

DRAFT MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF QUIDHAMPTON PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON 12th FEBRUARY 2020 IN THE VILLAGE HALL.

Present; Cllrs Bass, Cripps, Hoare, Rowley, Smith, Taylor, West and Whelan.
In attendance; Mrs C Churchill (Clerk). Wiltshire Cllr Pauline Church. 22 members of the public.
Apologies; Cllrs Fox-Rennie.

Cllr Rowley welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained how the recommendations had been drawn up as well as the legal status of the marked footway, the cars that park on the white line create an informal pinch point which helps to slow the traffic down.

Cllr Cripps explained that the Lower Rd Working Group consisted of himself, Cllrs Smith and Taylor. Traffic has been an issue for some time and despite the introduction of some measures, 20mph, CSW and the so far unsuccessful SID, the issue remains a problem. Local knowledge was used in conjunction of advice from WC.

Cllr Rowley invited members of the public to make statements and ask questions, reminding them that this is the opportunity for them to speak.

Questions or statements from the public. Public comments are in italics.

Who says speed bumps are not popular?

About 50% of the responses to the questionnaire. There can be an issue with noise, vibration and pollution and not recommended by the Highways Officer.

Thank you to Quidhampton PC for all the work that has been put into this. However do have an issue with the recommendation outside the White Horse, the report states no properties affected which is incorrect as Withy House is on the road.

Need to consider turning into properties inc deliveries to the pub, footway and buses.

It may also affect the residents of Withy House if there is an increase in noise and vibration.

Agree with previous comments.

Speed table could be an issue with ambulances carrying spinal patients.

Supports the coloured footway.

Bollards are in the wrong place.

Have additional bollards been considered to stop cars parking on the footway?

Live off Lower Rd but have difficulty exiting drive due to speeding traffic.

Every village in France has speed tables at the village entrance.

Can some of the £15million from Harnham be diverted to Quidhampton?

Cllr Rowley stated that Quidhampton PC has objected to the proposed planning at Harnham.

The Clerk attended the spatial planning meeting and asked that should the application be approved some of the S106 money is used in Quidhampton on traffic calming.

Thank you to all the CSW volunteers.

There is little in the way of quantitative analysis to support the report.

The results of the village consultation were in the initial report.

What will be the position of the eastern end speed bump?

Moving the eastern end bollards will impact properties on the southern side exiting their drives.

Currently share a SID with 4 other parishes, it is hoped that in time Quidhampton PC may be able to purchase one.

Bumps and tables – central Govt state that councils should restrict use because of increased emissions particularly diesel cars. The Govt agrees that they improve safety.

Do residents have the same objections to pinch points as they do to speed bumps / tables?

Need to change culture so people slow down rather than speed up / slow down.

Proven fact that speed bumps do not reduce traffic volume.

Thank you for all your efforts.

The bollards were not in the original consultation. They are currently an acceptable problem but if they are moved further out it would be a big problem.

Against the removal of bollards, the bollards do offer some protection to pedestrians.

R9 is not in the final recommendation

No additional signage is required.

If bollards at eastern end pinch point are moved it will create an impasse

Nice to see so many people attending.

Thank you to Quidhampton PC who have done a good job.

Suggest a sign is displayed asking hall users to park opposite the village hall as this will help protect users of the hall.

Why is the SID not being used?

The parish only has it for a short period of time as it is shared with 4 other parishes, in addition there has been an issue with it working at speeds other than 30. It has been returned to the manufacturer 3 times. Quidhampton PC has taken the decision to purchase a SID. However it is proven that it is less effective in a rat run.

Ideal situation – can it be access only, it has been done at Harnham.

The Clerk was involved with the Harnham scheme and did raise it with Highways, it is not a possibility on a through road (the Harnham schemes involved cul de sacs). Access only on Lower Rd would not be very difficult to enforce.

There being no further questions, Cllr Rowley opened the meeting at 7.54pm

0576. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Fox-Rennie.

Local Government Act 1972 s85(1)

0577. Interests.

- (i) Cllrs to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests related to any matters to be considered in this agenda that do not appear in the Cllr's register of interests.

None declared

- (ii) In accordance with the Dispensation Procedure, any requests for a grant of dispensation must be submitted prior to this meeting.

None received.

Cllrs were reminded that it is their responsibility to ensure their register of interests on the WC website is kept up to date.

Localism Act 2011. 2011. S 33.

0578. Traffic issues on Lower Rd.

To support the recommendations proposed by the Lower Rd WG as detailed in the report. All costs are indicative only and are based on WC response to each of the fifteen recommendation in the long list prepared by the LRWG.

The items marked as highest priority form a package of works costing in the region of £10K-15K. It is the view of the LRWG that this would achieve significant positive impact with minimal costs.

The items marked as second highest priority form a more significant package of works (costing in the region of £50K) but have the potential to achieve far more significant benefits.

The items marked as third highest priority would enhance the overall package (costing in the region of £35K) but are also most complex in terms of engineering with commensurate costs.

The overall cost of the scheme in its entirety would be in the region of £100K.

Item	Priority	Summary	Indicative Cost (£)	Comments
R1a	1	Coloured footway surface (typically green or red).	9,000	Defining the footway clearly as a space for pedestrians is a priority. This will also have the effect of moving parked cars into the carriageway, resulting in an additional traffic calming measure. There is no negative impact on parking provision or increase in noise through hard design features.
R1b	1	Footway roundels	1,125	See R1a. Roundels would further clarify the nature of the footway as a space for pedestrians.
R2	(1)	Clear footway of obstructions	5,000	Feasibility of this is noted by WC. It is however apparent that the current position of these bollards is a serious obstacle for pedestrians, especially those using buggies or wheelchairs.
R4	2	Speed hump at eastern entrance to village from Skew Road	15,000	This is a critical point for a measure, reducing speed on entry to the village and through the first straight section. Only a speed hump right across the carriageway is practical here; other options would not be appropriate. The position is far enough from properties to not cause a noise nuisance and off the National Cycle Network so ought not to adversely affect cycle traffic.
R11	2	Chicane near Locks Lane	20,000	It is agreed that this is the best location to install a measure and that a chicane is preferable to any form of raised feature. It is noted that detailed design work would be required to account for drainage, access to properties and the needs of buses.
R12	2	Speed table at White Horse	15,000	It is noted that there may be objections to raised features but this location would be ideal for some measure, especially as this is where the footway crosses from the north to the south side of Lower Road. A large table encompassing the crossing and extending outside the pub would not be as noisy as eg a single bump or pillows. Only the pub is immediately adjacent to this feature with other properties set back from the road. It is noted the improvement to this area would benefit the pub.
R15	3	Speed tables at intersection of Lower Road and Nadder Lane	35,000	This is the most contentious element as a) it comprises a raised feature and b) costs are relatively high due to engineering complexity. But, a measure at this end of the village is required and other options are not feasible. Existing signage has little effect. During the course of this work, there have been two accidents at this location involving damage to property due to excessive speed ¹ . This option would not only improve pedestrian safety for houses to the south of lower road, it would improve safe access to Nadder Lane, Edgam Place and Coronation Square. It is noted that detailed design work would be required to account for drainage.

Councillors were requested to read the full report which had been circulated.

Cllr Taylor felt that some very good points had been made.

LRWG looked at SID – this is a done deal.

The whole proposal is a substantive bid, similar the scheme at Zeals which was designed by WC.
Is there a proper study on the impact of noise and pollution on different styles of speed tables.

(i) To resolve to support R1a

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R1a.

(ii) To resolve to support R1b

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R1b.

(iii) To resolve to support R2

This requires further investigation as the issue with vehicles turning into properties was not considered.

Recommended that each bollard is looked at rather than as a whole.

Cllr Cripps suggested the consideration of Bell Bollards (as used in Bath).

Are bollards needed?

Positioning of bollards to be looked at.

Legal status of where they can be positioned, Highways have previously mentioned they can not be moved to the edge of the footway due to the width of the carriageway.

Can a different style of bollard be placed closer to the road?

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R2 subject to detailed design work included a review of the positioning, not necessarily removal of the bollards but ensure they are appropriately positioned for pedestrians but mindful of traffic and residents accessing driveways.

(iv) To resolve to support R4

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R4.

(v) To resolve to support R11

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R11.

(vi) To resolve to support R12

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R12 subject to detailed design work to mitigate potential environmental impact on residents.

Cllr Cripps will remove the sentence about the pub.

Cllr Cripps

(vii) To resolve to support R15

Quidhampton PC resolved to support option R15 subject to detailed design work to mitigate potential environmental impact on residents.

Clerk will inform WC CATG of the resolutions.

Clerk

Cllrs Smith and Taylor will attend CATG and represent Quidhampton PC.

Cllrs Smith / Taylor

Priority for work if not agreed as a whole;

R1a and R1b

R2

R4, R11, R12 and R15

0579. To note agenda items for the next meeting to be held on Tuesday 24th March 2020. Please note all agenda items should be sent to the Clerk before 9am on 12th March 2020.

Cllr Rowley closed the meeting at 8.48pm