

MINUTES

of the

CHELMSFORD LOCAL HIGHWAYS PANEL

2 June 2014

Present:

County Councillor John Aldridge	Essex County Council
County Councillor Jennifer Chandler	Essex County Council
Councillor Jude Deakin	Chelmsford City Council
Councillor Ian Grundy	Chelmsford City Council
Councillor Ray Howard	Essex County Council
Councillor Paul Hutchinson (substitute)	Chelmsford City Council
County Councillor Eddie Johnson	Essex County Council
County Councillor Mike Mackrory	Essex County Council
County Councillor Dick Madden	Essex County Council
Councillor Roy Whitehead (Chairman)	Chelmsford City Council

In attendance:

Brian Mayfield	Chelmsford City Council
Averil Price	Chelmsford City Council
Mark Robinson	Essex County Council
Michael Rowe	Essex County Council
Jon Simmons	Essex County Council
Derek Stebbing	Chelmsford City Council
Rosa Tanfield	Chelmsford City Council
Joy Thomas	Chelmsford City Council
Peter Wright	Essex County Council

1. **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jean Murray, who had appointed Councillor Paul Hutchinson as her substitute.

The Panel was informed that County Councillor Jennifer Chandler was now one of the County Council's appointed representatives. County Councillor Ray Howard had also been appointed to observe meetings of the Panel on behalf of the County Council Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation in place of Councillor Eddie Johnson.

2. **Minutes of the Chelmsford Local Highways Panel Meeting on 24 April 2014**

Joy Thomas said that the reference to a sum of £3,400 in minute number 4b, CLHP 44, was incorrect; £12,150 would be available from Section 106 funding for the improvement of the bus stop. Subject to that change, the minutes of the Chelmsford Local Highways Panel meeting held on 24 April 2014 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. **Matters Arising**

Councillor Whitehead referred to a conversation he had with Joy Thomas prior to the meeting concerning S106 payments and the use of S106 monies towards schemes identified by Joy Thomas, and it was agreed that in future the Panel minutes would refer to the use of S106 income in connection with such schemes as appropriate.

Chignal Road Scheme

With reference to Scheme LCHE002021 mentioned on page CLHP42 (minute number 3), Joy Thomas stated that there was funding available from a Unilateral Undertaking which could be used to meet the cost of the schemes and would be passed to the County Council for that purpose.

Odeon Roundabout

Jon Simmons informed the Panel that the dedicated left turn from the roundabout had not been progressed as quickly as had been hoped as there were other schemes with greater priority. However, it should be carried out during 2014/15.

The Panel asked that every effort be made to complete the scheme by Christmas 2014.

Swan Lane

Following discussions between officers of the County and City Councils, a flood alleviation assessment had been carried out to identify remedial work. Whilst much of the required work had already been carried out, County Council officers had identified that further works to clear ditches are the responsibility of private owners and, once their identity had been confirmed, they would be contacted. As far as the Flood Alleviation Scheme is concerned, officers are not aware that further work will be needed to ditches either side of Swan Lane.

Financial Top-up

It was understood that this had been approved, although no formal documentation or variation to the terms of reference had been received by the Panel.

VAS Schemes

ECC confirmed that they would be presenting potential the potential VAS schemes agreed at the last meeting (Scheme 54, LCHE002004 Lawn Lane, Chelmsford and Scheme 66 LCHE002021 Chignal Road, Chelmsford) to the County Cabinet Member for ratification before the next meeting of the Panel.

Ford End and Hylands School

The schemes for traffic management improvements at Ford End and for pedestrian safety improvements at Chelmsford Road, Writtle had now both been agreed by the Cabinet Member.

Arbour Lane Footway

Speed surveys had shown that traffic on both sides of the railway bridge generally observed the speed limit. Highway Rangers would be tasked with cutting back vegetation to open up the full width of the footway.

County Councillor Mackrory said that speeding was not the issue here, but rather the inadequate width of the footway and the potential for pedestrians to be struck by passing traffic. He hoped that the footway could be widened and the possibility explored of creating a build out, which would entail giving priority to traffic travelling in one direction. Jon Simmons said that this would be considered.

Action: Jon Simmons to revise the scheme validation as described and report to the next meeting on its feasibility.

Scheme LCHE141002 Galleywood Road/Dorset Avenue/Vicarage Lane

County Councillor Chandler pointed out that resurfacing work was being carried out at this junction at present and she asked whether that was as part of this scheme.

Action: Jon Simmons to check and respond to Councillor Chandler.

4. **Colchester Road Widening Scheme**

Mark Robinson reported that £15,000 had been allocated for design work on this scheme, with £5,000 having been spent on preliminary design. In addition it would be necessary to establish the works on utilities in the road and a further £30,000 would be needed for that. With associated crossing works it was estimated that the overall cost of the widening scheme was £1.8 million.

Derek Stebbing reported that the developers of the Channels site, Ptarmigan Land, had sought to discharge themselves from the limitation on the number of houses they were allowed to build before the associated Radial Distributor Road, to be provided by Countryside Zest, had been constructed. That request was being assessed by the County and City Councils, but Ptarmigan Land had also offered £2 million as a planning contribution (with phased expenditure of £500,000 by 1 June 2015 and the remainder by 1 June 2016) to fund the widening of Colchester Road. The works would be carried out by 1 June 2016 and would be in addition to, and not replace, the scheme for the distributor road. It was suggested that the Panel may wish to expedite the design work for the widening scheme to enable it to proceed as quickly as possible if it was decided to accede to Ptarmigan Land's request for a discharge of their obligations.

County Councillor Mackrory said that the priority was to prevent more traffic being forced to use White Hart Lane and the Panel agreed with his view that this would best be achieved by the early construction of the distributor road.

Joy Thomas informed the Panel that there was money from Section 106 agreements available, which had recently been increased by the Aldi Distribution Centre store contribution and which could be used to meet the cost of the design work for widening Colchester Road.

The Panel was of the view that nothing should be done that would adversely affect measures to relieve the traffic situation in White Hart Lane. It was **AGREED** that the design scheme for the widening of Colchester Road should be reviewed in the light of the decision on the release of Ptarmigan Land from their planning restriction. That £40,000 will be put forward to support the design work which the Panel view as a priority. If external funding does not become available, the scheme will have to be brought to the Panel for consideration of further funding.

5. **Approved Works Programme**

The Panel considered a report detailing the Approved Works Programme under the following headings:

- 2012/13 budget recommendations
- 2012/13 completed schemes
- 2013/14 budget recommendations
- 2013/14 completed schemes
- 2014/15 budget recommendations
- Revenue schemes

Jon Simmons said that of the 12 schemes listed on page 2 of the report (2012/13 budget recommendations) five had been completed and the rest would be during 2014/15.

With regard to specific schemes:

2012/13 budget recommendations

- (a) In the case of scheme 11 (New London Road subway cycling signage and street furniture improvements) the design had been completed but safety concerns were still being addressed.
- (b) With reference to the scheme for the Market Road bus interchange, the Passenger Transport division had requested an additional £4,500 to meet the cost of resurfacing the footway following the installation of new bus shelters. This was **AGREED** by the Panel.

2013/14 budget recommendations

- (c) Scheme 48 Margaretting Road/Writtle Road – the type of gateway feature to be installed would be appropriate to its location.

Schemes 24-28 – Averil Price pointed out that these all related to design work for casualty reduction schemes. The Cabinet Member Action (CMA) had been agreed in September 2013 and yet the work would not be completed until January 2015, as shown in the report. She expressed concern at the length it took to get schemes 'on the ground' once it had been agreed by the Panel. Peter Wright responded that the 1 January date was an indicative end date and once the design work had commenced and the scope of the works was determined, more definitive dates could be produced.

2013/14 budget completed schemes

- (d) Scheme 121 (Rainsford Road/Primrose Hill) – Councillor Deakin asked whether the scheme was different to the pedestrian refuse scheme. **Action:** Jon Simmons to check and respond back to Councillor Deakin directly..

The Panel was of the view that with the new primary school in Maltese Road due to open in September 2015 it would be appropriate to expedite the work to ensure that it was completed by then.

The Panel expressed its concern that a number of the schemes included in the lists were up to 2 years old, which had received Panel and Cabinet Member

approval and yet had not been progressed.

2013/14 budget recommendations

- (e) Scheme 35 (Margaretting Road, Galleywood) - Derek Stebbing said that there were two footway schemes for this area which the City Council now proposed to combine and lead on, using the funding from the Panel for its design. It was **AGREED** that the Panel contribution of £124,000 would be available for this combined scheme.

2014/15 budget recommendations

- (f) Averil Price expressed concern that the 6 schemes which had been reported at the April meeting as not being carried forward with revenue funding and which would now be funded through the capital budget, were showing on the incorrect schedule (refer to CLHP42). The 6 schemes were agreed during the financial year of 2013/14 and had been approved by the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation in November 2013 and February 2014 respectively. They therefore should be showing on the 2013/14 budget recommendation schedule and be expedited as quickly as possible, not 2014/15 as was currently being reported.

Action: Jon Simmons to update the schedules and ensure the engineers are aware of the Panel's view.

In response to a suggestion by Councillor Mackrory Jon Simmons agreed that no cancelled schemes would be shown as completed in future schedules.

It was confirmed that eight schemes had been completed since the last meeting.

AGREED that the works programme be approved.

6a **Potential Scheme Proposals**

The Panel received a report which set out the schemes in the Potential Schemes List. Each scheme, other than those yet to be validated, had been prioritised against set criteria and given a Red, Amber or Green status showing its priority.

With regard to specific schemes:

- (a) LCHE132072 North Avenue/Kings Road junction – the Panel felt that the junction should be narrowed by the time the public house was demolished and the replacement housing development was begun.
- (b) LCHE132084 Highwood Road, Edney Common to Loves Green – the Panel asked that it be provided with an estimate of the cost of constructing the proposed footway and **Agreed** that a decision on this should be made at the next meeting subject to further information being provided by Officers.
- (c) LCHE132092 Chelmer Village Retail Park – the Panel requested that County Council officers, look at ways to encourage the owners of the retail park to improve the traffic arrangements within the park. It was also **Agreed** that this would be raised outside of the LHP by the Chair at the next 5-a-side meeting with ECC to jointly discuss and find a workable solution.

- (d) LCHE142020 Chelmer Village Way, near Brook End Road North junction – the Panel asked that a feasibility study be carried out for a scheme to provide a central island and dropped kerb.
- (e) LCHE132077 New Bowers Way/White Hart Lane – the scheme for improved signage to the Library/Parish Centre was approved.
- (f) LCHE132078 Buttsbury Bridge, Stock Lane – it was requested that Officers provide at the next meeting information on what validation has already been carried out and the amount of maintenance funding that have already been provided after each 'strike' of the structure.
- (g) LCHE132094 Lawford Lane, Writtle – the Panel did not regard this as a scheme which merited funding and asked that it be deleted from the list.

Jon Simmons drew the Panel's attention to a new scheme for Molrams Lane/Maldon Road involving the provision of a pedestrian refuge island, signing and lining for a right-turn lane, and lighting, bollard and beacon improvements. The request for funding was to enable a stage 3 safety audit to be completed. No Section 278 money remained to fund the cost of designing this scheme. The cost would be £10,000. The Panel was asked whether it wished to include it in the list of potential schemes. The Panel agreed to do so, subject to the agreement of the local ward councillors.

County Councillor Johnson reminded the Panel that schemes needed to be agreed by July to enable funding to be allocated in the current financial year. Any unallocated funds would be re-directed for other highways purposes.

AGREED that, with the comments detailed above and with the deletion of the Lawford Lane scheme, the following schemes should be approved:

No.	Design reference	Task name	Parish	Works description	Allocated budget
1	LCHE132088	Haselfoot Road j/w Plantation Road, Boreham	Boreham	Dead end road marking	£1,500
3	LCHE132072	North Avenue j/w Kings Road	Chelmsford	Junction improvement	£910
4	LCHE132081	North Avenue j/w Melbourne Avenue	Chelmsford	Dropped kerbs	£2,500
5	LCHE132087	Keane Memorial Homes, Broomfield Road	Chelmsford	Keep Clear road markings at entrance to memorial homes	£1,500
6	LCHE142004	O/s 140-147 Forest Drive	Chelmsford	Parking lay-by	£25,000
7	LCHE132091	O/s Farthing Court, Broomfield Road	Chelmsford	Works to prevent parking on footway	£3,000
8	LCHE142066	Chignal Road j/w St James	Chelmsford	Traffic queuing on Chignal Road	£1,000

		Park		blocking access	
9	LCHE132093	North End	Great Waltham	Deer warning signs	£3,100
10	LCHE132080	Fambridge End Road	Good Easter	Flood warning improvements	£2,500
15	LCHE132090	Bridge at Battlesbridge, Hawk Hill	Rettendon	Additional signage at bridge	£1,750
16	LCHE142019	A1245 RAB j/w Main Road	Rettendon	Slip road from RAB to Main Road	£3,000
21	LCHE142020	Chelmer Village Way nr j/w Brook End Road North	Springfield	Pedestrian crossing facilities	£3,000 (for a feasibility study)
		Baddow Road jw Molram Road	Sandon	Stage 3 safety audit for pedestrian refuge	£10,000 (subject to ward member approval)
Total					£58,760

6b **The Square, Stock – Scheme LCHE001018**

A detailed feasibility study and design was presented for the enhancement of The Square, Stock.

Whilst acknowledging the thorough work that had been carried out on the feasibility study, Councillor Grundy said that Stock Parish Council, which had originally called for a scheme to protect the junctions around The Square, had not seen the detailed report now presented to the Panel and residents had not been consulted on the options being presented.

The Panel was of the view that whichever option was chosen the scheme would represent a significant part of its budget and it questioned whether it was a priority.

AGREED that the scheme for The Square, Stock, be moved to the deferred schemes list and that the County Council look at the issue of parking in the area and the general management of traffic around The Square, including investigation of a potential one way system.

6c **Avon Road Verge Protection**

A detailed feasibility study and design was presented for the protection of verges in Avon Road, Chelmsford and the construction of parking laybys. It was proposed to carry out a scheme in three phases, with the cost for each being

Phase 1 £112,923
Phase 2 £81,000
Phase 3 £35,000

The Panel discussed whether this scheme should be carried out when other roads in Chelmsford suffered similar problems with lack of adequate parking and vehicles having to park on verges. It also debated the option of only carrying out the first phase of the scheme to assess the impact before deciding whether to proceed with the

subsequent phases. It concluded, however, that carrying out the whole scheme would show its commitment to improving parking and tackling traffic problems around Chelmsford and that the scheme itself could act as a blueprint for other areas with the type of problems faced by the residents of Avon Road.

AGREED that the scheme for the verge protection in Avon Road be approved, with the modification that concrete rather than timber bollards should be used.

7. Highway Improvement Scheme Proposals

The Panel received a report on 19 highway improvement schemes, two cycling schemes and two public rights of way schemes, each of which had been prioritised against set criteria and given a red, green or amber status to indicate priority.

The following comments were made on particular schemes:

- (a) LCHE001022 Dyers Hall, Mashbury Road – Joy Thomas confirmed that a S106 contribution of £9,637 is available for this scheme
- (b) LCHE132027 Sandford Mill Road – despite a survey showing compliance with the current 60mph speed limit the Panel felt that a 30mph limit was more appropriate to the road and asked that the possibility of introducing one be looked at.
- (c) LCHE132067 Church Road/Middlemead – the cost of £7,000 would be met from Section 106 funding.
- (d) LCHE144007 Chelmsford City Centre – the Panel reiterated its view that no scheme which involved cycling in the High Street should be considered.

The Panel asked that potential highway improvement schemes be looked at the next meeting, particularly the feasibility studies that were likely to come forward as potential schemes. **Action:** Jon Simmons

AGREED that, taking into account the comments above, the schemes detailed in the report for item 7 be approved.

No.	Design reference	Task name	Parish	Works description	Allocated budget
8	LCHE001018	Avon Road	Chelmsford	Parking improvements	£228,923
11	LCHE001022	Dyers Hall to Cricket Ground, Mashbury Road	Chignal	Traffic management improvements	£27,900
14	LCHE132027	Sandford Mill Road	Springfield	Reduction in speed from 60mph to 30mph	£TBC
19	LCHE132067	Church Road/Middlemead	West Hanningfield	Traffic management improvements	£7,000, of which all could be funded from S106 monies

1	LCHE14006	Bridleway 12	Highwoods	Surface improvements	£6,000
2	LCHE148007	Bridleway 13	Highwood	Surface improvements	£14,000
Total					£283,823

8. **Highways Rangers Summary**

Jon Simmons circulated an updated summary of the Chelmsford City Highways Rangers work programme.

AGREED that the report be noted.

9. **Any Other Business**

Councillor Mackrory referred to the work apparently being carried out by the County Council on a “ring and loop” system for junction improvements in the City Centre to enable the introduction of a one-way system. He asked whether the scheme could come to the Panel for consideration.

Councillor Whitehead said that the County Council had originally put forward the “ring and loop” system proposals which the City Council had opposed because they excluded the railway station. A new scheme had been designed and modelling was now taking place on options for improvements to traffic management in the City Centre. It was expected that the County Council would consult interested parties on the scheme when it was in a position to do so.

10. **Next Meeting**

AGREED that a meeting be arranged for 24 June 2014 at 2p.m. to agree potential funding for schemes likely to proceed.

The meeting closed at 3:48 p.m.

Chairman