

SOUTH HAMS HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC ORDERS COMMITTEE

24 March 2017

Present:-

Devon County Council:-

Councillors R Croad (Chairman), J Brazil, R Gilbert, J Hawkins (Vice-Chair), R Hosking, R Rowe and R Vint.

Councillor Trevor Pennington, South Hams District Council
Councillor Peter Smerdon, South Hams District Council

Apologies:-

Councillors J Hart

* 85

Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2016 be signed as a correct record.

* 86

Items Requiring Urgent Attention

Littlehempston Cycle Path

(An item taken under Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972).

The Chairman, having exercised his discretion and in the spirit of the County Council's Public Participation rules and with the consent of the Committee, invited Mr Oldridge (representative of South Devon Cycle Link) to speak on this issue.

The Chairman had decided that the Committee should consider this item as a matter of urgency, in order that it could consider the proposals of the working group, following the resolution at the last meeting of the HATOC 'that Councillors Vint, Rowe and Pennington work with relevant officers on the Littlehempston cyclepath proposals, to identify a way forward for the delivery of this scheme'.

A report had been prepared, on behalf of Councillors Vint, Rowe and Pennington, with a proposal that the Committee lend its support to a preferred route (option 3), from the five potential routes as previously laid out in the Council's Feasibility Study of February 2012, notwithstanding the Council had not yet formally declared any of the routes as a Preferred Route.

The aims of the scheme were to create a direct, off-main-road cycle route that linked the 12 villages and towns to the northwest and north east of Totnes (including Ashburton, East Ogwell, Woodland, Denbury, Ipplepen, Torbryan, Broadhempston, Landscope, Staverton, Littlehempston, Totnes, and Newton Abbot).

Members noted that Planning Consent, Funding, and Landowner Agreement were three independent aspects of the project.

Members also received a copy of a letter from Sarah Woolaston MP showing support for the preferred route of the group (route 3) and they additionally suggested a possible solution that might address the concerns of South Devon Railway with regard to the safety and security of the railway.

Officers highlighted the Council had recently agreed a Strategy for cycling and multi-use trails and the County Council's priorities were to complete both the Wray Valley and Teign Valley trails, rather than investing in the NCN2 route. However, there was nothing to prevent community groups from progressing local off road cycling schemes and the Council would assist where it could. However, negotiations with landowners for this scheme could not be the responsibility of the County Council.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Vint, **SECONDED** by Councillor Gilbert, and

RESOLVED that the principle of South Devon Cycle Link progressing a cycle and pedestrian route from Littlehempston to Totnes (option 3 as outlined the report), be fully supported by the Committee.

Rainbow Crossing – Totnes

(An item taken under Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972).

(The Chairman, having exercised his discretion and in the spirit of the County Council's Public Participation rules and with the consent of the Committee, invited Mr M Price (representative of Proud2Be) to speak on this issue).

The Chairman had decided that the Committee should consider this item as a matter of urgency, in order that it could consider the proposals of the community group. A report had been prepared for the HATOC, which had been made available to Members at the meeting, which outlined the proposal for a local community group, Proud2Be, to fund the provision or enhancement of one or more permanent crossing points in the town.

The proposal would provide additional crossing points / or enhanced visibility of existing crossing points and from a community perspective provide a highly visible rainbow crossing highlighting the town's reputation as a welcoming place for all races, genders and sexualities. Totnes Town Council and Totnes Traffic & Transport Forum were in support of the concept.

At this stage, the proposers were seeking general support from the HATOC for the principle for crossings or crossing enhancements at three locations (Coronation Road, High Street in front of Market Square and on either side of The Wills Memorial on The Plains (and for a more detailed proposal for enhancements to the Courtesy Crossing at the Wills Memorial).

Members asked questions on what road features were already in these locations, such as lights, crossings, dropped kerbs etc.

Officers then reported their concerns relating to the legality and safety of such a proposal, especially as the proposed stripes would resemble a zebra crossing, albeit in different colours. It was suggested, as an alternative, that the stripes could run in the opposite direction, thereby not resembling a zebra crossing.

Officers also were concerned about the Coronation Road proposal and would not be able to lend support to that particular location.

The Committee noted there would be further work required, for example checks with the District Council regarding conservation issues, materials to be used, safety audit and a license for maintenance etc.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Vint, **SECONDED** by Councillor Croad, and

RESOLVED that the suggestion to develop proposals for colour enhancement to one or two crossings in Totnes be welcomed and the Committee receive a further report, in due course, on specific scheme plans and locations, taking into account the comments made by the Committee above.

* **87** **Annual Local Waiting Restrictions Programme**

The Committee considered the Report of the Chief Officer for Highways, Infrastructure Development and Waste (HIW/17/22) on the annual waiting restriction programme.

The report outlined that requests for waiting restrictions had been, in the past, difficult to deliver, due to resource and funding pressures, and the Council had therefore previously agreed a process to deliver an annual local programme for each HATOC area. This had proved a successful methodology, therefore was suggested for continuation with a further programme for 2017/18 as well as extending the scope of the programme to include other restrictions and minor aids to movement improvements such as dropped crossing points and bollards etc.

Members were asked that any potential schemes for the 2017/2018 year be brought to the attention of the Highways Officers for consideration as part of that programme.

For the 2016/17 programme, proposals were advertised for each District Council area, with indicative budgets of £12,500 for each area. In South Hams, there were 54 sites advertised, 32 sites progressed (no objections), 22 sites reported to the HATOC and 71 objections received.

Section four of the report outlined each site in detail, any objections received, the Councils response to those objections and a recommendation as to whether to take the scheme forward.

The Committee considered each of those proposals outlined in the report and the relevant local Member indicated their support or otherwise.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Croad, **SECONDED** by Councillor Hosking, and

RESOLVED

(a) that the work on the annual waiting restrictions programme and the prioritisation process applied in 2016/2017 be noted;

(b) that the recommendations contained in Section 4 of the report, as considered and supported by the Local Members at the meeting, be agreed and the recommended proposals implemented; and

(c) that pending Cabinet endorsement on decisions of funding and scope of works, a further programme be developed for 2017/18.

* **88** **Request for Pedestrian Crossing at Marldon School**

The Committee considered the Report of the Chief Officer for Highways, Infrastructure Development and Waste (HIW/17/23), on the request for a pedestrian crossing at Marldon School.

The report highlighted that at the last meeting of the HATOC, it had supported the principle of a pedestrian crossing outside Marldon School and had asked officers to prepare an evidence base (surveys, costings and monitoring) and submit a project proposal.

The report outlined that a pedestrian crossing had previously been installed just to the south of the entrance to Marldon School in 2004, but had been removed after a short period leaving dropped kerbs and tactile paving. It was thought the removal was due to complaints from local residents, relating to the proximity of the crossing to private driveways. There was also conflict with the operation of the bus stops.

The criteria for installing a pedestrian crossing was explained in detail and the report concluded the site would not meet this accepted criteria, both in terms of vehicle movements, numbers of pedestrians and collision data.

The report highlighted that inappropriate parking and resultant congestion in the vicinity of the Marldon School, particularly during pupil drop-off / pick-up was considered to be the main issue. The current zig zag markings and signage were legally enforceable but were generally disregarded. Also a previous School Crossing Patrol service was not maintained due to problems with recruitment and a volunteer scheme was not feasible due to a lack of volunteers.

The report also outlined what other options might be available, for example a central pedestrian refuge if one could be sited without compromising vehicle movements into adjacent premises, but the road could only accommodate a 1.5m refuge, which was not ideal for pushchairs etc. Also, bollards, or other physical barriers such as planters, could be placed on the footway to prevent parking outside of the school, but there was a danger of pushing parking problems into nearby residential roads.

Members discussed and asked questions on the national criteria for a pedestrian crossing, that other locations had crossings that didn't appear to meet that national criteria, the results of the traffic data from the 2010 surveys in Marldon, the impact of development on traffic levels, the views of local members that the lack of a crossing was dangerous, the support of the Parish Council and the Police for a crossing and the potential for the community to fund the works from S106 monies or the Community Reinvestment Fund.

Officers clarified that a previous crossing had been removed, not only due to resident's complaints regarding light pollution, but the siting of the crossing being adjacent to accesses made it unsafe as well as causing issues with the bus stop, making it inappropriate in that particular location.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Pennington, **SECONDED** by Councillor Rowe, and

RESOLVED that the Committee reaffirm its wholehearted support for a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of Marldon School, as resolved at its meeting of 11 November 2016 (Minute 80), and requests a site visit be arranged as soon as practicable, by the HATOC Committee of the new Council, to look at potential solutions and / or sites for a crossing.

* 89

20 MPH Speed Limit Review

(In line with the Councils public participation rules, the Chairman exercised his discretion and with the consent of the committee permitted Mrs D Sutton and Dr Karen Mellodew to speak to this item).

The Committee received an update on the Governments Review of 20mph speed limits, following from a resolution at the last meeting that *'in view of the continued delay of the Governments Review of 20mph speed limits, the Committee receive a report at its next meeting, so the matter could be debated'*.

The Committee noted that Atkins, Aecom and Professor Mike Maher had been commissioned by the Department for Transport to undertake research into 20mph speed limits.

- to evaluate the effectiveness of 20mph speed limits, in a range of settings;
- to examine drivers' and residents' perceptions of 20mph limits;
- to assess the relative costs/benefits to vulnerable groups e.g. children, cyclists, the elderly; and
- to evaluate the processes and factors which contribute to the level of effectiveness of 20mph speed limit schemes.

The 20mph research project was continuing to make progress and had been extended to allow for an additional year of accident data to be included, strengthening the evidence base being considered.

The final report was expected to be published later in the year, at which point the County Council would be better able to take a balanced view on the matter.

Members expressed their disappointment at the continued delay for this study and asked questions on the legal enforcement 20mph zones and the value of all built up areas and / or villages being 20mph.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Croad, **SECONDED** by Councillor Pennington, and

RESOLVED that whilst a site visit be undertaken to look at the issue of a crossing near to Marldon School, Members also use that opportunity to review Marldon in its entirety, including looking at traffic issues and speeding and Officers be asked to update the speed data prior to this site visit.

(NB – the date of the site visit to be 7 July 2017 as the date of the next HATOC)

* **90** **Exeter Road (B3372) South Brent - Various Traffic Calming Measures**

The Committee noted that, in accordance with Standing Order 23, Councillor Smerdon had asked that the Committee consider the issue of Exeter Road (B2272), South Brent in respect on potential traffic calming measures (speed warning signs) and a crossing point, which had the support of the Parish Council.

He further raised the issue of an exit off the Northbound A38 onto the B3372 at the Carew Shell service station, which he reported was dangerous. Also of concern was that if vehicles were prevented from re-joining the A38 on leaving the service station and were redirected onto the B3372, this would result in increased traffic through South Brent.

Members confirmed that the A38, as a trunk road, was the responsibility of the Highways England, therefore the Councils had no jurisdiction to undertake any sort of junction improvements.

Councillor Smerdon also raised the issue the impact of housing development within the vicinity and referred to previous suggestions for a crossing at the London Inn site (which didn't meet the national criteria) but also the potential for one near to the Sanderspool roundabout.

Officers further explained that speed data would need to be evaluated through the SCARF process before any vehicle activated sign could be considered as a measure, even if locality budgets were used as the funding mechanism.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Croad, **SECONDED** by Councillor Rowe, and

RESOLVED that Councillor Smerdon establish the exact requirements of the Parish Council's request and submit further information to the next meeting of the HATOC on 7 July 2017.

* **91** **Speeding Cyclists in Dean Prior (DNPA)**

The Committee noted that, in accordance with Standing Order 23, Councillor Smerdon had asked that the Committee consider the issue of Cyclists travelling through the village of Dean Prior (DNPA) at high speed, with no warning. He added that several residents had asked, at the Parish Council, what measures could be taken.

Members questioned the role of the Police in any enforcement and asked questions on what role the Council could play, noting the limited scope of the Council with such issues.

It was **MOVED** by Councillor Croad, **SECONDED** by Councillor Rowe, and

RESOLVED that the Committee note the issues raised and the lack of any current available solution, therefore asks Councillor Smerdon to speak with Highways Officers outside of the meeting.

* **92** **Petitions/Parking Policy Reviews**

There was no petition from a member of the public or the Council relating to the South Hams.

* **93** **Actions Taken Under Delegated Powers**

The Committee received the Report of the Head of Highways, Capital Development & Waste (HIW/17/24) setting out action taken under delegated powers on advertised Traffic Regulation Orders since the last meeting.

***DENOTES DELEGATED MATTER WITH POWER TO ACT**

The Meeting started at 10.00 am and finished at 11.57 am