph 5.1 of this report.
- (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.
- (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)
- (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.
- (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 and the appropriate county councillor.

Reasons for recommendations:

It is recommended that the waiting restrictions are implemented as detailed in Annexes A - F. They will make a positive impact towards:

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

This will help us achieve our 2030 Community Vision objectives

- Residents live in clean, safe, and green communities where people and organisations embrace their environmental responsibilities.
- Journeys across the county are easier, more predictable, and safer.

11/21 FORWARD PROGRAMME 2021/22 [Item 11]

The Forward Plan was noted.

The chairman encouraged Members to use the forthcoming informal meeting in September to try and develop a strategy around actions that the Joint Committee will be able to work on successfully.

12/21 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The next formal meeting is scheduled for Monday 15 November 2021 at 7.30pm.

Meeting ended at: 9.25 pm

Chairman