

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
<p>Petition 389</p> <p>Re-open Ferryhill Railway Station</p> <p>E-Petition</p> <p>Petition received 25.06.20</p> <p>No. of signatures – 525</p> <p>Paper petition - 2976</p>	<p>Dave Wafer</p> <p>Head of Transport & Contract Services (Interim)</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to re-open Ferryhill Railway Station and the Leamside Line.</p> <p>E-Petition to ran from 1.8.20 – 11.10.20</p> <p>Leamside Line remains one of County Durham’s key strategic assets and both the route and the opportunity for new stations along it are highlighted in the recently adopted County Durham Plan, the document that seeks to create the conditions and framework for an ambitious and deliverable future for residents and businesses:</p> <p>“The reinstatement of the Leamside Line would provide additional capacity and relieve the existing two track railway between Darlington and Newcastle. The Leamside Line could help enable a more regular rail service from Chester-le-Street and Durham City to York and Newcastle on the ECML as well as making the ECML HS2 ready. On a reinstated Leamside Line, new services and stations could be provided for passengers and additional capacity would be created for more freight to be transported in and out of the county ...” (para 5.211, County Durham Plan 2020).</p> <p>The Leamside and Stillington lines are also actively being considered by Network Rail through their Continuous Modular Strategic Planning Process (CMSP) and in particular their Church Fenton (near York) to Newcastle workstream, as well as by Northern Powerhouse Rail, as options for addressing the significant capacity limitations of the existing East Coast Main Line (ECML) through Durham to make sure the rail network meets the demands of passengers and freight-users for decades to come.</p>	<p>Petition CLOSED</p>

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>A decision on a bid made by the local MP for Department for Transport’s Restoring Your Railways Fund Round 2, for feasibility funding for the reopening of a station at Ferryhill and connections towards Teesside, is pending. It is believed a Round 3 opportunity will be opened at some point in the new year, with a bid for the Leamside Line to be made, considering co-ordination between different elements including Ferryhill and the Stillington Line.</p> <p>Durham County Council will continue to actively participate through the appropriate regional and sub national governance channels related to Leamside, Ferryhill Station and the Stillington Line.</p>	
<p>Petition 392</p> <p>Lambton Drive, Bishop Auckland – speed restrictions</p> <p>Petition received 1.10.20</p> <p>No. of signatures – 79</p>	<p>Michelle McIntosh</p> <p>Traffic Asset Senior Engineer</p>	<p>Petition raised with regards to the speed of traffic at Lambton Drive, Bishop Auckland.</p> <p>Regretfully, the Council receive more requests for traffic calming than it is able to fund from limited road safety budgets. Due to the need to concentrate resources on reducing casualty accidents Highway Authorities are required to direct their limited funding towards addressing locations with known and proven accident problems.</p> <p>Having checked the accident recording database shared with Durham Constabulary, I can confirm there have been two recorded ‘personal injury’ accidents on Lambton Drive in the past four years, this being the standard search criteria. Compared to many other locations, this represents a favourable accident record with priority continuing to be directed to locations with a known and proven accident problem as we continue progress towards meeting casualty reduction targets.</p> <p>Community Speedwatch</p>	<p>Petition CLOSED</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>As part of our partnership approach to improving road safety, joint working with Durham Constabulary has enabled us to introduce an initiative known as 'Community Speed Watch'. This initiative is about giving a degree of ownership to local communities and providing them with the opportunity to tackle the issues and perceptions around speed.</p> <p>Under the Community Speed Watch initiative, all speeding complaints are directed towards Durham Constabulary and their Police and Communities Together (PACT) meetings, enabling the appropriate level of intervention and action to be considered.</p> <p>Durham Constabulary would normally be able to advise of the date, time and venue of the next PACT meeting should you wish to attend however at this time, with such public gatherings suspended, contact could be made with local officers on the non-emergency 101 telephone number.</p>	
<p>Petition 393</p> <p>Ownership and maintenance of Urpeth Grange play area and equipment</p> <p>E-Petition Petition received 23.10.20 No. of signatures - 287</p>	<p>Barrie Alderson Outdoor Facilities Co-ordinator</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to take over the ownership and maintenance of Urpeth Grange play area and equipment, situated adjacent to Ripley Close, Urpeth Grange Estate, Urpeth.</p> <p>The County Council does strongly support the provision for children's' play facilities, and recognises in its Review of Fixed Play Provision (Cabinet 15th July 2015) that it can be owned and managed by a variety of bodies, including for instance Town and Parish Councils, community groups, businesses as well as the County Council itself.</p> <p>In considering the potential adoption of new play areas arising from development, then in furtherance of Cabinet decision made on Cabinet 5 June 2013 (Interim Policy, Procedure for the Adoption of Public Open Space Associated with New Housing Developments) the developer must design a scheme that meets</p>	<p>Petition CLOSED</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>with Council specifications (this is also referenced in the Cabinet Report of 15th July 2015), and if they want the Council to take on the site, the developer (in this instance Persimmon) should pay the Council a commuted sum equivalent to resource maintenance for 15 years. It is not compulsory however, and the developer may choose to make their own arrangements to maintain.</p> <p>In this instance, as part of the planning approval for this development Persimmon were required to provide a new play area. Prior to its installation it was discussed with Persimmon that Durham County Council could potentially adopt the play area for ongoing inspection and maintenance subject to a management agreement and commuted sum being put in place between the two parties.</p> <p>Whilst advice was followed on the specification for the play equipment, on completion of the works Persimmon advised the Council that they had decided not to take up this option but that instead the play area had been transferred to a management company along with the much larger area of open space of which the play area forms part. It is not up to the Council to be involved in how Persimmon fund the company to undertake ongoing maintenance, but it is likely that these costs are passed to the home-owners associated with the development, who may be alerted to this at the time of sale.</p> <p>There is no obligation for a developer to seek adoption from the local authority nor is this something the Council can insist on. The practice of using management companies to oversee ongoing management / maintenance is something that many of the larger housing developers are doing UK wide.</p>	

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>I can confirm adoption by the Council, on the original terms offered to Persimmon, would still be available to the management company (as landowners), subject (and pursuant to policy) agreement of a commuted sum.</p>	
<p>Petition 394</p> <p>To implement restrictions on HGVs travelling through the villages of Pitlington, Littleton, Sherburn and Sherburn Hill</p> <p>E-Petition Petition received 31.10.20 No. of signatures – 113 Paper Petition – 228 signatures</p>	<p>Michelle McIntosh Traffic Asset Senior Engineer</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to implement restrictions on HGVs travelling through the villages of Pitlington, Littleton, Sherburn and Sherburn Hill.</p> <p>E-petition ran until 30.4.21 and closed with 113 signatures.</p> <p>Lead petitioner to present at full Council on 14 July 2021.</p>	
<p>Petition 396</p> <p>To introduce parking restrictions or residents parking permits at Kirk View, Barnard Castle</p> <p>Petition received 12.02.21 No. of signatures - 39</p>	<p>Lee Mowbray Major Projects Team Leader</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to introduce parking restrictions or residents parking permits at Kirk View, Barnard Castle.</p> <p>The process that would be followed when looking at such proposals is outlined below:</p> <p>In order to control parking we would need to create a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). All parking restrictions on the adopted highway require a TRO to enable enforcement action to be carried out. Prior to introducing a TRO, the County Council must follow government legislation to ensure that a full public consultation is undertaken. If feedback is not universally</p>	<p>Petition CLOSED</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>positive during this exercise then this can mean that the process runs for several months.</p> <p>I shall arrange for a technician to visit the site and draft up a proposed TRO scheme for the Kirk View / Bede Road junction area. This proposal would then be subject to a full consultation exercise as mentioned above.</p> <p>Looking at the permit parking zone request, I can confirm that the County Council has a policy which states that we will not designate bays or areas for resident only parking but we will consider requests for permit only areas, which are designed to displace long stay commuter parking but not short stay visitors. To this end, a permit scheme in towns like Barnard Castle, would operate for one or two hours in the morning and one or two hours in the afternoon.</p> <p>Permit Parking Areas will only be introduced in line with the following qualifying criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permit parking areas will only be considered for residential streets within commercial areas which are subject to a high demand for commuter parking. 2. Initial requests for a permit parking scheme must be accompanied by support from at least 25% of the households in the street, or from a local member on behalf of the residents. 3. More than 40% of kerbside space is occupied by non-residents for over six hours in the survey period and more than 85% of kerbside space is occupied by any vehicles during the same six hours. 	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>4. Where support has been gained from at least 75% or above of the properties included within the proposed permit area.</p> <p>The cost of administering such a scheme is required to be funded by residents and, from past experience, a scheme will inevitably result in displaced parking affecting neighbouring streets and can impact on a town's vitality and economic wellbeing. In addition to this permit schemes can often cause inconvenience to residents and their visitors and may not be considered a worthwhile solution by all residents.</p> <p>We will investigate the Kirk View area to assess its feasibility for the introduction of a permit parking scheme. With this in mind, I have arranged for parking occupancy surveys to be undertaken in this area and will assess the results against the criteria noted above. These surveys are undertaken by an external company and they are hoping to carry these out early next month. Once the results have been received and analysed.</p>	
<p>Petition 397</p> <p>Traffic noise from A167</p> <p>Petition received 16.03.21</p> <p>No. of signatures – 30</p>	<p>Dave Wafer</p> <p>Head of Transport & Contract Services</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to address the daily traffic noise from A693.</p> <p>In terms of legislation and background the County Council have no regulatory control over traffic noise as it is exempted from noise nuisance legislation. Whilst residents living next to a new or altered road may be able to claim compensation, this is not the case for people living next to an existing road.</p> <p>As there is no legal limit to road noise, we do not carry out any monitoring of noise levels. Further information can be found at https://www.gov.uk/noise-pollution-road-train-plane/noise-from-roads</p>	<p>Petition CLOSED</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>As part of a national noise mapping programme implemented by the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006, estimates for road noise across the County have been produced. These maps of noise levels can be viewed at the following website that enables users to zoom into specific areas - http://www.extrium.co.uk/noiseviewer.html</p> <p>By way of background it is generally accepted that vegetation has no effect on noise unless it is the equivalent of a 50m stretch of dense forest, which obviously could not be achieved in this instance. Whilst vegetation may have a psychological effect in that it breaks the line of site and therefore can give the impression of a noise reduction, in reality, it has no impact.</p> <p>There are existing trees along the A693 near to Station Road and the grassed verge is already well vegetated. The seasonal changes to trees and vegetation may also affect how noise is perceived and this does not appear to offer much in the way of actual noise attenuation. Adding additional planting isn't likely to improve existing noise levels.</p> <p>Generally, the most effective method for reducing noise impact when people live near the transport network is to improve the glazing which can be very effective at eliminating road noise but would obviously be the responsibility of the homeowners.</p>	
<p>Petition 398</p> <p>Do not move Woodhouse Close Leisure Centre</p> <p>E-Petition Petition received 27.03.21 No. of signatures –</p>	<p>Alison Clark Head of Culture, Sport & Tourism</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to listen to the residents of Woodhouse Close and Bishop Auckland and reverse the decision to build the new leisure centre at Tindale.</p>	<p>E-petition to run from 14 May to 25 June 2021</p>

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
Petition 399 Reinstatement of the DLI Museum E-Petition Petition received 9.04.21 No. of signatures –	Alison Clark Head of Culture, Sport & Tourism	Petition asking the Council to reinstate the DLI Museum and its artefacts.	E-petition to run from 14 May to 25 June 2021
Petition 400 Community Petition to extend the 30mph zone on the A6076 Howden Bank E-Petition Petition received 13.05.21 No. of signatures – 81	Dave Wafer Head of Transport and Contract Services	Petition asking the Council to extend the 30mph speed limit at least 300m NE from its current location, to beyond the entrance to Maiden View and Willow Burn Hospice. Additionally, to consider a 40mph limit for the remaining distance of approximately 700m to the 30mph restriction in Maiden Law Village.	Awaiting response.
Petition 401 Compulsory Purchase Order on the Station Pub and 2 Houses on the end at St. Helen Auckland Petition received 21.05.21 No. of signatures – 150	Geoff Paul Regeneration, Economy and Growth	Petition asking the Council to Compulsory Purchase Order on the Station Pub and 2 Houses on the end at St. Helen Auckland.	Awaiting response.
Petition 402 To demolish or rebuild Ashley House, Thornley Road, Trimdon Station Petition received 24.05.21 No. of signatures – 50	Geoff Paul Regeneration, Economy and Growth	Petition asking the Council to demolish or rebuild Ashley House, Thornley Road, Trimdon Station.	Awaiting response.

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
---------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------