LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL - MINUTES AND ACTIONS		
Date: 23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2012	PRESENT:	
Venue:	Panel Members: Clir Hillier, Clir Twitchen, Clir Hedley, Clir Pummell, Clir Dornan	
Apologies: Cllr Schofield, Cllr Sargent, Cllr Abrahall, Cllr Morris, Sean Perry (ECC)	Other Attendees: Natalie Szpigelman – Highways Liaison Officer ECC Gary Webster – Safety Engineer ECC Keith Blackburn – Senior Infrastructure Funding Officer ECC Amanda Goddard – Business Service Partner ECC	

Item:	Action:	Action Owner:
1.	Welcome and Introductions: Chair Cllr Sandra Hillier opened the meeting and welcomed everyone to the meeting of the newly formed Local Highways Panel and invited all attendees to introduce themselves.	
	Minutes of the last meeting:	FOR
	There were no minutes from the last meeting but the attached notes are from the an initial meeting held on 21st May	LHP minutes 210512
	Members requested receipt of hard copies of meeting documentation one week prior to the date of the meeting. (There are issues with opening attachments so electronic copies are not always suitable).  Members also requested papers be titled and separated for easier reference.	NS
2	Funding for Local Highway panels:	
	Budgets and funding – this was discussed at the last meeting	Closed
	<b>S106</b> – The main aim of S106 under the new legislation introduced in April 2010 aims to identify and describe what, how and when S106 funding can be used.	
	Any S106 agreed prior to April 2010 the old process and restrictions would apply.	
	JD – raised the issue as to lack of scope/freedom with spending S106 funding under the new legislation and it was agreed that Members would lobby Cabinet and raise the restrictions. All S106 funding must be related to site and must be used in a fair and reasonable manner.	ALL

	Action – the Panel decided to remove this from the CRS and requested a feasibility study.	
	A176 Noak Rd, Wash Road – a mini r/bt is not possible on roads with a speed limit of over 30mph and unfortunately the speed limit on this road cannot be changed. A larger r/bt would cost in excess of £150k and due to the set rate of return this would not be possible.	
3.	Casualty Reductions Schemes:	
	KB – to look into agreement re Archers Field and advise Cllr Dornan directly.	КВ
	Members agreed it would be beneficial to lobby MPs with regards to S106 restrictions.	
	<b>KB</b> – suggested that talking to neighbouring Districts/Boroughs with regards to their S106 funding or other developments would be beneficial.	ALL
	Colchester and Chelmsford pilot – there is a charging schedule dependent on large planning applications to enable better use of S106 funding rather than CIL	
	CIL is different to S106 in that it is levied on a much wider range of developments and according to a published tariff schedule. This spreads the cost of funding infrastructure over more developers and provides certainty as to how much developers will have to pay.	
	KB to ensure financial transfer of all monies to be done by next meeting	КВ
	No. 208 – Works completed but unable to allocate to budget monies may go into a reserve fund.	
	No. 1057 – HGV re-route, work to start soon. Monies have been spent and ECC to hold onto excess for possible increased traffic issues. Renewed planning application to be heard 25/07/12	
	No. 952 – KB to organised money transfer	The state of the s
	No. 531 – KB to organise return of money as work completed and subsidised bus service is running.	КВ
	No 145 – KB to organise money not spent to be returned	КВ
	No. 132 – KB awaiting reply from hospital on return of money not spent, which has incurred interest.	KB KB
	S106- Finance position:	POSITION - BASILDO
	It was felt that more resource at the front end to obtain more detail prior to the planning stage would be an advantage.	ENGINEER FINANCE
	The need to liaise with Developers at an early stage and ensure funding was seen as a way forward. S106 funding is allocated prior to planning permission being granted and hence inconsistency with costings.	

	NS - to put this forward for feasibility study/costing of a r/bt, temporary traffic lights and report back at the next meeting	NS
	NS/GW – to organise possibility of 'temporary' no right turn out - by putting barriers – there may be issues with buses.	NS/GW
	B1007 Staneway – Due to issues with bus turning etc a new design could cost in excess of £190k. Restriction on right turn diversion at the r/bt is not viable. A change of route so that Staneway is 'give-way' would mean Highroad would become the main route especially for lorries	
	<b>Action</b> – Taking into account the above the Panel decided to 'shelve' this CRS.	
	B1464 Timberlog Lane – this was discussed at the last meeting and it was agreed to remove point 6.5 from the plan. NS reported that the £40k cost was now reduced to £25k. There were some concerns about the narrowing of Timberlog but GW explained strategy.	
	Action - This CRS was agreed.	
4.	Potential Schemes for Consideration –	
	NS agreed to remove ones on this list, that were agreed in the last meeting,hat are not going ahead.	NS
	Minor Schemes	
	1. Remove from list	
	2. <b>NS</b> – to change the scheme from £100k xing relocation to read – the light controlled xings at Sun Street, opposite library and Southend Road need to be re- phased to give traffic more time and ease congestion.	NS
	NS - to speak to the SA2000 Project Manager and report back at the	
	next meeting.	NS
	3. Remove from list	NS
	4. NS – to look into possible filter at junction.	NS
	5. <b>NS</b> – to look into enforcement issues and speed issues and take to Cllr Louis.	
	6. <b>NS</b> – advised that If speed of road is reduced to 20mph it would be 'self enforcement'	
	7. Accepted	
	8. <b>NS</b> – advised that signals contractor will be demobilising from December 2012 and therefore design could take place this year with a view to implement next year (if scheme is approved following validation and safety audit)	
,	9 to 12 Remove from list	NS
	13. NS - to change location to read 'Tye Common Road and to speak to	NS

	traffic calming team re possible speed reduction, 14. NS – advised of increased costs for r/bt. It was therefore suggested that NS would	NS	J: ¶
	organise an informal consultation with residents  15. <b>NS</b> – to find out about signs and lines on Rosebay Road and liaise with Cllr Ray Howard for more information and report back at the next meeting.	NS	
	NS – to provide break down of costs but go ahead with signage (approx £500.00) and detailed costing of foot path.	NS	į
	16. Remove from list		
	17 to 37 – Remove from list (see note below).		
	34. NS to liaise with KB and report back at next meeting.	NO	
-	Small Works	NS	
- 54	Points 1 and 2 were agreed.	NO	
	Bus Stops	NS	
	NS - to remove items 4-7from the list as they are not relevant to Basildon.	No	
	1. JD advised that he thought this would be cabinet member costs.	NS	
	2. NS – to find out more information and provide at the next meeting	Ne	
	3. Approved.	NS	
	School Crossing Patrol Sites – to be discussed at next meeting		
	Cycle Schemes – to be discussed at next meeting		
	NS – to provide list of cycle routes specific to Basildon area for discussion at next meeting.		
	Public Rights of Way – to be discussed at next meeting		
5.	Billericay School Parking Issues (no. 28 on 'wish list')		1
	Cllr Twitchen explained the situation and resulting issues/difficulties with regards to parking at Billericay School.		=
	It was agreed, that due to there not being an affordable solution to the issues at Billericay school to shelve this scheme as it was felt it would be easier to maintain the status quo.		
6.	Rangers	i i	
	A list of Ranger jobs carried out from June to July was tabled for information		
	2 Rangers have now been employed – NS can be contacted if the Panel have any works they would like to add to the Rangers list.		
			_

7.	Basildon 2012/13 Capital Programme	
	This is all going ahead. The £11m resurfacing programme was discussed, NS advised that this was for information only and has not been signed off.	
8.	Update on Parking Partnership and outstanding TRO	
	NS – tabled outstanding TROs that had been signed off by Cllr Louis. The costs will come from Revenue Rangers budget. They were all proposed by Members last year however they have not yet gone to consultation.	Signed TROs
	JD asked NS to send proposals to Garry Edwards (lead officer on SEPP for Basildon) and Nick Binder and report back with their thoughts by next meeting.	NS
	NS – to put forward and request consultation provided SEPP are happy and enforcement is manageable and effective. The Panel all thought that these TROs had gone for consultation and raised their concerns that this had not happened thus causing more delay.	NS
	In future they all agreed that they would rather be told at each stage what the situation was rather than finding out at a later date.	
	NS – advised that she had been liaising with the Design team and agreed that she would provide up to date information in future.	NS
•	AOB – NS advised the Panel that scheme designs, consultations etc would come from their budget and should be taken into account.	
	Date of next meeting	
	25 <sup>th</sup> October – 10am at Basildon Locality	
	17 <sup>th</sup> December – 10am at Basildon Locality	
	AG – to send out a separate email with meeting dates.	AG

-20