

BEECH ROAD SAFETY WORKING GROUP

MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING HELD AT 19:30 ON 29 June 2020

1. **Attendees:**

Charles Cockburn (CC)
Nick Ward (NW)
Malcolm Ward-Close (MWC)
Ian Gibson (IG)
David Walker (DW)

Apologies for absence: Roger Ison (RI), Brian Wagstaff (BW).

2. The Minutes of the previous meeting on 25th May were reviewed and approved unanimously. Approval was proposed by Ian Gibson, seconded by David Walker 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). This is the fourth set of Minutes requiring this approach. There were no matters arising from this review.
3. **Declaration of Interest** – (in accordance with the National Association of Local Councils Model Code of Conduct adopted July 2018) Councillors and Working Group members 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.
4. It was formally noted that Tony Ransley and Eric Baker have resigned from this Working Group – the Chairman thanked them both for their contributions and this was echoed by the other members present.
5. **BRSWG Mission.** The meeting took the opportunity to revisit the mission of the Working Group given the changes in personnel and the recent review of the Chairman’s Interim Report by the Parish Council.
Points arising:
 - a. Charles formally confirmed to the meeting that the PC wishes for the Group to continue with its work.
 - b. The Group agreed that it wishes to work on creating an overall solution to the road safety issues in Beech (particularly for pedestrians) and will present an option study to the PC, together with recommendations for the preferred option, **by October/November this year.**
 - c. To achieve this timeline it means that options will be developed and costed at a **budget level.** Each option will be reviewed (SWOT analysis) and, from this, a recommendation will be concluded.

- d. It is then expected that the PC will review the report, options and recommendations, and present this to “the village” in a consultation or referendum process. Legally this element cannot take place until May 2021 at the earliest.
- e. **In terms of immediate actions for completion over the next few weeks it was agreed that Graham Webb’s “Next Steps” document of 22nd June be adopted** (See APPENDIX for a copy of this).

6. Driver Awareness Signs – progress update

MW-C

We are awaiting a formal response from Ian Janes regarding our application to post new design signs on Medstead Road / Kings Hill. Informally he is happy with our proposal but, unfortunately, he has informed us that there are two other approvals required before we can begin production and installation. As we are utilising a brand new scheme with this proposal there is currently no process agreed to obtain these approvals so we are in the hands of HCC on this matter.

7. Workstream Update Reports and Next Steps

WORKSTREAM 1. Pathways

NW

Clarification on the scope of the budget quote from Poulson is required – does the 1300m long pathway just run through the private woodland (in which case why does it need to be so long) or does it include stretches up Kings Hill and/or adjacent to Forestry land. NW to make contact with Katy Poulson (as the new representative from the WG) and clarify the position if information is not forthcoming in the meantime. **Action: NW**

In terms of picking up contact with Seong-Gi, Charles is progressing this (hopefully through Daniel Gordon who already knows him). **Action: CC**

WORKSTREAM 2. Highway development

IG / MW-C / DW

Contact has been made with South Perrott PC to ascertain more detail around how their solution was implemented, what the perception of the change has been, and (if possible) how much it cost. A fairly lengthy response was received but, fundamentally, the detail does not appear to be readily available as many of the people (including the contractor who did the work) have moved on or retired given the time lapse involved. The response made it fairly clear that further questioning would not gain us anything.

Ian was comfortable that he can produce a Beech version of the South Perrott scheme with a budget estimate of costings. Clearly feasibility of such a solution needs early validation with HH.

Ian, Malcolm and David will aim to meet in the near future to look into the detail here and agree a work schedule. **Action: IG/MW-C/DW**

WORKSTREAM 3. Speed Control / Enforcement

CC

Malcolm agreed to support Charles with data analysis from the village speed camera where required.

WORKSTREAM 4. Campaigning and Lobbying

CC

Charles will continue his lobbying for greater police resources for the Alton Rural area and put forward that the measure of success of this in relation to road safety will be more speed enforcement activity in Beech.

WORKSTREAM 5. Funding

Activity on this workstream will be “parked” for now as we need budget quotes to be available for the options under consideration to determine the level of funding required.

Also, currently all grant funds have been diverted to Covid-19 “projects” so there is little point in seeking funds for road safety activity at this time..

8. The next meeting will be held at **7.30pm. on Monday 3rd August** – using the Village Hall Zoom software.
Nick to book access to this through Katie Smallman (Charles to provide her email address).

N J Ward

Appendix A

BRSWG – NEXT STEPS (GW SUGGESTION)
2020

22 June

Infrastructure Work

Immediate Actions

1. Implement speed poster project.
2. Determine preferred line of footpath on SG's land and check its acceptability to SG. *NB If close to Medstead Road it may in places overlap onto Hampshire Highways (HH) land.*
3. Make contact with villagers in South Perrott to ascertain: driver behaviour, speed limits, effect on vehicle speed, nature and frequency of any 'incidents', overall perception of success. Also any information on cost, if available.
4. Extract from Mr Housby (HH) full information about land 'dedications' on Medstead Road and Kings Hill, to build up a definitive picture and, if possible, obtain HCC legal view on whether these are now enforceable. *NB from other work it would appear that there is in any case a wide strip of HH-owned land along most of the south side of Kings Hill.*

On conclusion of 1-4 above

5. Engage with HH to obtain their views on the feasibility and cost of:
 - (i) The proposed footpath on SG's land east from 1 Kings Hill (which may or may not overlap onto their land), and the extension of that footpath on HH land east to the Bushy Leaze Wood entrance, all with potential construction from the roadside. (Option 1)
 - (ii) A footpath on HH land east from the entrance of Bushy Leaze Wood to 95 Medstead Road, negotiating the 'grips and ditches'. (Option 1a – we may as well ask them while we are at it and it may prove to be feasible after all.)
 - (iii) *(If the land dedications don't work on Medstead Road)* The 'South Perrott scheme' in the village centre.
 - (iv) *(If the land dedications do work on Medstead Road)* Construction of a footpath through the village centre.
 - (v) A footpath on Kings Hill west from 1 Kings Hill, utilising land owned by, and/or dedicated to, HH.
 - (vi) The resurfacing of Lower Grange Road and measures to govern the interaction of pedestrians and any traffic.

Speed limit reduction

6. Continue with researching, and lobbying for, 20 mph speed limits for the village centre, Wellhouse Road and (possibly) Kings Hill. **But** recognise that there is no guarantee of success in achieving this, and that any progress may be very slow and out of our control.

Speed limit enforcement

7. Continue with lobbying for increased police resources to enforce speed limits in the village, and with researching speed limit enforcement techniques. **But** recognise that the necessary policy and resources may not be forthcoming, and that any progress may be very slow and out of our control. **And** that (if policy and resources do materialise) they will not be guaranteed to be focussed on Beech and/or last indefinitely, and so in themselves may not be a permanent solution.