

**BASILDON LOCAL HIGHWAY PANEL MINUTES – MONDAY 26TH
MARCH 2018 – 14:00**

COMMITTEE ROOM 5, COUNTY HALL, CHELMSFORD.

Chairman:	Cllr Richard Moore
Panel Members:	Cllr Stephen Hillier, Cllr Malcom Buckley, Cllr Anthony Hedley, Cllr Allan Davies, Cllr Jeff Henry, Cllr Patricia Reid, Cllr Tony Ball, Cllr Kerry Smith
Officers:	EH Will Price – Highway Liaison Officer EH Sonia Church – Highway Liaison Manager
Secretariat:	Rochelle Morgan – Technical Assistant

Item		Owner
1.	Welcome and Introductions:	
2.	Apologies for Absence WP passed on Bernie Foster's apologies.	
3.	Minutes of meeting 29th January 2018 to be agreed as a correct record The minutes were agreed as a correct record.	
4.	Matters Arising from Minutes of the Previous Meeting: The Chairman advised these would be covered within the Approved and Potential Scheme sections of the meeting. Declarations of Interest There were none.	
5.	Approved Works Programme WP provided a budget summary for the next financial year. He advised that Basildon had been assigned a £500k capital budget, the same as previous years. A breakdown for 2018/19 was given as follows: 2017/18 Schemes re-profiled into 2018/19 - £53,500 Rolling Programme Schemes - £135,500 Potential Scheme List - £159,000 Safer Road Schemes 2018/19 - £258,500 TBC	

Total: £606,500

WP advised that the figure for safer road schemes was yet to be confirmed (as he was awaiting a decision from the Cabinet Member as to how the schemes would be funded). SC informed that the safer road schemes would undergo the standard CMA process.

WP informed the Panel that he had added schemes from the Potential Scheme List which had previously been approved by Members onto the Approved Scheme List for 2018/19. He drew Members attention to the following schemes (the first 2 of which were in fact still on the Potential Scheme List as they were awaiting approval):

Hill Avenue Wickford, close to Beauchamps School (LBAS183001)

WP presented the Panel with printed plans and objections relating to the moving of the zebra crossing. He provided the Panel with several options:

1. Leave the crossing in its current location
2. Move the crossing outside no 29 as per the engineer's design
3. Remove the crossing
4. Consider moving the crossing closer to the junction with Southend Rd.

WP advised that a number of objectors had suggested moving the crossing closer to Southend Rd (just north of the entrance to the shops), whilst others had said that doing so would cause congestion issues. Cllr Buckley concurred with the latter opinion and said he felt that moving the crossing close to the shops was not an option.

Cllr Hillier asked for further information as to why the crossing move was being considered and whether the move would interfere with driveways for local residents. Cllr Buckley informed the Panel that a student at the nearby Beauchamps school had been involved in a collision, and that there were congestion issues which had led the School Council to put forward the request. WP informed the Panel that the safety and congestion concerns related to the fact that there were 2 crossings in close proximity to one another either side of the junction with Beauchamps Drive. He informed the Panel that the new crossing location was not perfect, but that the prevalence of dropped crossings in the area meant that this was really the only viable alternative location. He advised that swept path analysis tests had been undertaken to confirm that the crossing would not disturb access to driveways, and that the beacons would be placed at the back of the footway so that residents view was not restricted when pulling on to Hill Ave.

Cllr Buckley then asked if the beacons will have covering to minimise the impact on local residents. WP advised that he had discussed this with street lighting engineers and a shroud would be fitted which would encase the beacons and prevent any sideways light spill.

The Panel decided to support the moving of the crossing to outside 29 Hill Ave.

WP informed Members that this would now go through a formal consultation and any objections would be taken to the Cabinet Member who would need to make the final decision on whether the scheme could progress.

Maylons Place (LBAS183005)

WP informed the Panel that he had visited the site alongside Cllr Reid and Cllr Davis and explained the rationale behind the scheme. He advised that there were two options:

1. Install a dropped crossing on 1 side of the road
2. Install a dropped crossing on both sides of the road and install/widen adjoining paths.

There was some discussion on the subject before the Panel agreed to support option 2.

Gardeners Lane North, Wickford (LBAS152017)

WP presented printed copies of objections received. He advised that the objections had been taken to the Cabinet Member who in turn had asked the Panel to consider whether the scheme represented value for money based on the fact that:

- Neither the police nor ECC's regulatory services department had the resources to enforce environmental weight restrictions.
- Surveys had shown that only a low volume of HGV's used the road.
- Many of those HGV's would need to continue using the road to access local businesses.

Cllr Buckley raised concerns about the amount of time the scheme had taken to reach this stage, since he had raised the issue on behalf of the parish council 3 years ago and received continual complaints since.

The Panel queried the high cost of the works. WP advised that much of that cost related to the need to install advanced warning signs on the A127, and the traffic management which would be involved in that. Cllr Buckley voiced his dismay and requested

<p>further info on why such levels of traffic management were required in such cases.</p> <p>After some further discussion the Panel requested that a lower cost scheme be pursued without advanced warning signs on the A127. WP advised that he would find out whether this was legal/possible and if so would obtain costs.</p> <p>Outside Great Berry Primary School, Langdon Hills (LBAS172019)</p> <p>WP presented local objections to the 20mph limit. There was a discussion between Members on if/how the scheme should progress. WP explained that the only possible alternative to the status quo was a 20's Plenty.</p> <p>Cllr Moore queried why Members were 'forced' to install a 20's Plenty outside Brightside whilst being given the option in this instance. WP advised that the circumstances were different, particularly in relation to mean speeds. Mean speeds at Great Berry School met the criteria for a 20mph limit without a CMA, whereas at Brightside they did not.</p> <p>Cllr Hillier, Cllr Smith and the rest of the Panel agreed to progress with a 20's Plenty at a cost of £8,500.</p> <p>Footpath from Lingcroft to Sparrows Herne, Basildon (LBAS162049)</p> <p>Cllr Smith queried the cost of this scheme and asked whether bollards could be installed at a lower cost. WP advised that the scheme description should have said "bollards or guard rails" and advised that the engineer would make a decision based on which represents the bigger deterrent and better value for money.</p> <p>SC informed the Panel that Essex Highways were introducing a direct delivery team in 18/19 which would reduce design time and lower scheme costs. She told Members that this is exactly the kind of scheme which would benefit. Therefore she felt the scheme costs would come in significantly lower.</p> <p>A13 crossing point in vicinity of Kierbeck Business Park (LBAS172042)</p> <p>WP acknowledged that the Panel had previously provisionally approved this scheme, but on a low priority basis. With that and the current potential over commissioning in mind, he asked whether the Panel wished to upgrade that priority in order to ensure scheme delivery in 18/19.</p> <p>Cllr Moore advised that he had been contacted by the Basildon Business Group and Stephen Metcalfe MP who had sought his</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
--	-----------------------------------

<p>support for swift scheme installation. He also advised that the matter had been in the local press. He asked Members for their opinions.</p> <p>There was much discussion before Members unanimously withdrew their support for the scheme. This was based on the opinion that the signs were overpriced and would endorse pedestrians crossing in an unsafe location. Instead the Panel felt that affected businesses should be putting on shuttle buses. They asked that the scheme be removed from the Approved Scheme List.</p> <p>Laindon Link junction with Albert Drive, Laindon (LBAS185001) Cllr Henry asked why this scheme was listed for 18/19 delivery when Members had previously approved delivery with underspend within 17/18. WP said that it had become too late in the financial year to initiate this scheme after the last meeting.</p> <p>Moss Drive junction with Moss Close, Vange (LBAS162042) WP informed the Panel that there had been a meeting with the Programming and Engineering teams to assess costs and scheme stages following the January Panel. At that meeting it was agreed that it would be more sensible and efficient to commission this scheme as a “design only” in the first instance so that scheme scope and target costs could be obtained before progressing with implementation. This was agreed by Cllr Smith and the Panel.</p> <p>Greenway, Billericay (LBAS165002) The Panel requested more information as to what this scheme involved, and what services were running in the area. WP to action.</p> <p>Church Road, Ramsden Bellhouse (LBAS142056) WP advised that he had been told this scheme could not be commissioned for delivery as there were too many uncertainties remaining with regards to adjacent property access and utility apparatus within the verge. He therefore recommended that the scheme is commissioned as detailed design only with a view to deliver in early 19/20. Cllr Buckley was unhappy that the scheme was taking so long to progress but reluctantly agreed to progress with design only. This was agreed by the rest of the Panel.</p> <p>Outside Greenstead Nursery, Infant and Junior Schools, Basildon (LBAS172020) Cllr Hillier queried the progress of this scheme following a recent meeting with the school. WP advised that the scheme had not yet been commissioned, and that the meeting with the school was unrelated and not something of which he was aware. WP asked if Cllr Hillier could send him details of officers in attendance so that he could find out more about the meeting and if/how it might impact on the scheme.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>Cllr Hillier</p>
--	-------------------------------

	All schemes in the proposed 18/19 programme were approved by the Panel with the exception of LBAS172042 (A13 pedestrian warning signs).	
6.	<p>Potential Schemes List</p> <p>Station Road, Wickford (LBAS183008) Cllr Buckley requested an update on the scheme. WP advised that the location within the scheme request form was unclear. WP to email Cllr Buckley for a precise location.</p> <p>Nethermayne, Basildon – Footbridge Step Markings (LBAS183003) The panel decided to remove this scheme from the Potential Scheme List as ownership was unclear.</p> <p>Radwater Avenue, Wickford (LBAS182017) Cllr Ball acknowledged the speed survey results, but said that he was concerned specifically about inappropriate speeds for a junction. He requested a site visit with WP. WP to organise.</p> <p>London Road, Wickford, close to no. 63 (LBAS152026) Cllr Buckley commented that the lighting on the crossing at present was appalling and drivers could not see pedestrians waiting or using the crossing. SC said that the Panel could consider upgrading the crossing, or just upgrading lighting. WP to investigate both options and update the panel at the next meeting.</p> <p>Trafford House, Station Way, Basildon (LBAS172033) Cllr Smith said this could be removed from the Potential Scheme List as major works had been undertaken which negated the need for bollards.</p> <p>B148 Westmayne/ Ford Access/ Lower Dunton Rd, Langdon Hills (both number 4 & 5 on report) (LBAS 172035) Cllr Henry raised a selection of issues close to this location. WP asked that Cllr Henry send him a scheme request so that he can carry out a validation which he could cross reference with this existing Potential Scheme.</p> <p>Kathleen Farrier Crescent, Laindon (LBAS182022) WP gave a brief background on this scheme request which related to parking on verges. He reminded/advised Members that the Panel had previously made the decision not to take action on these type of scheme requests as they did not endorse the removal of grass verges and had felt that actioning one scheme of this type would open the floodgates to similar requests throughout the Borough. Cllr Buckley gave numerous examples of requests he had received, and reiterated his reluctance to set a precedent which the Panel did not have the resources to replicate throughout the Borough. Cllr Davies said that he understood this point of view, but felt that action needed</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>Cllr Henry</p>

	<p>to be taken and the problem should not be ignored. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the options available to the Panel. SC informed Members of the stance that other Panel's had adopted on this matter. Particularly Braintree who had spent a great deal of their budget grasscreeting over verges.</p> <p>The Panel asked WP to obtain examples of schemes undertaken within other Boroughs/Districts and provide details surrounding costs/scope of works etc. The Panel would then make an informed decision on the options available.</p> <p>Tyler Avenue Bus Stop, Laindon Link (LBAS185005) Cllr Henry queried the background of this request. WP to email details.</p> <p>WP presented pages 24 and 25, showing information regarding surveys and VAS maintenance. The following points were raised:</p> <p>Queens Park Avenue Junction with Rosebay Avenue Cllr Moore advised that this should be Lampen Crescent, not Rosebay Avenue.</p> <p>Hornbeam Way, Wickford Cllr Buckley suggested this should be listed as Steeple View, not Wickford.</p> <p>High Road, Laindon on bridge between junctions with Florence way and Little Oxcroft – Cllr Smith was unsure that the location was correct. WP to clarify.</p>	<p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p> <p>WP</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Appendix</p> <p>❖ Highway Rangers</p> <p>WP provided the Highways Ranger report, detailing what had been requested and completed over the last quarter (Pages 27-30).</p> <p>❖ Section 106 Schemes</p> <p>SC gave an overview of the S106 contributions and schemes in the Borough. Members asked questions as follows:</p> <p>Cllr Buckley asked why the contribution relating to Willow Court had not yet been used when works were completed so long ago. SC advised that this may be with major schemes.</p> <p>Cllr Moore and other Members identified a number of sites where the deadline was approaching for funds to be used. SC advised that as long as works were started, those funds would be secure.</p>	

8.	AOB Cllr Hillier asked why the footbridge at the Laindon Centre had just been refurbished when it was due for demolition in a year. SC suggested this may have been a safety concern. This view was supported by Cllr Henry.	
9.	Date of next meeting: Next meeting dates were confirmed as the last Monday in June, September and January (25 th June, 24 th Sep, 28 th Jan) with times and rooms TBC.	