

BEECH ROAD SAFETY WORKING GROUP (BRSWG)

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING HELD AT 19:30 ON 20 April 2020

1. **Attendees:**

Charles Cockburn (CC)
Tony Ransley (TR)
Nick Ward (NW)
Malcolm Ward-Close (MWC)
Ian Gibson (IG)
Eric Baker (EB) (part-time)
Roger Ison (RI) (part-time)

Apologies for absence: David Walker (DW), Brian Wagstaff (BW)

2. The Chairman discussed the fact that Simon Cooper had resigned his membership of BRSWG and discussed the opportunity of inviting Ian Gibson to join. Ian's appointment to the Group was proposed by Tony Ransley and seconded by Malcolm Ward-Close. Welcome Ian!
3. The Minutes of the previous meeting on 9th March were reviewed and approved unanimously. Approval was proposed by Eric Baker, seconded by Nick Ward and signed off "virtually" by the Chairman, Charles Cockburn. Charles will formally sign off in front of the meeting next time we are able to meet in person (post lockdown). There were no matters arising from this review.
4. **Workstream set-up.** As we move into the development phase of the programme it was agreed to set up five workstreams to look at progressing the key themes in parallel. Group members also volunteered to lead and be part of these workstreams as detailed below. The current status of the work programme in each workstream is shown in the Appendix to these minutes and should be used as the starting point for work plans moving forward.

WORKSTREAM 1: PATHWAYS

Definition: Off highway paths where these are possible. Assess options, gain approvals (in principle at least), obtain costs. Responsible: NW (lead), EB

WORKSTREAM 2: HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT

Definition: Traffic management where off highway paths are not feasible. Assess options, understand approvals process, obtain costs. (NOTE – close alignment required with Workstream 3) Responsible: IG (lead), MW-C

WORKSTREAM 3: SPEED CONTROL / ENFORCEMENT

Definition: Options to utilise speed control equipment to ensure vehicle speeds through the village are reduced in line with current and possible future speed limits. Enforcement is of course key here too to change driver behaviour. (NOTE – close alignment required with Workstream 2) Responsible: CC, TR

WORKSTREAM 4: CAMPAIGNING AND LOBBYING

Definition: All activities designed to maximise engagement and support for the

programme from key stakeholders and influencers. Responsible: CC

WORKSTREAM 5: FUNDING

Definition: Seeking out new funding opportunities and applying for these, together with securing access to existing funding channels. Responsible: TR

PROJECT MANAGEMENT – To ensure all projects are aligned and progressing well Malcolm Ward-Close has agreed to act as Project Manager and set up and maintain an appropriate control spreadsheet for this purpose. Workstream leads must let Malcolm know by email when actions are completed and new ones initiated.

- 5. Declaration of Interest** – (in accordance with the National Association of Local Councils Model Code of Conduct adopted July 2018) Councilors are reminded of their responsibility to declare any disclosable pecuniary interest which they may have in any item of business on the agenda no later than when that item is reached. Unless dispensation has been granted, you may not participate in any discussion of, or vote on, or discharge any function related to any matter in which you have a pecuniary interest as defined by regulations made by the Secretary of State under the Localism Act 2011. You must withdraw from the room or chamber when the meeting discusses and votes on the matter. –
No interests were declarable at this time.

- 6. BRSWG – Objectives, Strategy and Scope of Work document** – see Appendix 2 for latest version of this.

7. Feedback and update on Actions from previous meeting:

- a. Comments on Minutes by Chair of PC.

Graham's comments are welcomed by the BRSWG. It was agreed that the process moving forward will be that, should Graham wish to continue commenting on future Minutes, BRSWG members should only respond to these should there be any objection to his comments or where we believe there has been misinterpretation and that further clarification is required.

- b. Conclusions from analysis of Highways maps of Medstead Rd and Kings Hill. (NW)
[This is in response to Action 1 on the PC Scope of Work]

The report on land ownership adjacent to Medstead Rd / Kings Hill was sent to all on 23 March. The summary conclusions from this analysis are as follows:

The maps confirmed in general what was already assumed.

Medstead Rd / Kings Hill is divisible into 3 sections based on different possible solutions to road safety issues in each.

1. Section from Basingstoke Rd at the end of the existing path through to start of Forestry land (on left).

Conclusion: There is no Highways land adjacent to the roadway (apart from a small section near the Bus Stop). This means this is a "shared roadway" and speed management / control solutions are required. (Workstreams 2 & 3 apply)

2. Section adjacent to Forestry England and private woodland (up to 1 Kings Hill on left).

Conclusion: There is Highways owned land all along this stretch and is substantial for most of the way on the left hand (woods) side. However it is

uneven and with many drainage channels. A pathway running parallel to the road is therefore possible here but a path running on Forestry and private woodland will be more cost effective. Obviously this will require separate approvals. (Workstream 1 applies).

3. Kings Hill section from end of private woodland to village boundary (by the Abbey)

Conclusion: There is Highways land on both sides of Kings Hill all the way along this stretch so a pathway is theoretically possible. Practically speaking the left hand side appears to be more appropriate as it could continue directly on from the path through the private woodland and the land is also flatter than the right hand side. As one approaches the exit to the pathway to Wivelrod the banks on both sides get steep and covered with shrubbery and trees making a path expensive if not impossible beyond this point. A traffic management / speed control solution might suit this narrow, steep sided section. Beyond this a pathway might be possible on the right hand side of the road across Abbey land. (Workstreams 1,2 and 3 apply).

- c. Analysis of speed camera output data. Malcolm will produce a summary report following the work he has done on this. Action: MW-C
- d. Publicity Campaigns. Charles reported back on his work to raise the profile of the challenge of unsafe roads for pedestrians in Beech. Of specific note is his letter to the Chief Constable for Hampshire regarding the poor level of policing in “Alton Rural”. This draft letter has been supported by Alton Town Council and signed off by the Mayor. Charles is now looking to get endorsement and approval from the Chairpersons of all local Parish Councils to show a unified and widespread concern for this issue before sending this in to the Chief Constable. Action: CC

8. **Identification of Facts we don't know but need to know**

Team members to consider these and send to Malcolm for collation Action: All

9. **Next Steps**

The key activity to be actioned before the next meeting is for the Workstreams to get together, consider the programmes concerned and progress on these ready to report back.

10. **Date of next meeting: Monday 18th May at 7.30pm online**

(or at West Dene House, 84 Medstead Road if feasible by then)

N J Ward – 21 April 2020








APPENDIX – WORKSTREAMS SET UP AND CURRENT POSITION

BRSWP - Workstreams

1. Pathways
2. Highway Engineering (for traffic management)
3. Speed Control / Enforcement
(Signage and Camera Technology)
4. Campaigning and Lobbying
(Stakeholder / Influencer management)
5. Funding




BRSWP – Position as of 20/4/20

1. Pathways

- Details of land owned by Hampshire Highways obtained 
- Quote for path through private woodland (£53.5k) 
- Contact made with Forestry England – no decision received 
- Contact with Hampshire Highways re 'Grange Road'
->awaiting responses 
- Contact with Hampshire Countryside services re Bridle path
to Wilvelrod Road -> awaiting response 
- Highways own land adjacent to Kings Hill, so pathway is
possible for some of the way. Needs further review. 
- Need quotes for other sections 








BRSWP – Position as of 20/4/20

2. Highway Engineering (for traffic management)

- Review of South Perrott road sharing system 
- Engineering proposal for road sharing system 
- Costing for road sharing system 







BRSWP – Position as of 20/4/20

3. Speed Control/Enforcement (Signage and Camera Technology)

- Speed data from Parish SLR distributed 
- Quotes for variety of speed monitoring devices obtained 
- Quotes for instructional road signage system 
- Request for funding re instructional road sign test 
- Quote for innovative speed signs obtained. 
- Need quote for speed managing options. 
- Best can do with 30mph proposal to Parish Council 





BRSWP – Position as of 20/4/20

4. Campaigning and Lobbying

- Charles' paper on this 
- Obtain data and evidence to support the campaigning group 
- Initial contact with Hampshire police re Beech Speed watch (evidence gathering) 
- Get other local councils to support more PCSO 
- Get Hampshire CC to agree to speed control measures 
- Get other Local Councils to support the 20mph initiative 

BRSWP – Position as of 20/4/20

4. Funding

- Parish council funds to be exactly defined -> £30k 
- S106 funds for Beech 3.5k 
- S106 funds for Beech re highways £11.5k 
- Action possible appeal to villagers... 

APPENDIX 2

BRSWG Objectives, Strategy and Scope of Work statement (latest version)

Definitions

The OBJECTIVES are the high level expectations of what the Group is looking to achieve.
The STRATEGY is the approach we are taking to achieve those objectives.
The SCOPE OF WORK is the actual set of actions we will undertake to deliver the strategy and achieve the objectives.

BRSWG Objectives

Launch a Road Safety Improvement Project – a project to
(i) improve road safety in Beech for all road users, but particularly for pedestrians
(ii) as a result, promote walking and other non-vehicle travel within the village, increasing the opportunity for physical exercise and social interaction.

STRATEGY

To achieve the objectives the key roadways in Beech will be assessed and one of the following strategies will be adopted:

- **Separation:** wherever possible provide the facility to separate human (and animal?) road users from vehicular traffic to minimise risk of harm.
- **Speed control / enforcement:** Where roadway sharing is necessary, introduce a 20mph speed limit either through physical speed constraints or speed control and enforcement measures.

Where multiple strategy options are available each one will need to be costed and this factor will influence decisions on the most appropriate solution, along with factors around approvals and ease and speed of implementation.

SCOPE OF WORK (As per Parish Council draft)

- Establish ownership of land bordering the full length of Medstead Road and Kings Hill. Where such land isn't controlled by Hampshire County Council (HCC), establish with the owners whether their land may be included in any footway scheme.
- Devise an ideal road safety scheme (traffic calming measures and/or roadside footways), or one or more options, for the full length of Medstead Road and Kings Hill.
- Consider whether any footways should include provision for other users (e.g. cyclists), and so set an outline specification for footways.
- Consider what physical traffic calming elements are required.
- Obtain outline costing for all scheme elements.
- Narrow down and refine feasible options, including checking acceptability with HCC.
- Determine the definitive scheme, probably to be delivered in phases over time.
- Establish available sources of funding.
- Establish a combined funding and delivery project plan.