

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
<p>Petition 444</p> <p>Southfield Way Crossing at the Sniperley Roundabout</p> <p><b>E-Petition</b> Received 29.09.23 No. of signatures 127</p>	<p>REG</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to give (long overdue) priority to enhancing the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing Southfield Way at the A691 exit road into Durham from the Sniperley (Hospital) roundabout. E-Petition ran from 29.9.23 – 10.11.23</p> <p>The difficulties pedestrians had experienced crossing the roads at Sniperley roundabout was brought to our attention and discussed at a face-to-face meeting with officers at County Hall on 17th July 2023.</p> <p>Requests for formalised crossings, such as a zebra crossings or traffic signal-controlled crossings, are assessed against national criteria devised by the Department for Transport (DfT), which takes into account various factors, including traffic flow and the number of pedestrians crossing the road throughout the day and not just the busiest period. It has been proven that low pedestrian flows at formalised crossings results in more road traffic accidents whereby the motorist has failed to stop, therefore, this is the reason for the DfT guidance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, pedestrian facilities would only be feasible on the existing pedestrian desire lines as part of a full signalisation of Sniperley roundabout. This has been investigated in recent years by the Traffic Signals Team who have advised that any proposals to introduce traffic signals, with pedestrian phases, would require more capacity on the roundabout's circulatory system or the removal of one of the junction legs. Without such works being undertaken, traffic signals would increase the queue lengths on the roundabout approaches, thus having a knock-on effect at other locations, such as the Hospital Roundabout on Southfield Way back towards County Hall Roundabout, creating increased congestion which, in turn, can lead to further road safety concerns at other locations on nearby routes. There are currently no plans to progress this further at the present time, however, it is likely to be considered in the future as part of wider traffic management plans</p>	<p>Petition closed</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>associated with new developments in the areas around Sniperley, Pity Me and Framwellgate Moor.</p> <p>The traffic flow and congestion at the roundabout is typical of many roundabouts seen elsewhere in the country where demand increases at ‘peak times’ during the day and it is appreciated it can be as difficult to cross at peak times as it is during other periods when the roundabout is not congested. However, in considering pedestrian numbers, the existing crossing facilities of dropped kerb crossing points to the splitter islands on the side roads, where traffic is more likely to be travelling slower and drivers would be more aware of pedestrian usage, remain appropriate for this junction. Discussions have taken place around the suggestion of moving the crossing point further round into Southfield Way away from the flow of the roundabout and the potential safety implications of pedestrians crossing at a location where, unlike at the existing islands, drivers may not expect to encounter people crossing. Additionally, and more importantly this suggested alternative would also have required pedestrians to consider traffic over three lanes, travelling in both directions and would offer no midway island where pedestrians could wait for a suitable opportunity to cross.</p>	
<p>Petition 445</p> <p>Urgently Introduce a 20mph Speed Limit on Burton Woods Estate</p> <p><b>E-Petition</b> Received 8.10.23 No. of signatures 32</p>	<p>REG</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to Impose a 20mph Speed Limit on the Burton Woods Estate in Spennymoor. E-Petition ran from 8.10.23 – 19.11.23</p> <p>Burton Woods development was not opened up with the intention of creating ‘rat runs’. The use of multiple accesses was by design, due to the number of properties. These accesses have allowed residents throughout the development, visitors, and service or delivery vehicles the flexibility to use the most convenient route for them. In some cases this results in shorter journey times as well as affording a more equitable distribution of traffic across the estate. Non-residential traffic is permitted to utilise the roads through the</p>	<p>Petition closed</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>estate as they are not restricted, and it is the intention that they will in the future become public highway. It must be accepted that there are both advantages and disadvantages to this layout and on balance it has been considered, as the development was progressed, that multiple points of access was the most appropriate arrangement.</p> <p>County Councillors have approached Durham County Council Officers with regard to making the estate a 20mph speed limit or zone (20mph speed limit where physical traffic calming is required) and Officers have indicated that they would be happy to progress this once the main routes through the development become adopted highway. Currently, the only section of the main through route with adopted highway status, and under the control/ownership of Durham County Council, is Studley Drive with the remainder of the route (Howsham Drive, Lotherton Drive and Gibside Way) being the responsibility of the developer. It is not possible to progress a 20mph scheme through the entire estate as these roads are not yet under Durham County Council ownership. We are unable to impose legal restrictions, or use public money to make changes, as these roads are essentially privately owned until such time as the developer offers them for adoption.</p> <p>We currently have no timeframe for the adoption of these roads as offering the roads for adoption is a process initiated by the developer. I am sorry that the position remains the same as previously offered but trust the above outlines the position.</p> <p>Regarding the ‘Acorns’ estate at DurhamGate, this development, like Burton Woods, has several phases, developers, and status of adoption. There is currently a 20mph at the ‘Acorns’ development as there is a section that had two phases constructed by the same developer and while phase two required a 20mph speed limit. The first phase was granted planning permission prior to</p>	

**Petition Table – Active Petitions**

**Appendix 2**

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>the Durham County Council 20mph policy being introduced, so did not. However, the developer agreed to extend it over both phases of their development. No precedent has been set that could be applied to Burton Woods as the situation is not the same.</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit could be introduced in the future, subject to available funding, but in considering the interim position I would advise that as part of an agreed protocol, all speeding complaints are directed towards Durham Constabulary primarily through their Police and Communities Together (PACT) Meetings, enabling the appropriate level of intervention and action to be considered.</p>	
<p>Petition 447</p> <p>Lanchester Traffic Calming</p> <p>Received 2.11.23</p> <p>No. of signatures 117</p>	<p>REG</p>	<p>Petition asking the Council to advise a plan for pavement widening, traffic calming measures and a reduced speed limit to be actioned on Durham Road, Lanchester stretching from All Saints Parish Church to the Oakwood Estate.</p> <p>A691 Durham Road, Lanchester</p> <p>Speed Limits -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. 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. 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</p>	<p>Petition closed</p>

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>and street lighting, the various 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. 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 unfair criticism of the police who must enforce the speed limits. The speed limit through Lanchester is currently 30mph over the section of road referenced in the petition and changes to 40mph just beyond the The Green/access to the village centre, where the road environment on A691 changes and there are no direct frontage properties. The 30mph was introduced in the 1990's and replaced the previous 40mph speed limit. The existing speed limits through Lanchester A691 have been reviewed several times since the last legal changes to the limit, which were the introduction of the 30mph previously mentioned and an extension to the 40mph approaching St Bede's school from Consett. The current speed limits and extents are deemed to be appropriate and credible, 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. However, decisions are based on full consideration of all factors. Although we will currently consider 20mph speed limits in residential estates, main routes such as the A691 would not meet our policy for provision.</p> <p>Additionally, having checked the accident recording database shared with Durham Constabulary I can confirm there has been one recorded 'personal injury' accident on the section of A691 from Oakwood to All Saints Church in the past 5 years, this being our standard search criteria. This accident did not involve a pedestrian and the causation of the accident was attributed to the</p>	

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		<p>driver having a medical episode. While we would prefer to see no accidents this represents a favourable accident record when compared to many other roads in the County which remain a priority to address from limited road safety funding.</p> <p>Traffic Calming and speed - Regretfully, the Department for Transport does not support the use of physical traffic calming measures such as road humps, pinch points, chicanes etc on 'A' and 'B' class roads, which should remain available to accommodate the free and unrestricted movement of traffic on the road network. Although not suitable for traffic calming measures as described we have, through pedestrian facilities (pedestrian refuge islands), road markings and signage created a layout to encourage compliance to the posted speed limits and make drivers aware of the environment in which they are travelling.</p> <p>As part of an agreed protocol, all speeding complaints are directed towards Durham Constabulary primarily through their Police and Communities Together (PACT) Meetings, enabling the appropriate level of intervention and action to be considered.</p> <p>Pavement widening - On the section of road subject of the petition from Warriors Bridge/Oakwood to All Saints Church (Durham Road junction with Peth Bank) there is footway provision on both sides of A691, although for a short section passing Greenwell Park/Valley Grove this is not immediately adjacent to the 'A' road.</p> <p>Although there is potential but limited scope on some sections for footway to be widened, the existing provision meets current standards so would not be made a priority from our limited budgets. Should there be any localised issues that residents consider create a problem with the passage of pedestrians we would be happy to look at these if further details can be provided. However, if</p>	

Petition Table – Active Petitions

Appendix 2

Nature of Petition	Appropriate Service	Summary of Information	Status of Petition
		the issue is parked vehicles blocking the footway causing an obstruction (e.g. blocking the passage of pedestrians, wheelchair users, parents with prams etc., which results in having to go onto the carriageway to pass) then this should be reported directly to Durham Constabulary using their '101' contact number.	
Petition 448  Speed outside school - Cotherstone Primary  <b>E-Petition</b> Received 25.1.24 No. of signatures	REG	Petition asking the Council to lower the speed limit by Cotherstone Primary School, Cotherstone	E-Petition to run from 25.1.24 – 7.3.24
Petition 449  Save Leazes Footbridge, Durham City  <b>E-Petition</b> Received 4.2.24 No. of signatures	NCC	Petition asking the Council to further explore the repair and replacement options for Leazes Footbridge, until a workable solution is found, and to make a functioning footbridge a top priority.	E-Petition to run from 6.2.24 – 14.6.24