

COLCHESTER LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2025 - 10.00

ONLINE MEETING: MICROSOFT TEAMS

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Chair: | County Councillor Sue Lissimore |
| Panel Members: | <p>City Councillors: Cllr Kemal Çufoğlu, Cllr Jeremy Hagon, Cllr Andrea Luxford-Vaughan</p> <p>County Councillors: Cllr Dave Harris</p> <p>Parish Councillors: Sue Allen Shepherd, Robert Johnstone</p> |
| Officers: | <p>Colchester City Council: Jane Thompson – Transport & Sustainability Lead</p> <p>Essex Highways: Daniel MacLean - Highways Liaison Team Leader</p> <p>Essex Highways: Jon Simmons – Highways Liaison Officer</p> |
| Secretariat: | Colchester City Council: Madeline Roelofsma – Democratic Services Officer |

| Item | | Owner |
|-----------|---|-------|
| 1. | <p>Welcome and Introductions:</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed Councillors and officers to the meeting.</p> | |
| 2 | <p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Elizabeth Alake-Akinyemi, Cllr Lewis Barber, Cllr Mark Cory, Cllr Simon Crow, Cllr John Jowers, Cllr David King, Cllr Lee Scordis.</p> | |
| 3. | <p>Minutes of the meeting held on the 16 September 2025</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 16 September 2025 were confirmed as a correct record.</p> | |

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| <p>4.</p> | <p>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting</p> <p>Regarding Minute 4, Paragraph 1, Councillor Cunningham had emailed Councillor Cory and confirmed that the Clifton Terrace scheme could not be considered through the LHP Process.</p> <p>Regarding Minute 4, Paragraph 2, the request for a flow chart had been resolved.</p> <p>Regarding the action at Minute 6, Paragraph 6 (Mersea Road/Stansted Road), Councillor Harris had spoken to residents. Although there was some support for a T Junction, most felt that the issue could be resolved with some flaring. The Panel would like to understand why a bit could not be shaved off the mini roundabout. It was agreed that Councillor Harris should share the findings of his consultation with the Highways Liaison Officer, so he could seek clarity from the engineers.</p> <p>Highways Liaison Officer confirmed that he was in discussion with the Integrated Passenger Units about the contract for bus shelters that fell outside the remit of the Essex Wide Bus Shelter contract and would update the panel in due course.</p> <p>Regarding Minute 7, Paragraph 1, the Highways Liaison Team Leader reported that the company that had been going to supply the parts for speed indicator devices had gone out of business. Alternative quotes for repair were being sought and he would provide an update once more information on timing was available.</p> <p>Regarding Minute 7, Paragraph 2, the Highways Liaison Officer had provided Cllr Çufuglu with contact details for the North Essex Parking Partnership. He was also in discussion regarding workable coordination with lights and would provide an update shortly.</p> | <p>Cllr Harris/ Highways Liaison Officer</p> <p>Highways Liaison Officer</p> <p>Highways Liaison Team Leader</p> <p>Highways Liaison Officer</p> |
| <p>5.</p> | <p>Report on Funded Schemes 2025/26 and 2026/27</p> <p>The Panel considered a report which provided an update on the position of schemes which the Panel recommended for inclusion in its 2025/26 and 2026/27 programmes. The Highways Liaison Officer confirmed that £148,900 remained available from the original budget of £750,000.</p> <p>At the last meeting Panel had asked for the outstanding funds to be ringfenced for the Clifton Terrace Scheme. However, the Portfolio Holder had now confirmed that this was not possible under the Local Highways Panel (LHP).</p> | |

Councillor Hagon enquired whether the panel had considered holding back the budget in case approved schemes that were due to be delivered over the next 2 years ran over budget.

The Highways Liaison Officer responded that there were four schemes that had been committed to but already required top-ups:

Scheme 13 page 9: Church Lane, Colchester – Pedestrian Crossing Improvements. The road safety audit process had identified that the scheme required additional works. The original allocated budget was £12,900, and a top-up of £21,000 was required.

Scheme 28 page 11: Roberts Road j/w Brigadier Grove, Colchester – RAB improvements. £66,400 had originally been allocated, but now that they had been out to supply chain partners, a top-up of £29,000 was needed.

Scheme 30 page 11: Rainsborowe Road, Colchester – Roundabout Improvements. The scheme had originally been allocated £21,400. Having gone out to tender, costs had come in much higher. As a result, a top-up of £37,000 was required.

Scheme 32 page 12: Bounstead Road/Berechurch Hall Road/ Berechurch Road, Colchester – Junction Improvement. The original budget was £73,700, and the envisaged top-up was £44,000.

The Highways Liaison Officer concluded that the four schemes required a total top-up of £131,000. The LHP had £148,900 left to allocate, so these top-ups would take the majority of the available budget.

The panel discussed the four schemes in some detail. Concern was expressed that the wider picture had not been considered when schemes were costed. The Highways Liaison Team Leader clarified that when a scheme was originally considered, they did try to look at the wider picture. Once a scheme was commissioned and designed it went through the road safety audit and it was unusual to have a large scope increase at that point. He also highlighted that these were the last of the supply chain schemes. Others were direct delivery and Essex Highways would have more control. It was therefore highly unlikely that any significant further top-ups would be required.

The possibility of using member-led funding to cover additional costs was raised, however this was not feasible.

In all cases, either the additional funds would have to be found, or the scheme delayed. The Highways Liaison Team Leader explained that if a scheme were cancelled, there would be abortive costs. He therefore recommended progressing with all four schemes.

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | <p>Although the risk of further shortfalls was limited, it was agreed that the Highways Liaison Team Leader should liaise with the Portfolio Holder to discuss what would happen if further top-up requests were received.</p> <p>The Chair recommended that the funds should be allocated to cover the requested top-ups, noting that there was a possibility that by the next meeting in March, further schemes might have dropped out and there may be more funds to allocate, as well as potential further overspends.</p> <p>Councillors Harris, Çufuglu and Hagon agreed, on the basis that the schemes had been through a trusted process. However, the Panel should be aware of the risk of schemes requiring top-ups in future.</p> <p><i>RESOLVED</i> that the following schemes be allocated top-up funds, totalling £131,000, through the Local Highway Panel:</p> <p>Scheme 13: Church Lane, Colchester. Top-up of £21,000.</p> <p>Scheme 28: Roberts Road, Colchester. Top-up of £66,400.</p> <p>Scheme 30: Rainsborowe Road, Colchester. Top-up of £37,000.</p> <p>Scheme 32: Bounstead Road, Colchester. Top-up of £44,000.</p> <p>This left a total of £17,900 in the LHP Budget.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the Highways Liaison Team Lead should reach out to the Portfolio Holder to ask for clarification on the future of the LHP and circulate any information available in advance of the next meeting.</p> | <p>Highways Liaison Team Leader</p> <p>Highways Liaison Team Leader</p> |
| 6. | <p>Report on Schemes Awaiting Funding</p> <p>Based on the top-ups agreed by the Panel, the Highways Liaison Officer proposed that no more schemes should be agreed for funding at that point. Potential schemes could be discussed at the March meeting, and a further meeting could be called if anything urgent arose in the meantime.</p> <p>In response to a request for information on the new process for submitting new schemes in future, the Chair informed the Panel that the Portfolio Holder had made an announcement at Full Council the previous week. He was still working on a process and comms were expected to come out shortly. Once an announcement had been made, the Highways Liaison Team Leader would circulate the information to the Panel.</p> | <p>Highways Liaison Team Leader</p> |

