Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

Road Safety       Iroad, from the start of Willow Tree Avenue to part-way up Shincliffe Bank. (Note that a 40mph speed limit within County Durham was enforceable from 10%+2 = 46mph.)         Shincliffe       - Improve road signage to advise people of the approaching risks to reduce the number of accidents travelling southbound out of the city.         Shincliffe       Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary have exchanged correspondence with the petitioner previously on the issues set out in the petition and was more recently discussed at a public meeting in Shincliffe on 1/11/22 with a wider group including residents, Durham County Durham County Council and also the PCC and her team.         E-Petition       E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         No. of signatures 19       E-Petition regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions) <u>Burey August 200 1710 105 21% 20% 21% 50% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0</u>	Petition 422	REG												5m stretch c ank. (Note th	
Improvements – A177         Shincliffe Village/High         Shincliffe Village/High         Shincliffe         Shincliffe         E-Petition         Received 15.08.22         No. of signatures 19         Policie         F-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position rangement that the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary. Durham Counties Council and Durham Constabulary. Durham Counties Council and Durham Counties Council and Durham Counties Council Traffic Assets, MP office, Parish Council and also the PCC and her team.         E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         During the prover the speed lime were were available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         During the prover the prover the speed lime were were available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         During the prove tore of the	Road Safetv														
Shincliffe Village/High         Shincliffe Village/High         Shincliffe Name         Shincliffe Village/High         Bereeived 15.08.22         No. of signatures 19         E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         At77 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions) <u>Builty Wirk Wirk Wirk Wirk Wirk Wirk Wirk Wirk</u>															,
Shincliffe       Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary have exchanged correspondence with the petitioner previously on the issues set out in the petition and was more recently discussed at a public meeting in Shincliffe on 1/11/22 with a wider group including residents, Durham Constabulary, Durham County Council Traffic Assets, MP office, Parish Council and also the PCC and her team.         E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.       The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)	•											0			
E-Petition         Received 15.08.22         No. of signatures 19         Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         At77 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date of Survey         Date of Survey         Date of Aurrage         Survey         19/10-         Traffic Flow         19/10-			Durham	County	Cound	cil and	Durh	am Co	onstab	oulary	have		•		nce
Received 15.08.22       including residents, Durham Constabulary, Durham Council Traffic Assets, MP office, Parish Council and also the PCC and her team.         E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham Council and Durham Constabulary remains in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date or Market in the speed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date or Average in the princip is the princip i	E-Petition														
No. of signatures 19       MP office, Parish Council and also the PCC and her team.         E-Petition ran from 20.8.22 – 20.11.22.         The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date of Average Averag	Received 15.08.22														
The position regarding the speed limit had been discussed at length and whilst we appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed 	No. of signatures 19														
appreciate the comments raised Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date of Survey Daily Traffic Flow         19/10 7410         19/10 7410			E-Petitio	n ran fro	om 20.	.8.22 -	- 20.1	1.22.							
remain in agreement that the speed limit set at 40mph remains appropriate and credible.         At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions) <u>bate of Average Survey Baily Traffic Flow Baily Traffic Flow 11/10              <u>530 31-35 36-40 41-45 46-50 51-55 56-60 3-60 Mean 85<sup>m</sup> centile 19/10 - 7410 15% 21% 38% 21% 5% 0% 0% 0% 36 mph 42 mph    </u></u>															
credible.       At the public meeting one of the actions agreed was to undertake a new speed survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date of Survey       Average S30 31-35 36-40 41-45 46-50 51-55 56-60 >60 Mean 85 <sup>th</sup> 201%         Traffic Flow       MPH															ry
survey and it was expected that this would be commissioned at the start of the new year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available. A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions) $\frac{\boxed{Date \ of}}{Burvey} \frac{\boxed{Average}}{Daily} \frac{\le 30}{1-35} \frac{31-35}{36-40} \frac{41-45}{41-45} \frac{46-50}{45-5} \frac{51-55}{56-60} \frac{>60}{50} \frac{Mean}{85''} \frac{85''}{centile} \frac{19/10-7410}{15\%} \frac{15\%}{21\%} \frac{38\%}{21\%} \frac{21\%}{5\%} \frac{5\%}{0\%} \frac{0\%}{0\%} \frac{0\%}{36 \text{ mph}} \frac{42 \text{ mph}}{42 \text{ mph}}$				n agreer	nent t	hat the	e spee	ed limi	t set a	t 40m	ph rer	nains	approp	riate and	
year. Summary data as below would be circulated from this new survey, once available. A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions) Date of Survey       Average Daily       \$30       31-35       36-40       41-45       46-50       51-55       56-60       >60       Mean       85 <sup>th</sup> Traffic Flow       MPH       MPH <td></td> <td></td> <td>At the pu</td> <td>ublic me</td> <td>eting o</td> <td>one of</td> <td>the a</td> <td>ctions</td> <td>agree</td> <td>d was</td> <td>s to un</td> <td>dertal</td> <td>ke a ne</td> <td>w speed</td> <td></td>			At the pu	ublic me	eting o	one of	the a	ctions	agree	d was	s to un	dertal	ke a ne	w speed	
available.         A177 Shincliffe (between High Street and Old School House junctions)         Date of Survey       Survey         Daily       MPH         MPH       MPH															v
Date of Survey       Average Daily       ≤30       31-35       36-40       41-45       46-50       51-55       56-60       >60       Mean       85 <sup>th</sup> Traffic Flow       MPH					data a	s belo	w wou	ıld be	circul	ated fr	rom th	is nev	v surve	y, once	
Date of Survey       Average Daily       ≤30       31-35       36-40       41-45       46-50       51-55       56-60       >60       Mean       85 <sup>th</sup> Traffic Flow       MPH											_		_		
Survey       Daily       MPH			A177 Sh	incliffe	(betw	/een H	ligh S	street	and C	old Sc	hool	House	e junct	ions)	
MPH     MPH <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>≤30</td> <td>31-35</td> <td>36-40</td> <td>41-45</td> <td>46-50</td> <td>51-55</td> <td>56-60</td> <td>&gt;60</td> <td>Mean</td> <td>85<sup>th</sup></td> <td></td>					≤30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	>60	Mean	85 <sup>th</sup>	
Flow         Flow         Centile           19/10 -         7410         15%         21%         38%         21%         5%         0%         0%         36 mph         42 mph			Guivey	Dany	MPH	MPH	МРН	МРН	MPH	MPH	MPH	МРН	Speed	Per	
19/10 -         7410         15%         21%         38%         21%         5%         0%         0%         36 mph         42 mph														contilo	
														centile	
				7410	15%	21%	38%	21%	5%	0%	0%	0%	36 mph	42 mph	
			25/10/20												
			(shaded	area is	perce	ntage	of veh	nicles	vithin	Police	e enfoi	rceme	ent thre	shold)	

Append	lix 2
--------	-------

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

(while there were some vehicles in the 0% level they were so small in numbers that	
they do not register as a percentage)	
40 MPH Speed Limit	
<ul> <li>74% of vehicles travel within the existing 40 mph speed limit</li> </ul>	
• 5% of vehicles travel at a level where speed enforcement may be considered	
by the Police but at the lower end of offending	
• While there were a few vehicles in the 51 to 60 mph thresholds they do not	
register as a percentage due to the low numbers	
<ul> <li>Some of the higher speeds as we know would be attributed to blue light</li> </ul>	
vehicles but we can't quantify that	
<ul> <li>In the above 50 mph the data shows the vehicles to be present Monday to</li> <li>Friday between 2 pm and 0 pm. Saturday between 6 pm and 0 pm. Support</li> </ul>	
Friday between 3 pm and 9 pm, Saturday between 6 am and 9 am, Sunday between 9 am and 10 am	
<ul> <li>The speed profiles, mean speed and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile show that a 40 mph</li> </ul>	
speed limit is generally well respected and had credibility	
Also agreed at the meeting as actions for Durham County Council were localised	
traffic solutions which included sign and road marking maintenance, introduction of a	
short section of barrier where children wait for the bus on A177 and a review of the	
speed limit signage on this section of A177.	
We have reviewed the personal injury accident data and have offered feedback	
previously. While we would prefer to see no accidents the ones that have occurred at	
this location have involved driver error, and in some cases criminality, however there	
is nothing from the analysis of the accident information that suggests they were	
attributable to either the highway or speed.	
Durham County Council and Durham Constabulary hoped to continue to engage	
positively with the residents group, the Parish Council and also with the PCC's office	
to progress and investigate the issues raised by the group at the meeting. We would	
of course share the speed data early in the new year once the survey was completed.	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

Petition 423 Request for traffic mitigation measures on Lowes Barn Bank <b>E-Petition</b> Received 15.08.22 No. of signatures 126	REG	<ul> <li>Petition asking the Council to provide short and long-term solutions to the continually worsening traffic problems on Lowes Barn Bank, a residential 'c' road: <ul> <li>to mitigate the exceptionally large increase in car and HGV traffic using this road as an unofficial / unsigned diversion route in Summer/Autumn 2022 during the multi-month B6300 closure, and the resultant stationary traffic / chaos for much of the working day - including air quality monitoring.</li> <li>to propose workable solutions to restrict HGVs from using this steep road as a short-cut, which we feel was a completely inappropriate and unsafe route for such vehicles, given the 'c' classification and character of the road - especially given the proximity to the alternative 'A' road routes.</li> <li>to propose solutions to limit the speed of all vehicles to a safe speed at times of day when traffic was flowing - especially on the downhill approach to the sharp bend.</li> </ul> </li> <li>E-Petition ran from 19.8.22 – 31.12.22</li> <li>Durham County Council were sorry hear about the issues facing those residents who live on or adjacent Lowes Barn Bank, especially during the months when the closure of B6300 Burnigill Bank. Despite signed diversions some additional traffic was inevitably displaced into this area. We appreciated the patience of all those affected by this extra traffic however after previous delays to the progression of this scheme it was essential that the works were completed to allow the available routes and capacity on the road network to be restored.</li> </ul>	Under Review

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

be responsible for the enforcement of any such provision, also do not support the implementation of a weight limit restriction.	
In considering the location of Lowes Barn Bank, linking two of 'A' class roads and adjacent a major junction, there were arguably other routes for HGV traffic to use in this vicinity however it was the driver's choice to take whichever route on the public highway they wish to use. It was also likely that these decisions may differ depending upon volume of traffic at certain times of the day. Durham County Council as the Highway Authority had a duty to facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic and given Lowes Barn Bank, Neville's Cross Bank and Darlington Road were public highways suitable to carry all classes of traffic, it would not be appropriate to divert specific classes of vehicle traffic onto other routes in the location, negatively impacting other residential areas, motorists, public transport users and emergency service response times.	
Since Durham County Officers from Strategic Highways and Strategic Traffic meet with residents and local councillors on site, we had reopened discussions with local generators of HGV traffic. Historically discussions had resulted in an undertaking to, where possible, operate in a manner that affords a reasonably equitable distribution of their journeys over available routes. This means that the burden of these journeys was not imposed solely on any one location. Where these local agreements exist, they are, unless imposed via a planning condition or operator's licence, a voluntary arrangement and we were therefore unable to either insist upon their use or enforce them. As operators these companies can choose to direct their vehicle onto any public highway, where there were no restrictions.	
The carriageway construction on Lowes Barnes Bank was, like the majority of county roads, constructed to accommodate vehicles of all weights. The petition suggested that the traffic on this road was resulting in structural damage to homes so should any resident consider this the case it would be advisable, as with any public road, that they should direct their concerns to their household insurance company. In turn, they would make an assessment and where necessary instruct a structural engineer to act on their behalf. If such a survey was to categorically confirm structural damage was occurring the County Council would investigate the claim. DCC carried out	

Nature of Petition

Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition

		vibration surveys on private and commercial dwellings for over twenty years but discontinued this service because in all that time we never obtained a reading approaching a level that may cause structural damage to a building. Many of the reported issues at this location point to driver behaviour and judgement however the manner in which motorists drive on the public highway was not controlled by the imposition of speed limits or weight restrictions and the Highway Code was provided as the basis for driver behaviour on public roads. Making changes to access was unlikely to change habitual driving behaviour and changing poor driver behaviour was an issue for which powers were only afforded to the Police when an offence had been committed. Despite the concerns raised , personal injury accident and speed data for Lowes Barn Bank does not suggest an overall issue. DCC had considered the issues reported and investigated the requested changes. As part of this review the information held relating to Lowes Barn Bank had also been considered and officers had carried out their own observations of the traffic at various times. We do appreciate the time taken to pursue these requests for changes at Lowes Barn Bank however we had concluded that there were no measures that we were able to support.	
Petition 428 The Play/Recreation Area at The Wynd, Pelton. <b>E-Petition</b> Received 10.10.22 No. of signatures 79 <b>Paper Petition</b> No. of signatures 107 Total - 186	REG	<ul> <li>Petition asking the Council to stop discussions with a housing developer, Bellway Homes. Bellway Homes have been given permission by Durham County Council to carry out site investigations on land registered as an Asset of Community Value.</li> <li>E-Petition ran from 10.10.22 – 20.1.23.</li> <li>Durham County Council noted the petition in relation to the land south of the Wynd, Pelton and the listing of the same as an Asset of Community Value ('ACV') following nomination by Pelton parish Council. Early stage discussions had been held with Bellway Homes Limited, who had expressed an interest in purchasing the subject land. At this time, Durham County Council had not committed its land for sale.</li> </ul>	Petition CLOSED
10tai - 100		The Durham County Council ('DCC') Asset of Community Value ('ACV') Board made the decision to list the asset as an ACV on 8th August 2022. The listing was	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

		<ul> <li>confirmed following a nomination by Pelton Parish Council. The Governments         <ul> <li>'Assets of Community Value – Policy Statement' – September 2011 was clear that             the listing of the asset does not restrict what DCC can do with the land. In order to             inform discussion with a third party housing developer, site investigations were             undertaken in September 2022.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If the land were to come forward for housing development then DCC (as a corporate             landowner) would be seeking to ensure that the existing open space and play facility             would not only be replaced but also enhanced to provide the local residents with a             better facility than is currently available.</li> </ul>	
Petition 429 A181 near Thornley and Cassop	REG	Petition asking the Council to make changes to the road A181 near Thornley & Cassop to avoid accidents & increase safety. E-Petition ran from 10.10.22 – 14.11.22.	Petition CLOSED
<b>E-Petition</b> Received 10.10.22 No. of signatures 36		The section of A181 referred to dis carry a high volume of traffic daily, as did many of 'A' class roads countywide. The section in question carries traffic between B1279 Thornley and B6291 Cassop, as well as the onward travel to surrounding villages, it was therefore anticipated that these routes would be busy. Based on a search of the database we shared with Durham Constabulary there had been one personal injury accident recorded on the section of A181 between its junctions with the B6291 and B1279 in the last 4 years, being our standard search criteria. This accident involved a turning movement and not attributed to the highway layout. Considering the flow of traffic traversing this route daily, and when compared to other similar junctions, this represented a favourable accident record. We were aware of other personal injury accidents on the A181 but not on the section referenced in this petition and unfortunately, 'damage only' collisions take place on a daily basis across the road network, where damage had occurred to property/third party vehicles resulting typically in an exchange of insurance details. While we would prefer to see no accidents, the limited road safety funding available had to be prioritised towards dealing with personal injury accidents as Highway Authorities	

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

The Council's entire road network is monitored annually by colleagues in our Accident Investigation and Prevention Team, who undertake analysis at locations where there is a developing accident trend beyond set intervention levels. This methodology ensures that the Council targets its limited road safety resources towards dealing with the locations that have the worst accident records. Considering this the investigation of further measures at this location would not be supported as it did not meet our current escalation levels.	
Historically the complaints we received regarding this section of A181 had generally been in relation to the right turn out of Thornley and delays caused due to the traffic flows on the A181 not providing sufficient gaps for the right turn manoeuvre. Traffic surveys on the A181 show that there was very good compliance with the speed limit and a review of the speed limit confirmed that the current National Speed Limit was the correct one for this road.	
With the relatively close proximity of the roundabout to the south east (approx. <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub> mile), it could be considered appropriate to prohibit the right turn from Dunelm Road onto the A181. This would require all traffic to turn left onto the A181 and carry out a U-turn at the roundabout. This would help reduce the delays at the junction caused by drivers waiting for a gap in both directions of traffic flow on the A181 before pulling out, a left turn only requiring a gap in the southwest bound flow thereby presenting more opportunity to exit the side road.	
However, whilst the removal of the right turn from Dunelm Road had the potential to make an improvement at peak times, this may not be the case at other times and may lead to drivers intentionally carrying out an illegal manoeuvre out of peak. In addition, whilst bus operators have allowances in their time schedules to cover for delays at peak times, this measure would add an extra 2 minutes to every journey impacting on already tight schedules.	
This location would continue to be monitored as part of the countywide analysis and it was noted that the location could benefit from a refresh of the existing road markings. This work would be carried out as part of our routine activities when the contractor was next in the area and the weather conditions were suitable.	

Appendi	x 2
---------	-----

Nature of Petition	Appropriate	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
	Service		

Petition 430	REG	Petition asking the Council for a new footpath and bench on Hargill Bank, Howden- le-Wear.	Petition CLOSED
New footpath and bench			
at Hargill Bank, Howden- le-Wear		Durham County Council, like most Councils, had a highway maintenance backlog and must prioritise limited budgets where they would have the most impact. This was generally in the maintenance of existing footway and carriageway provision.	
Received 6.12.22			
No. of signatures 69		The creation of new highway infrastructure, such as footpaths, was normally funded by developers when areas were developed for retail, commercial and housing. The Council then adopts and maintains thereafter.	
		While the demand for new facilities was appreciated it was not always possible to provide them from existing budgets. However, the Council were committed to expanding our work as an authority to encourage more active lifestyles with cycling and walking being of high importance in achieving this in our towns and villages.	
		The Strategic Traffic Team were currently working with the Area Action Partnerships, Towns and Villages Officers and the local County Councillors to address issues raised by local communities. At this time traffic management projects were being investigated in this area to address concerns about traffic speed and road safety the request for footway and seating provision would be discussed further should a funding opportunity present.	
		In the interim the Sustainable Transport Team who, along with colleagues investigating provision of projects in the wider areas, may be at some point in the future be able to take forward this request subject to the sourcing of available funding streams. This would ensure it was given consideration in the future if we were able to undertake a walking and cycling scheme in this area.	

Nature of Petition Appr Servi	opriate Summary of Informat	ion	Status of Petition
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----	--------------------

Petition 433	REG	Petition asking the Council to put pressure on landlords and owners to bring back derelict/abandoned property back in to use.	E-Petition would run from 13.3.23 – 21.4.23
Derelict and abandoned houses in Stanley			
E-Petition			
Received 10.3.23			
No. of signatures			
Petition 434	REG	Petition asking the Council to enforce a 30mph speed limit through the residential area, by either traffic calming measures or a speed camera.	E-Petition to run from 22.3.23 – 28.8.23
Front street Pelton Fell speed limit			
E-Petition			
Received 17.3.23			
No. of signatures			

# Appendix 2