

LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL – MINUTES AND ACTIONS

	PRESENT:
Date: 27th June 2016	Panel Members: Cllr Keith Bobbin, Cllr Anthony Hedley, Cllr Malcolm Buckley, Cllr Nigel Le Gresley, Cllr Kay Twitchen, Cllr Kerry Smith, Cllr Frank Ferguson, Cllr Melissa McGeorge
Venue: Room C419, County Hall	
Apologies: Cllr Mark Ellis, Cllr Melissa McGeorge	Other Attendees: Will Price – Highway Liaison Officer, Sonia Church- Highways Liaison Manager, Cllr Ray Howard – Deputy Cabinet Member, Bernard Foster- Parish Council representative, Jasmine Wiles - Apprentice/Minute taker

Item:	Action:	Action Owner:
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>Cllr Bobbin welcomed everyone to the meeting. All present introduced themselves.</p>	
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>N/A</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of meeting held on 14th Jan 2016 and matters arising</p> <p>Councillor Bobbin led the Panel through the previous meeting's minutes. Actions were discussed as follows:</p> <p>Pedestrian Refuge and Signage at A129 Southend Rd/ Bakers Farm Close (LBAS 152029).</p> <p>Will Price clarified the reasons why this location did not fulfil the TSRGD criteria for sign 562 and other requested accompanying signs. Namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The crossing point was not on the 'desire line' and therefore not regularly used. • The road was not a high speed road (50mph or above). • There were no visibility issues. <p>For these reasons WP advised that installation of the signs would need special approval from the Cabinet Member via the CMA process.</p> <p>Councillor Le Gresley and Cllr Buckley voiced their unhappiness at the situation. Councillor Buckley suggested that guidelines were only</p>	

	<p>guidelines and therefore the Panel should be able to deviate from them where circumstances necessitated.</p> <p>Sonia Church explained that the TSRGD informed/governed highway authorities on the appropriate use of signage in accordance with the Highway Code. Any deviation from this manual therefore had the potential to confuse drivers and create rather than reduce safety issues.</p> <p>Cllr Buckley reminded the Panel that these signs were regarded as a last resort since a zebra crossing had also not been permitted.</p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley queried the sign type being discussed. WP advised that it was the general hazard sign (exclamation mark) which Cllr Le Gresley had suggested.</p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley stated that he would still rather have a crossing (which would be likely to reduce driver speeds). WP reiterated that the crossing did not meet the criteria due to existing 85thile speeds being over 35mph.</p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley mentioned the possibility of the Parish commissioning their own study.</p> <p>Cllr Twitchen told the Panel that she was keen to support all fellow Member’s proposals, but that the Panel should try to adhere to officer’s recommendations and national guidelines.</p> <p>Cllr Howard supported officer’s comments that if the panel were to go against the TSRGD criteria then WP would have to take the scheme to the Delivery Board for Cabinet Member approval and Cllr Johnson may not approve.</p> <p>The Panel agreed that scheme LBAS152029 (ped refuge widening) should go ahead without the sign element of the scheme.</p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley thanked WP for all of his hard work despite the outcome.</p> <p>Billericay Bus stops</p> <p>Cllr Twitchen voiced her frustration at the level of information received thus far but said that she did not want an update within the meeting. WP apologised and explained that it had been difficult to get a clear update from Passenger Transport. WP to email further info to Cllr Twitchen.</p>	
4.	<p>Approved Schemes List 2016/2017</p> <p><u>Budget Update</u></p> <p>WP explained that in March the Panel had commissioned and carried over schemes to the value of around 140% of their budget. He told the Panel that schemes to the value of 100% of the budget had been</p>	

programmed for delivery in 16/17. The remaining 40% would be carried over to 17/18 (or potentially integrated into the 16/17 programme if savings could be found elsewhere). WP told the Panel that he had tried to align the programming of schemes to the Panel's priorities, but if they wanted to make changes they could do so (although this might mean abortive costs and wider associated programme changes).

Approved Schemes List

LBAS152002- Kennel Lane, Billericay, Weight Restriction

Cllr Twitchen asked WP how much longer this scheme would take. WP stated that all signs were in place, and just awaiting UKPN connection. Connection programmed for summer 2016.

LBAS152003- Brightside, Billericay, 20mph Zone

Cllr Twitchen asked WP how much longer this scheme would take. WP advised that the consultation process and resulting conflicting comments/petitions etc had hindered delivery. Delivery now programmed for 4th quarter of the financial year.

LBAS152006- Rosebay Avenue, Billericay, Lamp Column Re-Location

Cllr Twitchen asked WP how much longer this scheme would take. WP explained that again, there had been a UKPN connection issue. However, delivery was expected this summer.

Cllr Buckley questioned how decisions were made on which schemes should be carried over to 17/18. WP explained that he had attempted to ensure that the 16/17 programme reflected the priorities of the Panel (based on previous meeting's discussions) and that schemes were fairly distributed amongst divisions.

LBAS152017- Gardiners Lane North, Wickford

Cllr Buckley questioned why this scheme had been programmed for 17/18 when the works should be easy to implement. WP explained that, regardless of the complexity of the works, not all schemes can be delivered concurrently, and therefore the programme is effectively a queue of schemes that are worked on in order of priority and/or commission date. Cllr Le Gresley stated that he had written confirmation that this scheme was to be done this financial year. WP explained that Essex Highways had done a lot of work recently to tighten up on programming and to ensure that timescales allocated to schemes were

	<p>more realistic, deliverable and in-keeping with Member's priorities. SC explained that the scheme could be brought forward to the 16-17 programme, but that this would mean moving scheme(s) of the same value from the 16/17 programme into the 17/18 programme and may lead to some abortive costs. Cllr Twitchen suggested that the Panel refrain from swapping any existing 16/17 schemes and instead treat this scheme as the first 'fall back' scheme if any space becomes available in the 16/17 programme. This was agreed by Cllr Le Gresley, Cllr Buckley and the rest of the Panel.</p> <p><i>LBAS152024- Old Church Road, Bowers Gifford</i></p> <p>Councillor Bobbin highlighted the urgency of this scheme, explaining that a great deal of time and money had been spent on the removal of flytipping. WP said that he had received a number of emails from the Parish and was aware of the urgency of the situation, and that he had in turn been emailing the Senior Engineer with a view to getting the scheme delivered ASAP. However, at that stage it was impossible to promise a delivery date earlier than the 4th quarter of the financial year.</p> <p>With the Borough council having paid £35,000 for the removal of fly tipping, Cllr Hedley queried whether a cheaper and quicker solution might be for the Borough to pay for the installation of the works. WP explained that the issue was one of capacity rather than funding, and as such the scheme would take just as long to deliver with Borough funding. SC stated that she would also follow this scheme up with the Senior Engineer to have it treated as a priority.</p> <p><i>LBAS152026- London Road, Wickford Close to No63</i></p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley queried progress on the design of this scheme. WP advised that (contrary to the scheme list) it was currently not included in the 16/17 programme since the 100% max budget value of schemes had been exceeded with other seemingly higher priority schemes. There was some discussion re whether this scheme should be entered into the 16/17 scheme in place of another scheme, however it was concluded that this should remain outside the 16/17 programme.</p> <p><i>LBAS152029- A129 Southend Road/ Bakers Farm Close, Wickford</i></p> <p>Cllr Buckley told the Panel that he didn't understand why this seemingly straightforward scheme was so expensive. SC explained that the cost attributed to each scheme covered far more than the physical measures being installed.</p>	<p>WP</p>
--	--	-----------

	<p><i>LBAS161008- CR Site 82- Sparrows Herne junction with Lee Wooten Lane, Langdon Hills</i></p> <p>Cllr Smith said that he would like the damaged fence removed from this location. WP said he understood it was a sound barrier and therefore should not be moved. Cllr Smith said that the vegetation here was more of a sound barrier than the fence. WP to explore when and why the fence was installed and whether it can be removed.</p> <p><i>LBAS161011- Noak Hill Junction with Wash Road and LBAS162039- Greens Farm Lane, Billericay.</i></p> <p>Councillor Twitchen queried the estimated delivery date for these schemes. WP advised that they had not yet been programmed, but that they were both within the 16/17 programme and being treated as a priorities.</p> <p><i>LBAS163014- Kenilworth Close/ London Road/ Mountnessing Road, Billericay and LBAS163016- Meadow Rise, Billericay</i></p> <p>Cllr Twitchen voiced her concern that these schemes had been pushed into the 17/18 programme and highlighted the access issues for elderly and disabled residents in the area. WP explained that it was the Panel's prerogative to change the 16/17 programme, but that the inclusion of these schemes would necessitate the omission of other scheme(s) of equal value. Cllr Twitchen and the Panel decided that they should not seek to adjust the programme, but instead that LBAS 163014 in particular should be highlighted as a 'second priority scheme' if the opportunity arises to add schemes in to the 16/17 programme.</p> <p><i>LBAS165003- Sugden Avenue, Wickford</i></p> <p>Cllr Buckley told the Panel that he had contacted Member Enquiries in relation to this scheme, and that he had been told it would be delivered in the 16/17 financial year. SC reminded Members that they should contact WP with any matters relating to the LHP to ensure they received correct and up to date information.</p> <p>Cllr Twitchen asked how she should report ranger issues. SC explained that they should be logged on the 'report it tool' online. There was discussion about where this could be found. Cllr Buckley asked that the ranger report be included at the next meeting.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
--	--	---------------------

	<p>Revenue Budget</p> <p>WP and SC explained that due to changes in the revenue budget including an increase in ranger service costs, the amount remaining for surveys had dropped to £2,500. WP reminded the Panel that the cost for each PV2 survey was £900 and the cost for each speed survey/automatic traffic count was £250. SC explained that VAS repairs were also now being brought into the LHP revenue budget, and the Panel would need to make decisions on whether faulty VAS/SIDs should be repaired or not. There was some discussion over the implications of this.</p>	
5.	<p><u>Potential Schemes List</u></p> <p>Traffic Management</p> <p><i>LBAS172062- Salcott Crescent, Wickford</i></p> <p>WP explained to the panel that the speeds were too high for a zebra crossing and the PV2 results were too low for a signalised crossing. Cllr Le Gresley said that something needed to be done in this area and asked about the possibility of installing VAS signs to help slow traffic before installing a zebra crossing. WP to re-examine data and if appropriate validate suitability for VAS signs.</p> <p>Cllr Buckley questioned whether the Panel should be validating new sites when there were already schemes being carried over to 17/18 and there was no certainty that the LHP would have budget to undertake any further works in future financial years. SC explained that validations take time to carry out and could not be left until the last minute (i.e. when budgets are determined) – that could leave the Panel without schemes and effectively redundant. Cllr Howard told the Panel that there was currently no intention to reduce the LHP budget.</p> <p><i>LBAS172055- Kennel Lane, Billericay</i></p> <p>Councillor Twitchen confirmed that this could be removed from the Potential Scheme List.</p> <p><i>LBAS172047- Outwood Common Road junction with Southend Road, South Green</i></p> <p>Cllr Twitchen informed the Panel that she had sought an update on how to escalate a scheme which exceeded the LHP budget, but that this update had as yet not been forthcoming. WP apologised and told Cllr Twitchen that he did have an update which he would send her via email.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>

	<p><i>LBAS172010- Noak Hill Road outside Billericay School</i></p> <p>WP told Members that he had queried the availability of S106 funds for this scheme, and had found that it was not eligible. With that and the high cost of scheme delivery in mind he asked the Panel whether they wanted to remove the scheme from the Potential Scheme List. Cllr Hedley said he would explore alternative funding possibilities and get back to WP. Scheme to be left on list for now.</p> <p><i>LBAS172020- Runwell Road, Wickford</i></p> <p>Cllr Le Gresley queried the possibility of using S106 money to undertake the footway widening works (detailed design and delivery). He understood that a great deal of S106 funding was being given to Chelmsford C.C. on account of the Runwell hospital development, and queried whether some of this could be made available. WP to ask the relevant S106 officer.</p> <p><i>LBAS172007- New Avenue, Basildon</i></p> <p>Councillor Smith to send a scheme request form.</p> <p><i>LBAS172008-Cranfield Park Road, Wickford</i></p> <p>WP and Cllr Le Gresley explained the background to this scheme which had recently been added to the Potential Scheme List. A resident of Cranfield Park Rd had been promised the installation of an earth bund some years ago according to emails, but it had not materialised. As a result it was now down to the Panel to decide whether they would like to commission a scheme to undertake these works.</p> <p>Cllr Buckley voiced his bemusement at the estimated cost of an earth bund and said that bollards should be used instead. Cllr Gresley and the rest of the Panel agreed. WP said he would explore the possibility of bollards and report back.</p> <p>The Panel asked that this scheme be considered a “third priority” for addition to the 16/17 programme if the opportunity arose.</p> <p>PROW</p> <p>Cllr Twitchen reminded the Panel that these schemes had already been discussed and asked WP where the updated scheme description had come from. WP told Cllr Twitchen that the scheme description had come from the PROW team and asked whether Cllr Twitchen would like the</p>	<p>Cllr Hedley</p> <p>WP</p> <p>Cllr Smith</p> <p>WP</p>
--	--	--

	<p>schemes to be removed from the Potential Scheme List or kept on for future consideration. Cllr Twitchen and the Panel confirmed that the schemes should remain on the list for future consideration.</p> <p>Walking</p> <p><i>LBAS173011- Florence Way, Langdon Hills</i></p> <p>WP queried with Cllr Smith whether this scheme should be removed from the Potential Scheme List in light of the probable unsuitability of the location for a crossing, and the newly reduced survey budget. Cllr Smith agreed that the scheme should be removed from the Potential Scheme List.</p> <p><i>LBAS173013- Westmede, Langdon Hills,</i></p> <p>Cllr Smith told WP that he had been assured by Basildon Borough Council that the wall in question was under ECC ownership. WP told Cllr Smith that ECC's Highway Records dept had argued the contrary. WP to investigate further.</p> <p><i>LBAS173012- Lower Southend Road junction with Broadway, Wickford</i></p> <p>Cllr Buckley suggested that S106 money might be available for this scheme. WP to seek guidance from relevant officer.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
8.	<p>A.O.B.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Festival Way Feasibility Study</p> <p>WP confirmed that he had passed the delivery of this scheme to his colleagues in the S106 scheme dept. WP to liaise with Cllr Ellis outside the meeting.</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Lee Chapel School Feasibility Study</p> <p>WP explained the findings of the study. He told the Panel that an advisory 20mph limit (when lights flash) had been deemed unsuitable since there would be conflict with zebra crossing beacons. The cost:benefit ratio of the variable limit on the other hand was deemed to</p>	

	<p>be very low since speeds average speeds were already around 20 - 23mph at school peak times and the cost of installation would be very high. Cllr Smith re-iterated his support for the installation of a 20 restriction, disagreed with the findings of the study, and asked WP to find out whether S106 funding may be available.</p> <p>Cllr Ferguson discussed the concerns re speeding on Lee Chapel School and passed on his observations that the parked cars on the road acted as a form of traffic calming. He suggested that, if anything, a signalised crossing would be the best form of improvement here. Cllr Smith explained that this could jeopardise the school crossing patrol. Cllr Ferguson accepted this point and suggested that a signalised crossing should be considered on Great Knightleys. WP said he would send Cllr Ferguson an LHP scheme request form.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
9.	<p>Date of Next Meeting 27th September 2016, 2pm, CR5.</p>	