

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
<p>Petition 394</p> <p>To implement restrictions on HGVs travelling through the villages of Pitlington, Littleton, Sherburn and Sherburn Hill</p> <p><b>E-Petition</b>                      Petition received 31.10.20                      No. of signatures – 113                      Paper Petition – 228 signatures</p>	<p>Michelle McIntosh                      Traffic Assets Team Leader</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to implement restrictions on HGVs travelling through the villages of Pitlington, Littleton, Sherburn and Sherburn Hill.</p> <p><b>HGV Traffic/Weight restriction and limit HGV usage on least suitable routes</b></p> <p>The HGV traffic travelling through Low Pitlington, High Pitlington, Sherburn, Sherburn Hill and Littleton has been raised a number of times over the years and we have previously advised the SPL Community Group that we would not consider introducing a weight restriction on this road as there is no structural reason i.e. there is no weak bridge and the road serves local communities and businesses, all of which require deliveries by HGV. There are structures within the highway on this route but they are regularly inspected and do not require that any restriction is placed to regulate the weight of vehicles passing over them.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the use of the relaxation of ‘except for access’ opens the restriction to easy abuse by drivers and can render the restriction unworkable. Therefore, in legal terms we would not be able to satisfy our duties as Highway Authority under the relevant pieces of legislation if we were to attempt to introduce such a restriction. There is also no option to try and direct HGV traffic as suggested onto the ‘least suitable routes’ as this would be subjective and opinion on which routes are the least suitable would likely vary depending upon where those asked reside. Additionally while there are no avoidable or prohibited movements for Taylormade traffic we have generally had a good line of communication with the company and are aware that they work to vary their routes and consider local impact when planning movement of materials to/from their site.</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>There are currently no weight restrictions through Low Pittington, High Pittington, Sherburn, Sherburn Hill and Littletown and while residents might consider that such a restriction should be introduced on environmental grounds it remains the case that there is no viable alternative route. There are no plans to introduce restrictions or any scope to limit the numbers of vehicles using the route. We are also unable to influence which routes they take.</p> <p><b>Structures/Bridges</b></p> <p>As mentioned there are 2 structures within the adopted highway at Low Pittington and High Pittington and it was suggested these structures were subject to 'very limited inspection'.</p> <p>The inspections are carried out to the relevant code of practice. This code was updated to Code of Practice "Well-managed highway Infrastructure" in October 2016. More emphasis in the updated code was placed on managing the asset through the risk assessment process and Durham have adopted the new Code from October 2018 therefore allowing a full review of inspection intervals to be completed which has extended timescales between Principal Inspection from 6 years to either 8yrs, 10yrs or 12 yrs using the guidance in Interim Advice Note 171/12 Risk Based Principal Inspection Intervals.</p> <p>The current position with the structures is summarised below ;</p> <p>B0544 Pittington Village Bridge - This structure had a Principal Inspection carried out by an external contractor in January 2015, a General Inspection in February 2017 and again in February 2019. A Principal Inspection for this bridge was programmed to be carried out by the end of the 20/21 financial year and is confirmed to have been undertaken on 15th March 2021.</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>There are works identified for this structure in the medium to long term but there is nothing which gives concern over its structural integrity in terms of vehicular loading at this time.</p> <p>B0135 Coalford Lane Bridge - This structure had a Principal Inspection carried out by an external contractor in December 2014, a General Inspection in April 2017 and again in August 2019. This bridge will now not receive a further Principal Inspection until 2022/23 financial year following the updated review under IAN 171/12 which has extended the requirement for a Principal Inspection to every 8 years.</p> <p>There are works identified for the medium to long term but there is again nothing which gives concern over its structural integrity in terms of vehicular loading. The issues raised are more cosmetic in nature than structural.</p> <p>In conclusion there are no issues with these structures that would result in the necessity to restrict the size of vehicles using the road.</p> <p><b>Existing traffic calming and comparison raised in relation to scheme on B1285 Murton</b></p> <p>The existing traffic calming scheme for High Pitlington was introduced to reduce vehicle speeds and through traffic in the village, as both the Police and County Council received many justified complaints regarding vehicle speeds. It was therefore necessary that the measures had to be effective to have a positive improvement in reducing vehicle speeds. Apart from taking account of motorists' views, we also had to consider all highway users including pedestrians using this road.</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>During the development of the scheme the various types of traffic calming feature were considered to identify which was the most suitable to achieve the objectives of the project. Following this process the most appropriate feature was determined to be a series of sets of speed cushions, which is due to the various site constraints, the road being a bus route and the need to reduce speeds over a long distance.</p> <p>While it was stated that the group do not consider there was sufficient public consultation for the existing traffic calming scheme I can confirm that a consultation was undertaken with residents of Low Pitlington and High Pitlington, where all properties, a total of 611 at the time, were issued with details of the proposed scheme and invited to make comment. In addition, the statutory consultees, including the emergency services, were also consulted with regard to the proposals and inviting their comments. 215 responses were received from individual properties with a majority of those who responded being in favour of progressing the proposals. The proposal was also advertised by notices posted on site, in the local press and available to inspect at named Durham County Council offices.</p> <p>Additionally the proposal having received objections was subject to review at Durham County Council’s Highways Committee, which is part of our democratic process, with a report outlining the details of the scheme, the consultation and the nature of the objections.</p> <p>Speed surveys were carried out both before and after the scheme was introduced which determined that the scheme had been successful in reducing vehicle speeds. While there have been requests to alter, relocate or remove the traffic calming features they are still considered appropriate for maintaining lower speeds through the village.</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>The B1285 location mentioned at Murton is subject to an historic 18T weight limit ‘plug’ which is a restriction over a short distance that effectively prevents vehicles of a certain weight from passing through a point so while the route beyond is not restricted vehicles cannot access from that direction. While this effectively forces restricted vehicles to use more suitable alternative routes, rather than pass through, no such alternative exists for Low Pittington, High Pittington and Littleton as all routes are similar in nature and are the only viable options for access to the Taylormade site as well as any deliveries that need to be made by HGV in the villages.</p> <p>Murton also has speed table traffic calming features introduced to replace previous traffic calming, which comprised priority give way ‘pinch points’. These ‘pinch point’ features were removed following complaints about noise, Anti-Social behaviour and difficulties reported with adjacent access and parking. While such features were considered for High Pittington there are a number of issues relating to speed tables that resulted in the chosen cushion arrangement with one example being that such features are costly due to the requirement for alterations to highway drainage, which is not an issue with cushions. If this option had been introduced it would have meant a much shorter scheme would have been delivered and only have influenced the speeds over a shorter distance. It is possible that such a scheme would not have resulted in the successful speed reduction achieved by the current scheme over the wider area.</p> <p><b>Road Safety &amp; Bend at Low Pittington</b></p> <p>We have investigated road safety concerns raised in relation to the bend at Low Pittington there is no scope to widen this section due to the existing levels of adjacent private land. We</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>have acknowledged previous concerns in relation to vehicle overrun of footways at this location and any actionable defects have been addressed.</p> <p>Additionally, having checked the accident recording database shared with Durham Constabulary I can confirm there have been no recorded ‘personal injury’ accidents on the section of road through the bend at Low Pittington in the last 4 years, this being our standard search criteria. This represents a favourable accident record when compared to many other roads in the County which remain as priority to address from limited road safety funding which must be directed to deal with those locations having the worst accident records.</p> <p><b>Sherburn mini roundabout</b></p> <p>This junction was previously a typical cross-roads with a slight stagger between the north and south legs. Such layouts introduce uncertainty over priority and do nothing to slow traffic on the straight through leg, which can also lead to risk taking by motorists on the minor road legs. The roundabout has been in place for many years yet is still a location where accidents as the result of driver error/judgement are recorded. We have made changes in recent years to attempt to address this and the layout is still considered appropriate due to limited scope for alternative arrangements.</p> <p>A traffic signal installation was previously considered as an option prior to the decision to introduce the mini-roundabout, however it was discounted at that time due to a number of reasons including existing layout and available space, likely to control peak flows but would create unnecessary delays at other times and stop lines would have to be set back to accommodate the turning paths of large vehicles and this introduces further</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>delays in the signal timings. The proximity of side roads close to the junction creates an issue over keeping the entrances clear whilst accommodating the queues of vehicles and in such layouts the junction can easily become blocked if the accesses are obstructed and vehicles want to turn in. Traffic signals would remove the issue of bad driving in negotiating the roundabout, but signals generate damage only, rear-end shunt type accidents and ones associated with red-light jumping. From the aesthetic perspective, a signalised junction would look out of place in Sherburn and as it would also cost upward of £100,000 such an improvement is not considered justified or appropriate.</p> <p><b>Reported/recorded incidents &amp; Carriageway Inspections</b></p> <p>When images, recordings or anecdotal statements detailing potential road safety issues or incidents are received this information is reviewed however if the material received is incomplete, unclear or the issue suggested is not defined, DCC are unable to take any action. For example an image showing an HGV on the wrong side of the road, where due to the scope of the photo, it is unclear if a wider picture might offer an explanation such as overtaking a stationary vehicle. If information or footage showing an example of an issue raised, but where there is insufficient supporting evidence such as clear picture of the licence plate or date and time of the incident, the Traffic Assets team will note the occurrence but cannot action further. If there is clear evidence of an actionable issue this can be escalated to a number of parties such as; dangerous driving to the police or, the operator of the business. Issues such as items on the road or reported carriageway/footway defects will be logged for investigation by the DCC team responsible but these will also be picked up as part of routine inspections carried out by the Highways Inspector during the course of his/her regular duties.</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>Dangerous driving or behaviour may also be reported directly to Durham Constabulary on the non-emergency 101 telephone number.</p> <p><b>20mph speed limit</b></p> <p>The road through High and Low Pittington would not meet the criteria for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit or zone. We do remain open to the progression of an advisory 20mph on Hallgarth Lane passed the Primary School if third party funding can be identified.</p> <p><b>Origin and destination surveys</b></p> <p>Origin and destination surveys, as the name suggests, are carried out to determine where a vehicle has travelled from and is where it intends to travel to as well as collecting other data . These surveys require a police officer with the powers to stop a vehicle as well as someone to ask the questions required for the scope of the survey. This type of survey is, due to the set up required, a costly undertaking and can potentially create delays to the travelling public so it is not something we would undertake unless there was a valid reason to collect this data. As we do not propose to investigate the imposition of a weight limit there is no justification to carry out such a survey.</p> <p>We have already agreed with the local County Councillor to carry out a classification survey to determine levels of HGV traffic using the villages of Low Pittington, High Pittington, Sherburn, Sherburn Hill and Littleton when typical traffic patterns resume as this survey was previously postponed due to concerns that changes in lockdown rules would not offer suitable data. This would provide data on the number of vehicles using</p>	



Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>the different routes however we are not using this data to determine a proposal so all this will confirm is how many HGVs use the route.</p>	
<p>Petition 399 Reinstate the DLI Museum</p> <p><b>E-Petition</b> Petition received 9.04.21 No. of signatures – 121</p>	<p>Alison Clark Head of Culture, Sport &amp; Tourism</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to reinstate the DLI Museum and it's artefacts.</p> <p>On 21 October 2015, Cabinet agreed to new arrangements for the storage and display of the DLI collection which included the storage of items at the Sevenhills facility and proposals for the loan of items to a number of venues including Palace Green Library, Bishop Auckland Town Hall, Spennymoor, Newton Aycliffe and Seaham. This was part of an approach to widening the exposure of the history of the DLI to wider groups whilst also achieving medium term financial plan (MTFP) savings. More substantive arrangements for a permanent display were agreed by Cabinet on 17 January 2018 where, as part of consideration of a report on the development of the Aykley Heads site as a Strategic Employment Site and the relocation of the DCC Headquarters to the city centre, the new History Centre development, which includes a permanent display for DLI collection, was agreed. Subsequent to that report, further updates on the development of the History Centre have been considered by Cabinet on 17 October 2018 and 16 January 2019.</p> <p>Following the local elections in May this year, the Council's new Joint Administration has requested a review of the proposed arrangements for the care, storage and display of the Durham Light Infantry Collection, archive, museum building and grounds.</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>This is a key priority to review and ensure that the proud and significant military history of County Durham is recognised.</p> <p>Whilst not a direct response to this petition, the review by the Joint Administration is seeking to respond to 2 questions, the first of which will address the subject of the petition ‘We the undersigned petition the Council to Reinstate the DLI museum, restoring all artefacts and exhibits within its own bespoke building’:</p> <p><b>Question 1: Can the former DLI building be brought back into use to house the DLI collection?</b>  <b>Question 2: What are the options to repurpose the former DLI building/site for an alternative use?</b></p> <p>The output from the review will be a high-level report which sets out information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options for displaying and storing and care of DLI collection in the existing DLI building. This is to include a full assessment of costs, risks, financial, legal and value for money issues associated with the options considered.</li> <li>• An impact assessment on the plans for the new History Centre including funding impact</li> <li>• Impact on the storage, display, and care of other DCC collections</li> <li>• High level options assessment which will include any suitable alternatives uses for the former DLI building and with regard to the grounds and environment around the site. This will include indicative high-level costs and opportunities for income generation.</li> </ul> <p>The review will be informed by a Special Meeting of Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Management Board which was held in</p>	

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>the Council Chamber, County Hall, Durham on Wednesday 28 July 2021 at 1.30 pm.</p> <p>The outcome will be considered by Cabinet by September 2021.</p>	
<p>Petition 400</p> <p>Community Petition to extend the 30mph zone on the A6076 Howden Bank</p> <p><b>E-Petition</b></p> <p>Petition received 13.05.21</p> <p>No. of signatures – 81</p>	<p>Michelle McIntosh</p> <p>Traffic Assets Team Leader</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to extend the 30mph speed limit at least 300m NE from it's 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.</p> <p>It is appreciated that residents often have a desire for a lower speed limit outside their properties. The County Council take these concerns seriously and give them full consideration when we evaluate changes to speed limits. Speed Limit changes are undertaken using guidance issued by the Department for Transport and our own considerable local experience of implementing speed limits within the County. We also work closely with Durham Constabulary when considering changes to speed limits.</p> <p>It is an intention of the Department for Transport guidance to ensure that speed limits are credible with the aim that they become self-evident and self-enforcing, by virtue of their surroundings.</p> <p>Speed limit reviews take into account many factors that are considered and evaluated. Examples of such include the existing vehicle speeds, nature of the road and its surroundings, local needs, existing highway infrastructure, development, highway signs, road markings and street lighting, the various</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>road users, the credibility of the speed limit and accident history. The length of speed limit, distance between speed limit terminal points and the number of changes along the route are also considered.</p> <p>A speed limit which lacks credibility results in a significant proportion of motorists ignoring the limit and potentially driving at even higher speeds and can also lead to greater risk taking. In addition the imposition of non-credible lower limits can raise residents' expectations that the speeds of vehicles will suddenly reduce but this is seldom being achieved in practice, thus creating further annoyance for both residents and motorists, and also unfair criticism of the police who have to enforce the speed limits.</p> <p>This length of A6076 has for a number of years been the subject of speeding complaints which in part is due to the lack of credibility of the speed limit over some sections. On Howden Bank there is intermittent property /development frontage mainly on one side of the road, with the road widening to three lanes over part of the bank. This, in conjunction with other factors creates a roadside environment which does not validate the perception by drivers as being a location where a lower limit is expected or appropriate. The new development at Maiden View offers no additional frontage development and no contribution to changing the roadside environment and for this reason the speed limit was not changed for the development at the planning stage.</p> <p>New developments such as Maiden View are subject to review at the planning stage by the Development Management Team, where the highway elements and impacts are considered. This would have included the access to the development being reviewed and designed to current standards which would have</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>been undertaken to the design appropriate for the existing speed limit. The localised widening to accommodate the road markings for the turn was to ensure sufficient width for the layout and it is not unusual to for markings to wear at some points on a layout due to vehicle overrun. Drivers are encouraged to follow a path but as an intermittent line marking they are permitted to enter the hatching as stated in Rule 130 of Highway Code ‘you should not enter the area unless it is necessary and you can see that it is safe to do so’, so it is possible that this wear is as a result of legitimate driving. We will, as with all highway lining countywide, recover worn areas of road markings when considered necessary.</p> <p>The existing speed limits on this section of A6076 are still deemed to be appropriate and I hope you can appreciate that it is not an easy task to review speed limits as inevitably any decision not to lower a limit or where a limit is raised is not what some people want, but decisions are based on full consideration of all factors. Additionally, having checked the accident recording database shared with Durham Constabulary I can confirm there has been 2 recorded ‘personal injury’ accidents on the section of A6076 from the junction with A691 to Maiden Law crossroads at Tower Road in the past 4 years, this being our standard search criteria. I can confirm that both of these accidents were single vehicle accidents where the causation was recorded as winter weather conditions and there was no suggestion that the accidents were attributable to speed or the highway. While we would prefer to see no accidents this represents a favourable accident record when compared to many other roads in the County with priority continuing to be directed to locations with known and proven accident problems. We therefore do not propose any changes at this location.</p>	

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>Speed Complaints</p> <p>As part of our partnership approach to improving road safety, joint working with Durham Constabulary 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 or your constituent 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 401</p> <p>Compulsory Purchase Order on the Station Pub and 2 Houses on the end at St. Helen Auckland</p> <p>Petition received 21.05.21 No. of signatures – 150</p>	<p>Stephen Grundy Senior Asset Strategy Officer</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to Compulsory Purchase Order on the Station Pub and 2 Houses on the end at St. Helen Auckland.</p> <p>The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process is a lengthy process made up of a number of stages. It is only when the CPO has been confirmed by the Confirming Authority, usually the Secretary of State, does an Acquiring Authority, The Council in this situation, have the powers to compulsorily purchase properties. The process leading up to confirmation can take between 12 and 18 months.</p> <p>CPO is an acquisition by last resort and therefore The Council must demonstrate that it has exhausted all other avenues to purchase the land. This would include working with the owners of the properties to bring them back into use, taking enforcement action through Building Control and entering into discussions to purchase the properties by negotiation. The Council will also have to provide details to demonstrate that a viable scheme is in place for the properties to be acquired.</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>As part of the CPO process, The Council will have to prepare Statement of Reasons, which will demonstrate that the proposed scheme and consequently the CPO is in the public interest and will deliver social, environment and economic well-being. These are the criteria upon which a CPO is judged. The Statement of Reasons will also have to demonstrate that all other avenues have been exhausted as mentioned above.</p> <p>The Council have been working with the new owner of the Station Pub since she acquired the property in June 2020 to support the process of bringing the property back into use. Whilst the property was purchased during the COVID-19 pandemic, at the time of the purchase lockdown restrictions were starting to ease and the new owner intended to start renovating the property. However, further COVID-19 lockdowns have hampered the renovation progress. To date the owner has made the property water tight due to serious issues with water ingress.</p> <p>The Council have further supported the owner by offering her assistance in developing an application for a Business Improvement Grant, which will be used to help bring the property into a useable condition. An application has subsequently been submitted and is currently being assessed by colleagues.</p> <p>In terms of the residential properties adjacent, 62 Station Road has recently been sold on 29 March 2021 to a Lettings Company. With regard to 64 Station Road, the Council have recently been in dialogue with the solicitor acting on behalf of the property freeholder who has confirmed that the freeholder has actually agreed to dispose of the freehold interest to the current leaseholder.</p>	

**Petition Table – Active Petitions**

**Appendix 2**

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>The information above will be used to in Statement of Reasons to demonstrate that The Council have entered into dialogue with the respective property owners to support them in bringing the properties back into use. The new owners of 62 and 64 Station Road will be contacted to establish their plans for the properties with Building Control engaging with them as a matter of urgency.</p>	
<p>Petition 402</p> <p>To demolish or rebuild Ashley House, Thornley Road, Trimdon Station</p> <p>Petition received 24.05.21 No. of signatures – 50</p>	<p>Geoff Paul Regeneration, Economy and Growth</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to demolish or rebuild Ashley House, Thornley Road, Trimdon Station.</p>	<p>Awaiting response.</p>
<p>Petition 403</p> <p>Request for Parking Bays and the Removal of Trees at Kemp Road, Peterlee</p> <p>Petition received 12.7.21 No. of signatures – 19</p>	<p>Dave Wafer Head of Transport and Contract Services</p>	<p>Petition asking for parking bays and the removal of trees at Kemp Road, Peterlee.</p> <p>The conversion of open space amenity land to off street parking spaces is possible in most instances but it can be extremely costly and cost an estimated £5000 per parking space. This estimate can rise dramatically if any public utility apparatus is affected. Unfortunately we do not have a budget for this purpose and therefore are unable to take your request forward for additional parking at this stage.</p> <p>However, you may wish to consider approaching your local Area Action Partnership or local Councillors who may have access to a suitable funding stream.</p> <p>With regard to the removal of trees I can confirm that our Senior Tree Officer has inspected the trees. The trees in the street comprise a mixture of Sycamore, Lime, Swedish Whitebeam and Cherry and are currently in a reasonable condition, although</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>



Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>their health is being impacted by the increase in informal parking on their root plates. These trees provide a positive contribution to the local area and it is not in the Durham County Council Tree Management Policy to remove otherwise healthy trees to allow for increased parking areas. More advise can be given with regards to a proposed scheme which could accommodate tree retention.</p>	
<p>Petition 404</p> <p>Controlled crossing in Dipton</p> <p>Petition received 15.8.21 No. of signatures – 94</p>	<p>Michelle McIntosh Traffic Assets Team Leader</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council for a controlled crossing in Dipton.</p>	<p>Awaiting response</p>
<p>Petition 405</p> <p>Bus Services through Picktree Village</p> <p>Petition received 15.8.21 No. of signatures – 23</p>	<p>Andy Leadbeater Integrated Passenger Transport Manager</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to lobby for improvements to the bus services through Picktree Village.</p> <p>Go North East is already making changes to its services that will see a full evening and Sunday timetable introduced to the Stanley – Chester-le-Street – Washington – Sunderland service 8, which will operate every 60 minutes. This replaces the mid-evening journeys that have operated via Picktree until now as service 8A. This forms part of extensive changes to their network, starting on 5th September.</p> <p>At the same date, the current Chester-le-Street – Washington – South Shields service 50A is replaced by journeys operating as service 50 on the standard route of service 50 i.e., omitting Picktree Village. The net effect of the change is that Picktree Village gains more later evening and Sunday buses while having slightly fewer in mid-evening.</p> <p>Durham County Council is currently working with regional partners to introduce a new “Enhanced Partnership”</p>	<p>Petition <b>CLOSED</b></p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service/Officer	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>arrangement for bus services in the north east, in line with recent changes in government policy. This introduces a new relationship between councils and bus operators, considerably changing the “deregulated” regime introduced by the Transport Act 1985 which gave bus operators the freedom to choose which services to operate on a commercial (unsubsidised) basis. In future, the intention is that the way services operate will be on the basis of meeting agreed standards including frequencies, routes and fares. In line with the new arrangements, the Partnership is currently working on a Bus Service Improvement Plan to be submitted to government in late October, with a view to winning funding for a programme of measures intended to transform the attractiveness of bus services, starting from April 2022. While part of the plan will need to address the headwinds created by travel changes arising from the pandemic, it is hoped that ambitious measures can significantly enhance the role of bus services in society, and contribute to the actions that are necessary to address concerns about climate change. For further details, please see the Transport North East website at <a href="https://www.transportnortheast.gov.uk/">https://www.transportnortheast.gov.uk/</a> and especially the news item regarding the “Big Bus Conversation”.</p>	