

**UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL  
MINUTES – 15 JANUARY 2018 18:00  
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD  
SAFFRON WALDEN**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Chairman:</b>      | Councillor S Walsh  |
| <b>Panel Members:</b> | Councillors S Barker, R Gooding and J Moran (Essex County Council).<br>Councillors H Asker, J Freeman, A Mills and G Sell (Uttlesford District Council).  |
| <b>Also Present:</b>  | Councillor J Davey (Uttlesford Association of Local Councils)<br><br>J Farr and B Martin (Stebbing Parish Council), S Goddard and D Nash (Little Walden), P McCullough and Councillor J Redfern (Great Chesterford), I Grant and J Grant (Wendens Ambo Parish Council). |
| <b>Officers:</b>      | S Church (Highway Liaison Manager), B Ferguson (Democratic Services Officer) and R Long (Highways Liaison Officer).   |

| Item      |  | Owner |
|-----------|--|-------|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>Welcome and Introductions:</b><br><br>Councillor Walsh welcomed everyone to the meeting.  |       |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Apologies and Declarations of Interest</b><br><br>No apologies were received.   |       |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting held on 18 September 2017:</b><br><br>The minutes of the UDC Highways Panel meeting held on the 18 September 2017 were approved as a correct record.   |       |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Matters Arising from the Minutes of 18 September:</b><br><br><u>Audley End Road, Audley End, Saffron Walden</u><br><br>Councillor Asker asked whether any progress had been made in response to the presentation given by Audley End Miniature Railway at the previous meeting. The Highways Liaison Officer said the scheme had progressed to the validation stage and a speed survey was being carried out to ascertain |       |



|                  |   |  |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>if the scheme was viable.</p> <p><u>Sampford Road, Thaxted - new footway design</u></p> <p>Councillor Barker said she was concerned that the Panel had not been made aware of a development in the vicinity of the footway, nor had the Planning Department been made aware of this Highways scheme. She said the developer should be responsible for joining up the footway with the new development, and in such cases a Section 106 agreement could have been conditioned within the planning application, if Highways and the Planning department had communicated effectively.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>5.</b></p> | <p><b>Public Question Time</b></p> <p><u>Stebbing</u></p> <p>Mr Martin asked how the parish's application for speed signs was progressing. He also asked what was happening with regards to the area wide survey.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said repairing the current signage would be ineffective and Highways were looking into installing a permanent Vehicle Activated sign (VAS) outside of the school. She added that speed surveys were being carried out to validate the scheme.</p> <p>Mr Martin said he was concerned that the survey on the B1057 would achieve the same results as they had in the past, as the speed loops had been put in a location where speeding was not a problem.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer asked Mr Martin to send her details on an alternative location and she would look at relocating the speed survey.</p> <p>With regards to the area wide survey, she said this was under review and may not occur this year.</p> <p><u>Little Walden</u></p> <p>Mr Goddard asked the Panel to consider reducing the speed limit on the approach to and through Little Walden. He said the village had been campaigning for a reduction since the 1990s and accidents were still occurring, particularly on the 'Stonebridge' approaching the village. Extending a 40mph speed limit to the Stonebridge would reduce accidents and a reduction to 30mph through the village would improve life for the residents, who had to walk to the church and pub without a footway.</p> <p>Mr Nash said the road leading to Chesterford Research Park went through the village and made the corner by the pub particularly dangerous in the morning. He said residents using the church had a dangerous walk as they could not use the correct side of the road, due to the sharpness of the bend.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said tests had been carried out on the surface on the approach to Stone bridge to ascertain why there had been a</p> |  |



|                  |   |  |
|------------------|---|--|
|                  | <p>number of accidents there. She said the test had revealed it was not related to the skid resistance of the road surface.</p> <p><u>Great Chesterford</u></p> <p>Ms McCullough said speed tests had been carried out for one hour on the B1383 running through Great Chesterford and 41 out of 100 drivers were caught breaking the speed limit. The road was a danger to pedestrians who needed to cross and that the paths were also too narrow; a 13 year old boy had been hit on this stretch of road by a van which had mounted the pavement. She asked the Panel to review the situation as the current speed limit was being ignored.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said she would get the process started although it was unlikely to be included in this year's schedule of schemes.</p> <p>Councillor Redfern said the village needed assistance in enforcing the current speed limit on the B1383, to ensure drivers and pedestrians were safe when using this stretch of road.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>6.</b></p> | <p><b>Approved Works Programme</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer updated members on the approved Works Programme and highlighted the following schemes:</p> <p><b>15. The Endway, Great Easton - Installation of new footway</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer told Members that the design for the scheme was uncompleted and if the total value was to exceed the original estimate of £130,000 they would be asked to reaffirm their commitment to the scheme. In the interim the £50,000 allocated to commence works on this footway were agreed to be diverted to the installation of the 5 pram crossing sites in Saffron Walden town centre.</p> <p><b>28. Town Street, Thaxted - road layout design (Rolling Programme 2018-19)</b></p> <p>Members were told that the design team had evaluated the situation and no valid scheme was applicable. Members agreed to cancel the scheme and the £3,000 would be diverted to other schemes.</p> <p><b>29. Bridleway 36 Clavering (Rolling Programme 2018-19)</b></p> <p>Members were told that the cost had been re-evaluated and would cost £30,000, rather than the £25,000 estimated in the report.</p> <p><b>5/6. Duck Street and High Street, Little Easton – Speed limit request</b></p> <p>The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be advertised for Duck Street before the end of January and installation works could begin in the new financial year, if there were no objections. The situation with the High Street was more complicated as issues had been identified with the existing 30mph limit. These issues would be incorporated into the TRO</p> |  |



|          |  |  |
|----------|--|--|
|          | <p>process.</p> <p><b>9. Uttlesford Speed Limit Review sites</b></p> <p>Speed Limit Reviews were being considered in areas where problems had been identified. The Highways Liaison Officer said this would take a lot of work and suggested that it would be rolled forward to the next financial year to allow the extra work to be completed.</p> <p><b>12. Manuden Road/ The Street, Manuden – kerbing and drainage design</b></p> <p>The scheme was in the design stage of the process, although problems had been identified with land ownership that could result in legal proceedings.</p> <p>Councillor Barker said this was another example where a Section 106 agreement could have been imposed on the developer, as it should have been their responsibility to connect the kerbing of the new development with the rest of the community.</p> <p>Members discussed their own experience of similar scenarios and agreed that such schemes should not come to this Panel, but rather be dealt with by planners and developers at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Councillor Mills said a dedicated Section 106 Officer position was being established by the Council and this post would come into effect in the next financial year. He said this would improve the communication between planners and developers.</p> <p><b>21 - 25. Saffron Walden – Implementation of Drop Kerbs</b></p> <p>Members were told that the implementation of a number of dropped kerbs would require more funding than was originally estimated. The Highways Liaison Officer said the funds from the postponed Gt Easton footway scheme could be diverted to cover costs.</p> |  |
| <b>7</b> | <p><b>Potential Schemes List</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer presented her report on potential schemes for 2018/19. The budget for 2018-19 was £236,000 and she asked Members to prioritise the schemes presented before them. The following schemes were discussed and considered:</p> <p><b>33. Great Easton - Footway phase 2</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said the Panel had previously decided that £130,000 was the upper limit for this scheme which meant that the scheme would slip from this year's budget into next.</p> <p>In response to a question from Councillor Barker, Councillor Mills said he would ascertain at what stage the development was at and correspond with planners to determine if a contribution from the developer was possible.</p>   |  |

## **2. Crix Green Felsted – Signage**

Members were told the true cost of the scheme was £6,500, not the £6,000 stated in the report.

Agreed.

## **4. B1053 / B1054 section between Radwinter and Hempstead – deer warning signage**

Members discussed the validity of the scheme in balance with its cost. It was agreed that the threat of colliding with a deer on these roads warranted the implementation of warning signs.

Agreed.

## **5. Chelmsford Road, Barnston – Road widening works**

Members were told that this scheme would be deferred due to the high cost caused by stats diversion.

Councillor Barker said this was one of the busiest roads in Uttlesford and said she expected the planners and developers to communicate when the development for the school commenced.

Deferred.

## **6. B1256 between Sewage works roundabout and Queen Vic roundabout**

Signage for 50mph speed limit had been requested. Councillor Barker said the signs already existed but were covered by vegetation.

The Highways Liaison Officer said this scheme would be subject to the Highways Rangers checking the site.

Deferred.

## **10. Manuden Road, Chevron signs**

The validation process had been completed and the scheme had been confirmed as viable.

Agreed.

## **11. Ashdon – Speeding**

The validation process had been completed and the scheme in its entirety would cost £15,000.

Agreed.

## **12. Little Walden - Speeding**

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Members were told it was unlikely that the scheme could be implemented this year, although the initial design and TRO process could take place. This would cost £7,000.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p><b>13. Elizabeth Way j/w Lavender Fields</b></p> <p>The request for keep clear markings had been validated as an appropriate scheme. The cost had been increased to £1,500.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>14. Cambridge Road, Quendon outside Waterbutt Cottages</b></p> <p>An issue had been identified relating to parking outside of Waterbutt Cottages in Quendon. A feasibility study would be carried out at the cost of £3,000.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>15. Bumpstead Road, Hempstead - 40mph buffer speed limit</b></p> <p>The validation process had identified that a 40mph buffer speed limit could be installed with a possible gateway feature. The cost was revised to £11,000.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>16. Rookery Lane, Wendens Ambo – signage amendments</b></p> <p>Members agreed to implement the amendments to signage on Rookery Lane to deter traffic from using the road to access Wendens Ambo.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>17. Ross Close, Saffron Walden – Pram Crossing</b></p> <p>The scheme was to install a pair of pram crossings outside the Junior School on Ross Close.</p> <p>In response to a question from Councillor Barker, the Highways Liaison Officer said this scheme was less expensive than those in the centre of Saffron Walden as the road would be subject to different traffic management requirements.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>18. The Street, Manuden – Signage for Village Hall</b></p> <p>Members were told that this was an issue for the Village Hall to resolve by ensuring their contact information, and directions on their website, were up to date.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Removed from the Potential Schemes List.</p> <p><b>20. Church Street, Saffron Walden - Bollard outside Lankester Antiques</b></p> <p>The validation process had identified that this scheme was unviable and enforcement would be a more effective measure to prevent delivery vehicles mounting the kerb.</p> <p>Removed from the Potential Schemes List.</p> <p><b>23 – 28. Various Locations – Signage</b></p> <p>Members discussed and considered schemes 23 – 28, all of which related to the implementation of signage.</p> <p>Schemes 25 and 28 were deferred.</p> <p>Schemes 23, 24, 26 and 27 were agreed.</p> <p><b>30. Wenden Road, Arkesden – Measures to protect listed building</b></p> <p>Members discussed the validity of the scheme and there was disagreement regarding who was responsible for protecting the listed building.</p> <p>Councillor Moran said he felt that the money should come from elsewhere but if no other authority would deal with the issue, it would be up to Highways to resolve the problem.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>31. Steventon End – Junction improvements</b></p> <p>The validation process had identified that a give way sign and relevant road markings should be installed to improve safety on the junction.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>32. Chelmsford Road, Barnston – Deer warning signs</b></p> <p>The cost had been revised to £5,000, rather than the £3,000 stated in the report.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said 83% of the budget had now been allocated. She said £40,250 remained of the budget which would be left to consider other schemes for the upcoming financial year.</p> <p>Members were told that no decision had yet been made on match funding, therefore it was possible that additional money would be available following</p> |  |
|--|--|

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
|            | the Council meeting in February, when the budget for the upcoming year would be set.   |  |
| <b>8.</b>  | <p><b>Highway Rangers</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer reminded Members that the Highway Rangers worked on request.</p> <p>The report was noted.</p>  |  |
| <b>9.</b>  | <p><b>Section 106 Schemes (For information)</b></p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer presented her report on the Section 106 Programme 2017-18. The following programmes were highlighted:</p> <p><b>3. Church Road, Stansted - Traffic calming</b></p> <p>Members were told that the speed survey indicated that traffic was compliant with the speed limit and therefore no traffic calming measures were required. The scheme, therefore, had been cancelled.</p> <p><b>10. Cambridge Road, Stansted - Zebra crossing (2018-19)</b></p> <p>Councillor Sell said there had been disruption on the roads in Stansted and requested that the organisers of this scheme coordinated with others in Stansted to ensure the roads were not reduced to gridlock.</p> <p>The Highways Liaison Officer said coordination did occur but she would keep Councillor Sell informed of the scheme's progress.</p> <p>The report was noted.</p> |  |
| <b>10.</b> | <p><b>Any other business</b></p> <p>No other business was raised.</p>  |  |
| <b>8.</b>  | <p><b>Date of next meeting:</b></p> <p>The date of the next meeting is 26<sup>th</sup> March 2018, 18:00.</p>  |  |

**The meeting closed at 19:55**