

BASILDON LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL MINUTES – 29th January 2018, 2pm

Committee Room 5, County Hall.

Chairman:	Councillor Richard Moore
Panel Members:	Cllr Jeff Henry, Cllr Allan Davies, Cllr Stephen Hillier, Cllr Kerry Smith, Cllr Malcom Buckley, Cllr Patricia Reid, Cllr Tony Ball, Cllr Anthony Hedley.
Officers:	Sonia Church – Highway Liaison Manager Will Price – Highway Liaison Officer
Secretariat:	Paula Montague

Item		Owner
1.	<p>Welcome and Introductions:</p> <p>It was confirmed that Bernie Foster would be attending the Panel on behalf of the Association of Basildon Local Councils (ABLC).</p>	
2.	<p>Apologies for Absence:</p> <p>Cllr Stephen Hillier, Cllr Allan Davies</p> <p>Declarations of interest:</p> <p>None were recorded.</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes of meeting held on 25 September 2017 to be agreed as correct record:</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
4.	<p>Matters arising from minutes of the previous meeting:</p> <p>Noak Hill/Wash Road Cllr Buckley and Cllr Ball informed the Panel that, following local concerns, they were not in support of the implementation of a right turn prohibition. Councillor Buckley added that the implementation of a prohibition would not address concerns relating to “rat running” and speeding on Dunton Road. WP reminded Members that there was a significant collision problem at the junction (13 collisions in 10 years including one fatality) which was directly attributable to the right turn movement. He informed the Panel that 3 successive</p>	

feasibility and traffic modelling studies had been completed here which showed that a roundabout or traffic lights were not viable at the junction. He also advised that the studies had shown that traffic flows on Dunton Road were well within the road's design capacity and there were no issues with speeding.

WP went on to inform the Panel that the road safety scheme commissioning process changed in 2017/18 in such a way that any road safety schemes which meet the criteria go directly to the Cabinet Member for sign off. Since Noak Hill/Wash Rd exceeded the road safety criteria it would need to go to Cllr Grundy for a decision re 2018/19 delivery. However, he told the Panel that they could of course make their views known to the Cabinet Member. He also let them know that all objections would be reported to Cllr Grundy before his decision is made.

Cllr Moore queried the Cabinet Member making decisions on the Basildon LHP's budget. WP clarified the budget was under the Cabinet Member's 'ownership', and the Panel steer it with recommendations based on their more detailed local knowledge. The Panel expressed their disapproval of this situation.

SC said that a paper for road safety schemes across the entire County would be put together and presented to the Cabinet Member in advance of the new financial year, but she emphasised that no decisions on individual schemes had yet been made. Once budgets were announced the Cabinet Member would be deciding how he wished to fund casualty reduction schemes. She told the Panel that consideration must be given to Essex County Council's responsibility to reduce casualties on the network, and advised that Members attend the Cabinet Member's surgery should they wish to object to any given CR scheme.

Great Berry School

WP was invited to update the Panel. He informed Members that objections had been received during informal consultation. He let the Panel know that the need to document and report objections to the Panel and the Cabinet Member before proceeding with formal consultation had slowed scheme to the extent that we would probably not be able to secure delivery this financial year. Cllr Smith produced numerous pieces of correspondence he had received in support of the scheme which he said he would be passing to the Cabinet Member following the Panel meeting. Cllr Hedley said he did not see why 1 or 2 objections should prevent a scheme going ahead.

Cllr Henry requested clarification on informal and public consultations, asking why these objections should slow the scheme to such an extent, and why we couldn't immediately proceed to formal consultation. WP and SC sought to clarify the process. They

	<p>advised that formal consultations have cost implications, particularly surrounding advertising costs, and for that reason objections to informal consultation should be considered prior to advancing to formal consultation to ensure funds are not wasted on a non-viable scheme. WP clarified that although the objection reporting process would slow delivery, it did not mean that the scheme could not or would not happen.</p> <p>With the generally positive response to the scheme in mind Cllr Henry asked if we could proceed directly to formal consultation and brief the Cabinet Member re objections at the completion of formal consultation, consequently enabling scheme delivery within this financial year. WP advised that he would check the governance process and do his very best to achieve this.</p> <p>Cllr Smith asked what would happen to the scheme budget if the scheme isn't delivered within the year. WP said that we would look to attribute the funds to "reserve schemes" on the rolling programme which could be delivered within the year. He advised though that it was very late in the year to find any such scheme. In response, the Panel reiterated its desire to complete the scheme this financial year.</p> <p>Cllr Henry and other Panel Members queried why the consultation process had not taken place earlier in the year to avoid this situation. WP advised that schemes were fully designed prior to the undertaking of consultation in order to know exactly what the scheme would entail. Consequently WP advised that consultations always took place towards the end of a scheme. Cllr Henry asked for a timeline relating to the consultation for this scheme. WP said he would provide this. SC said she would like to see consultations undertaken sooner in scheme to ensure we have sufficient public support for a scheme before design work begins. She said she would be trying to arrange for this in future.</p> <p>Cllr Henry questioned whether the frequency of Panel meetings could be detrimental to scheme delivery (i.e. the lack of opportunity to formalise decisions after consultations etc). SC advised the Panel that decisions can be made between meetings either by email or the Panel can meet without officers if required.</p> <p>In acknowledgement of Cllr Hillier's objection, Cllr Buckley said that the broad coverage of the scheme (including side roads) was not as he would have envisaged. He said that there could have been more clarity in this regard from the outset. Cllr Hedley clarified Cllr Hillier's only objection to the scheme was its broad scope. WP discussed the reason why side roads had to be included; namely that the minimum length for any speed limit should be 600 metres, that introducing the limit on Forest Glade alone would necessitate terminal signs at each of the side roads, and that it didn't seem rational for drivers to leave</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
--	---	---------------------

	<p>a small cul-de-sac with a limit of 30mph to join a more major road with a 20mph limit.</p> <p>Cllr Hedley stated if the full consultation receives the majority public approval, one Cllr's objection should not be an issue. WP agreed to put forward the strength of feeling on this matter and confirmed that he would seek to go straight to formal consultation with a view to deliver the scheme this year.</p> <p>20mph – Brightside School, Billericay</p> <p>Cllr Moore stated that just before the September meeting Mike Thompson had taken a paper to the Cabinet Member recommending that the Panel consider the introduction of a 20's plenty instead of the commissioned 20mph limit. Cllr Moore queried why this had not previously been discussed with the Panel and why, after the Panel had confirmed that they wished to stick with the limit (at their September meeting) they were told that this was not an option. Cllr Moore asked for Officers to explain the process.</p> <p>WP clarified the speed limit/TRO process to the Panel. He explained that TRO's involve informal and then formal consultation, and that this consultation takes place towards the end of the scheme process (after design and before delivery). He explained that any objections received during the consultation process needed to be taken to the Cabinet Member for his consideration. At that time it was the relevant officer's duty to make recommendations to the Cabinet Member on how the objections could be overcome and therefore how the scheme could proceed. In the case of Brightside he explained that objections (including a petition from residents) had been received largely complaining at the breadth of the restriction. He explained that the mean speeds recorded in the area also did not meet the criteria contained within the new HPN. With all of that in mind, the officer had recommended that a 20's Plenty be installed instead of a 20 limit. This would remove the need for a TRO, reduce the breadth of the scheme, negate any objections and enable swift delivery (by avoiding any further consultation). This view was endorsed by the Cabinet Member and the decision was made effectively to ask the Panel if they would like to proceed with the scheme as a 20's Plenty or drop the scheme as a result of the issues outlined.</p> <p>Cllr Moore raised concerns that the paper went to the Cabinet Member without knowledge of the Panel. Cllr Hedley stated that residents were expecting a 20mph limit. Some residents had signed petitions both in favour and against the limit. He felt therefore that the organiser of the objection petition could have coerced signatories and/or that people may have signed the petition to avoid discussion on the subject.</p>	<p>WP</p>
--	--	------------------

	<p>Cllr Hedley suggested the Panel should have been informed of the recommendation. Cllr Moore agreed on the basis that the Panel disagree on the recommendation of the 20s plenty. Additionally, if the Panel had known they would not have had the discussion at their last meeting.</p> <p>Cllr Hedley suggested 20s Plenty may be appropriate for other locations such as Great Berry instead of a TRO scheme. Cllr Henry suggested it could yet become a 20's Plenty. SC advised that a 20's plenty appeared appropriate at Brightside as speeds were already low. She said that there had been a lot of changes relating to 20mph Policies this year and that misunderstandings and delays had occurred along the way. But, that we had learned from this and there was now a great deal more clarity concerning 20mph restrictions. There was continued discussion around the subject.</p> <p>Mr Foster discussed his understanding that speed limits could only be introduced where speeds are low enough for them to be self-enforcing. WP explained that this was no longer the Council's stance, and instead we should look to install limits where mean speeds were between 24 – 29mph. WP explained the rationale behind this.</p> <p>Cllr Hedley said that he did not want to drop this scheme and reluctantly agreed that a 20's Plenty should go ahead. This was agreed by Cllr Moore and the rest of the Panel who stipulated that we should undertake speed surveys once the 20's Plenty is installed to ascertain whether it was effective.</p> <p>Speed survey turnaround time. Cllr Ball queried why the speed survey on Radwinter Ave had not yet been completed. WP advised that the loops which had been laid had been damaged on 2 occasions, but that they were trying again. Cllr Buckley queried the cost of a speed survey. WP confirmed £250 for an ATC (speed survey) and £1100 for a PV² survey.</p>	<p>WP</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Approved Works Programme Update 2017/18: WP invited any questions relating to the Approved Works Programme and updated Members as follows:</p> <p>Gardiners Lane North, Ramsden Crays WP advised that objections had been received to the proposed weight restriction, including one from the Police (who said that the limit was unnecessary, that they would not have resources to enforce it, and that it could encourage HGV's pass through the centre of Wickford). Cllr Buckley queried whether Trading Standards could enforce the restriction. WP confirmed that they could in principle, but that they would also be unlikely to have resources. Cllr Buckley said he did not accept non-enforcement as a justifiable reason to abandon the scheme. The Panel were in agreement that</p>	

	<p>the scheme should still be pursued (on the understanding that objections would be taken to the Cabinet Member in the normal manner).</p> <p>Hill Avenue, Wickford WP advised that the design was not yet complete, but that it looked as though the crossing was physically viable and it was now a matter of gauging resident's views to the move. Cllr Buckley said that the scheme had been put forward by the school and he reiterated his strong support.</p> <p>Old Church Road, Bowers Gifford WP advised that gate posts had been removed from this site by an unknown individual after their installation. He put forwards the recommendation that lockable bollards be installed in the new financial year to prevent fly tipping in a manner that is more amenable to adjacent landowners. WP advised that he was also working in partnership with the Borough Council in an attempt to overcome the fly tipping issue. The Panel were supportive of this approach.</p> <p>Northlands School, Pitsea WP and SC advised that we had been unable to undertake the necessary engagement and subsequent sign design activity with schools this year. As a result they recommended that the Panel install 'standard' signs this year and add individual designs to those next year. SC recommended that the Panel to attribute £2000 next year for engagement with Merrylands, Northlands and Brightside. This approach was supported by the Panel.</p> <p>Cortauld Road junction with Repton Close, Basildon WP advised that delivery of this CR scheme was no longer achievable within the financial year. He told the Panel that it had been perhaps overly ambitious to seek to design and deliver the scheme within one year. WP advised that savings from the scheme could be used at other suitable reserve sites. Cllr Buckley advised this junction is close to a waste plant, planning permission for which included funding for road repairs due to heavy vehicles. WP to check if S106 funds were available.</p> <p>A127 Pedestrian Casualty Sites, Nevendon WP advised that the signs relating to this Road Safety Scheme had been designed and could now be installed with £30,000 of the £68,000 of savings from the Cortauld Rd/Repton Close scheme. The Panel queried why the cost to install signs was so high. WP advised that a great deal of the cost was attributable to traffic management on the A127. Cllr Buckley said that if the improvements did take place we should seek to involve Basildon Borough Council so that they can litter pick the verge at the same time.</p>	<p>WP</p>
--	---	-----------

	<p>The Panel questioned whether the installation of the signs was cost effective. WP advised that there was a history of collisions with pedestrians at the site, and that the signs were the recommendation of the road safety team. He also advised that a great deal of the savings from the Cortauld Rd scheme would be lost to the Panel if not used here. The Panel agreed that nevertheless, they did not support the installation of the signs at this cost.</p> <p>With that in mind WP and the Panel sought to identify schemes from the programme which may be deliverable within the financial year. The Panel approved the delivery of LBAS002011 (Clay Hill Rd, Basildon).</p> <p>2018/19 Rolling Programme: The Panel were asked to go through the Rolling Programme and attribute schemes with a High/Medium/Low priority in preparation for the formation of next year's programme. Priority levels were attributed and schemes discussed as follows:</p> <p>Greenway, Billericay (LBAS165002) – High priority</p> <p>St Peters Primary School, Billericay (LBAS172013) – High priority</p> <p>London Road, Wickford close to no 63 (LBAS152026) – Cllr Buckley advised that the doctors surgery with which much of the footfall in the area was presumably associated had been relocated. He therefore asked that we undertake further PV² surveys to assess the need for a crossing upgrade and asked that we do not include this scheme within next year's programme.</p> <p>Dunton Road junction with Steeple View, Dunton (LBAS165001) – High priority</p> <p>Wickford Infant and Junior School (LBAS172017) – The Panel agreed that this was a high priority scheme but that the form of 20 should be re-assessed so that it was in keeping with the new HPN (and therefore less likely to experience delays/scope changes).</p> <p>North Crescent School, Wickford (LBAS172018) – High priority (with the same stipulation as above).</p> <p>Southend Road junction with Highcliffe Road, Wickford (LBAS175011) – Medium priority</p> <p>Twinstead, Wickford (LBAS152014) - Before this scheme goes ahead Cllr Buckley asked that we 1) determine whether humps can be legally removed and 2) consult residents to find out whether this would be preferable. He advised therefore that the scheme should not feature in next year's programme.</p>	<p>WP</p>
--	---	------------------

	<p>A130 path leading to Rushbottom Lane, Bowers Gifford (LBAS162001) – Medium priority</p> <p>*If gritters are not required (which deviates staff resources) we may be able to deliver scheme this year with savings outlined earlier.</p> <p>Broadmayne junction with Upper Mayne, Basildon (LBAS171004) – WP advised that this scheme would be removed from the rolling programme and would go directly to the Cabinet Member for approval as a CR scheme. Cllr Buckley queried whether there is any developer money from the Lake Avenue (Gloucester Park Swimming Pool) site to fund any approved works at this location. WP to check.</p> <p>Greenstead Nursery, Basildon (LBAS172020) – High priority with same stipulation as LBAS172017</p> <p>Miles Gray Road, Basildon (LBAS172022) – High priority</p> <p>Moss Drive junction with Moss Close, Vange (LBAS162042) – High priority</p> <p>Lingcroft/Sparrows Herne, Basildon (LBAS162049) – Low priority</p> <p>A13 crossing point (LBAS172042) – Low priority</p> <p>Church Road, Ramsden Bellhouse (LBAS142056) – High priority WP recommended to do detailed design next year, with delivery in the following year. Cllr Buckley said he would sooner do both within one year despite the risk of the scheme being undeliverable due to unknown utility info. WP said he would discuss with engineers to try and facilitate this.</p> <p>Wickford C of E school (LBAS152033) – High priority</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>2018/19 Potential Schemes List: WP provided a breakdown of the potential schemes list. Schemes were approved or removed and/or attributed priorities as follows:</p> <p><u>Traffic Management</u> Runwell Road, Wickford (LBAS172020) – Remove from Potential Schemes List</p> <p>Castledon Road, Wickford (LBAS172011) – Remove from Potential Schemes List</p> <p>New Avenue, Basildon (LBAS172024) – High priority</p> <p>Mountnessing Road, Billericay (LBAS172027) – Medium priority</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>

<p>Gobions, Basildon (LBAS172030) – High priority</p> <p>Tye Common Road, Billericay (LBAS172032) – High priority</p> <p>Trafford House, Station Way, Basildon (LBAS172033) - Cllr Smith requested this scheme remains on the Potential Scheme List until works are finished.</p> <p>Radford Way, Billericay (LBAS172034) – High priority</p> <p>WP advised against attempting design and delivery in one year due to the high level of risk in achieving this. The Panel asked whether we could approach Sainsbury’s for a funding contribution. It was agreed that we would undertake design only in 2018/19, at the same time making contact with Sainsbury’s to see if they are able to contribute towards delivery in subsequent financial year.</p> <p>Coppice Lane, Wickford (LBAS172037) – Medium priority</p> <p>Jacksons Lane, Billericay (LBAS182002) – WP advised that Network Rail were supposedly replacing this barrier and told Cllr Hedley he was seeking more concrete info from them which he would pass on.</p> <p>Rectory Road, Basildon (LBAS182006) – High priority</p> <p>Little Lullaway/Gladwyns, Basildon (LBAS182007) – Still in validation. Cost would be approximately £4,500 for permanent bollards or pedestrian guard rails. Cllr Henry questioned whether permanent bollards could be installed due to our obligation to maintain emergency access. WP will meet with Cllr on site for further investigation.</p> <p>Coopersales, Laindon (LBAS182011) – High priority</p> <p>Prower Close, Billericay (LBAS182013) – High priority Cllr Hedley declared that he lived on the road and therefore felt unable to comment on the scheme. WP advised that there was a lack of “no through road” signs and felt therefore that the installation of signs was a good idea.</p> <p>Whitmore Way, Basildon (LBAS182021) – Medium priority WP advised that the location no longer met the criteria for a SID or VAS sign, but that there was currently a SID on site which was beyond repair. SC and WP clarified the difference between SID and VAS. SC advised we could remove the existing sign using funds from the revenue budget and reassess to see whether the issue returns if that were the Panel’s preference. After some discussion</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
--	-----------------------------------

	<p>Cllr Henry said he endorsed the installation of a new SID sign. This was supported by the Panel.</p> <p>London Road, Wickford (LBAS 182016) – Remove from Potential Schemes.</p> <p>Radwinter Avenue, Wickford (LBAS182017) – awaiting validation.</p> <p>Dry Street junction with One Tree Hill (LBAS182018) – awaiting validation. Cllr Smith asked that we hold back on this validation until further notice.</p> <p>Old Church Road, Bowers Gifford (LBAS182019) – High priority WP outlined the strength of feeling from the Parish on this issue and passed on their view that this scheme should be carried out as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Janet Duke School, Basildon (LBAS172015) – WP clarified that this scheme was programmed for design and delivery within the S106 programme. The design had been completed but funds were no longer available for delivery. He asked for the Panel’s approval to deliver this scheme utilising underspend within the LHP programme this financial year. Cllr Henry stated that the road is a rat run and this scheme is required. All agreed to allocate funding this year.</p> <p>Hornbeam Way, Basildon (LBAS182012) - Low priority WP advised that the VAS sign currently in situ was not working as the associated solar panels were obstructed by trees which were not overhanging the highway (and therefore not within our powers to remove/cut back). Cllr Buckley asked if we could use a battery. SC advised batteries are charged by the solar unit so the trees would also hinder charging. The Panel agreed funding for mains connection and/or a new sign (whichever was most economical) but advised that this was a low priority scheme.</p> <p>Cllr Buckley requested removal of a sign in Harding Elms Road, he has been advised the Rangers couldn’t collect it as there is no footpath in the area. SC advised if the sign is needed it should be repaired, if not someone would need to go and pick it up; either way, this is a maintenance issue.</p> <p><u>Walking</u> Adjacent to Wickford C of E Infant School (LBAS172044) – High priority</p> <p>Between 23 and 25 The Firle, Langdon Hills (LBAS173004) – High priority</p> <p>Hill Avenue, Wickford (LBAS183001) – High priority</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The design for this scheme was not yet complete but WP asked the Panel whether, in principle, they were supportive of the scheme so that he could begin to prepare the next year's programme. He also advised that the scheme may be more likely to cost in the region of £80,000. The Panel were unanimously supportive.</p> <p>Sporhams, Basildon (LBAS183002) – Awaiting validation</p> <p>Nethermayne, Basildon (LBAS183003) – Awaiting validation</p> <p>Stock Road junction with Orchard Avenue (LBAS183004) – Awaiting validation. WP advised that the PV² criteria had been met, but that there were driveways in the vicinity of the crossing which might make an upgrade unfeasible. If the Panel wanted to implement a crossing upgrade they would first need to commission a feasibility study with subsequent design at an estimated cost of £30,000. There was some discussion and this was agreed by the Panel. Cllr Hedley advised that there was also a major issue with parking in this location, with parents blocking driveways and parking in hazardous positions. WP advised that any parking issues would need to be dealt with through SEPP.</p> <p><u>Passenger Transport</u> Near 213 Clay Hill Road, Basildon – High priority</p> <p>Laindon Link junction with Albert Drive – High priority. WP advised that we may be able to deliver this year. The Panel endorsed this if possible.</p>	
7.	<p>Appendices</p> <p><u>Revenue Budget</u> Lower Dunton Road – WP advised that there was a broken VAS sign in this location and that manufacturers had quoted £1200 to attempt repair, but had warned that it may be unsuccessful. He asked for the Panel's steer on whether they would like to go ahead with this.</p> <p>Cllr Henry discussed the recent triple fatality in the area and described what he saw as the local view on this matter. He also informed Members of the matters raised on this subject at the recent Cabinet Members surgery. He made the Panel aware that maintenance works including vegetation trimming and sign repairs had been agreed at the surgery. Cllr Henry said that it seemed irrational to spend capital money replacing the VAS sign when surveys had shown that the speed criteria was not being met. The Panel agreed that the sign should be removed if we could do so at a cost of less than £500.</p>	WP

	<p><u>Rangers update</u> SC noted that we do not get many requests from County Members. Cllr Buckley said they are always told Rangers are unable to complete works for various reasons. There was a discussion around the subject.</p> <p><u>S106</u> There were no issues noted.</p>	SC
8.	<p>AOB</p> <p>There was none.</p>	
9.	<p>Date of next meeting:</p> <p>26th March 2018.</p>	