

CHELMSFORD CITY LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL MINUTES

20 DECEMBER 2017

at 13:00 at the Civic Centre, Chelmsford

Chairman:	County Councillor Dick Madden
Panel Members:	<p>Chelmsford City Council – Councillors Richard Ambor, Michael Holloway, Ray Ride and Bob Shepherd</p> <p>Essex County Council – County Councillors Jenny Chandler and Mike Mackrory</p>
Officers:	Michael Adewole - Chelmsford City Council, Sonia Church - Essex Highways, Claire Harris – Chelmsford City Council, Averil Price - Chelmsford City Council and Jon Simmons - Essex Highways
Also present:	County Councillor Jude Deakin
Secretariat:	Brian Mayfield - Chelmsford City Council

Item		Owner
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed those present, particularly Councillor Ride, whose first meeting of the Panel this was.</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Aldridge.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of Previous Meeting</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 26 September 2017 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	

<p>4.</p>	<p>Matters Arising from Minutes of the Previous Meeting</p> <p><i>Writtle Road junction with A1016 Westway, Chelmsford – Additional Pedestrian Guard Rail – LCHE152103</i></p> <p>A new scheme for this site had been added to the Potential Schemes List.</p> <p><i>Tyrells School, Tavistock Road, Bodmin Road, Taunton Road, Springfield 20mph zone/limit – LCHE152066</i></p> <p>A technical note on the scheme had been prepared and sent to Councillor Mackrory (see minute no. 6 below).</p> <p><i>Pump Lane junction with Crocus Way, Springfield – Crossing/signage/surface improvements – LCHE171004</i></p> <p>This scheme had been completed.</p> <p><i>Mill Road j/w Downham Road, Stock – 40mph speed limit – LCHE162130</i></p> <p>This scheme had been added to the Approved Works Programme for delivery in 2017/18.</p> <p><i>322 Springfield Road – Road hatching</i></p> <p>The scheme had been included on the Potential Schemes List (see minute no.6 below).</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Approved Works Programme Update 2017/18</p> <p>The Chairman informed the Panel that he and the chairmen of several other Local Highway Panels had been lobbying for their budgets to be increased in 2018/19. Budgets had been halved a few years ago to enable funds previously earmarked for LHP schemes to be used for capital works to resurface footways and local roads. The chairmen felt that now that those works had been carried out for a number of years the LHP budgets should be restored. Sonia Church said that there remained resurfacing work to be done, which may affect the decision on the restoration of budgets.</p> <p>In response to a question from Councillor Ride, Jon Simmons confirmed that the whole budget for the Approved Works Programme had been allocated in 2017/18.</p> <p>Turning to the Approved Works Programme, the Panel received a schedule setting out progress with the 62 schemes currently in the Programme for 2017/18. The sub-group of the Panel established at</p>	

<p>the last meeting had recommended 13 schemes in the Programme as the priorities for 2018/19.</p> <p>Additional information to that given in the report was provided on the following schemes:</p> <p><i>Main Road nr j/w Erick Avenue, Broomfield – pedestrian crossing upgrade – LCHE162129</i></p> <p>The presence of the wooden telegraph pole would not affect visibility at the crossing as the beacons would protrude further than at present and would be of the brighter LED type.</p> <p><i>Waterson Vale, Chelmsford – 20mph signs/roundels – LCHE142093</i></p> <p>It was proposed to carry out a more comprehensive scheme at an additional cost of £5,000. It was recommended that the additional funding be met from the budget for <i>O/s 50-62 Shimbrooks, Great Leighs – LCHE152114</i> where it was now intended to carry out design works only in the current year at an estimated cost of £8,000. This was agreed.</p> <p><i>High Street, Chelmsford – Review of prohibition of vehicles TRO and signage – LCHE172023</i></p> <p>As well as reviewing the TRO and signs in the High Street, the Panel was informed that various agencies were working together to assess the information available on the extent of the problem and how the prohibition could be enforced. A wider scheme for a cross-town cycle route would not include the High Street, which may help reduce the numbers of cyclists using it, although the impression was that it was young people who were the ones disregarding the prohibition.</p> <p><u>Priority Schemes</u></p> <p>The Panel agreed that the priority schemes recommended by the sub-group should be approved for inclusion in the 2018/19 rolling programme. The Panel also accepted the recommendations of the Panel on those schemes that should be removed from the programme.</p> <p>With regard to the scheme for <i>o/s the parade of shops 90-106 Kings Road, Chelmsford</i>, which was recommended for removal, Jon Simmons said that he would meet Councillor Deakin on site to explain</p>	<p>JS</p>
--	------------------

	<p>AGREED that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the position on the Approved Works Programme for 2017/18 be noted; 2. Schemes LCHE152014, 162055, 148002, 163005, 142052, 162141, 152015, 142073, 152091, 152081, 162060, 162144 and 165026 be included as priority schemes in the rolling programme for 2018/19; and 3. the sub-group's recommendations on the removal of schemes from the programme be accepted. 	
6.	<p>Potential Schemes List for 2017/18</p> <p>The Panel was requested to review the current Potential Schemes List and remove any that it did not wish to consider for future funding. A sub-group of the Panel had been tasked with prioritising the schemes in the rolling programme for 2018/19 and had recommended seven priority Traffic Management schemes and one priority School Crossing Patrol scheme.</p> <p>Jon Simmons reported that a design for a scheme to remove the hatched road markings opposite 322 Broomfield Road had been added to the Potential Schemes List for a funding consideration. The Chairman had also asked the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation whether funding could be provided for it in 2017/18. If that was agreed it would be carried out in the current financial year.</p> <p>Members of the Panel were invited to suggest schemes that should take priority in 2018/19 and the following were recommended in addition to the scheme for <i>o/s 322 Broomfield Road</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Severnake Road near Rossendale Road, Chelmsford – LCHE162 160</i> - <i>Writtle Road Road j/w A1016 Westway, Chelmsford – LCHE172026</i> - <i>Pryors Road, Galleywood – LCHE162 166</i> <p>It was also agreed that £5,000 should be included for consultation on and the design of the 20mph zone in <i>Tavistock Road, Bodmin Road, Taunton Road, Springfield LCHE152066</i>. The views of the Cabinet Member would be sought first, however, on whether that scheme met the new emerging criteria and guidelines for introducing 20mph zones, which were currently under review in the light of experience nationally with the effectiveness of 20mph zones. On that subject, the Panel was informed that the design of roads in new developments made them suitable for 20mph speed limits and that they therefore automatically met the criteria for such zones without needing specific approval.</p>	JS

	<p>Councillor Holoway expressed the view that a case could be made for the use of mobile speed monitoring equipment to be funded from sources other than the LHP budget.</p> <p>On other schemes in the Potential Schemes List, the Panel was informed that:</p> <p><i>LCHE152016 – Park Avenue, Chelmsford</i> – the validation would be completed by the time of the next meeting <i>LCHE152001 – Bridge over River Crouch, Hawk Hill, Battlesbridge</i> – the feasibility scheme may be funded by other means</p> <p>Taking into account the priorities established by the sub-group and the Panel at this meeting, the revised list of schemes for 2018/19 would be submitted to the next meeting.</p> <p>AGREED that the recommendations of the sub-group on the priorities for the Potential Schemes List be approved, together with the five priority schemes mentioned above, and that the revised list of schemes for 2018/19 be submitted to the next meeting.</p>	
7.	<p>Highways Rangers Update</p> <p>The Panel considered a summary of the Chelmsford City Highways Rangers work programme for August to October 2017 and details of the Panel's revenue budget for 2017/18.</p> <p>Members asked that the thanks of the Panel be conveyed to the Rangers for their work.</p> <p>AGREED that the Highways Rangers Update report be noted.</p>	CH
8.	<p>Section 106 Update</p> <p>The Panel received an update on Section 106 highway schemes.</p> <p>AGREED that the Section 106 Update report be noted.</p>	
9.	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><i>A132 St Mary's and Church End Lane, Runwell</i></p> <p>Councillor Ride raised concerns about this junction in the light of a recent fatal accident and other incidents. He argued that there was a clear need for a pedestrian crossing at this location and asked whether it was intended to provide one as part of the nearby Runwell hospital site development. Jon Simmons said that such a scheme</p>	

	<p>would be funded and constructed by the developer under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. He would check whether a scheme had been submitted to the Essex Highways for approval and inform Councillor Ride.</p> <p><i>Highways Briefings</i></p> <p>The Panel was informed that a number of comments had been made by representatives of parish councils at recent briefings for them on highways and parking matters. Their feedback had included concerns about the relatively high cost of schemes in Essex compared to other parts of the country and the lack of information about the final cost of schemes and their comparison with the estimated costs.</p> <p>Sonia Church informed the Panel that the discrepancy in costs could be attributed to the use of different financial models. In Essex, the cost took account of all work associated with a scheme, including design, validation and decision-making on it, whereas in other areas only the actual construction costs were published. The timely publication of the final cost of individual schemes was difficult when they could not be finalised until the completion of the auditing process, which in many cases was not until June in the following year.</p>	<p>JS</p>
--	---	------------------

The meeting closed at 14:34

Chairman