

## **BEECH ROAD SAFETY WORKING GROUP**

### **MINUTES OF VIRTUAL MEETING 21.9 HELD ON 14 OCT 2021 11.00**

**1) Attendees:**

Charles Cockburn (CC)  
Ian Gibson (IG)  
Graham Webb (GW)  
Malcolm Ward-Close (MWC)

**2) Apologies for absence:** None

**3) Approve minutes of the previous meeting:** Minutes for meeting 21.8 approved.

**4) 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.

**5) Catch up on consultation**

GW has distributed a draft interim report on the response to the consultation process, ahead of presenting this to the Parish Council meeting on Monday 18 October 2021. He has asked for comments.

At this time we had received 37 responses from a total of 32 houses. Since the initial draft was distributed a further the numbers increased to 41 responses from 35 households.

It was agreed by the group that though the quality of responses was good, the number returned was disappointing. There are two ways of looking at this:

a) Those who have difficulties with our proposals have almost certainly made their concerns known by completing the consultation form.

b) Some people have complained that they have had difficulty with the technology in saving and emailing the completed form.

It was agreed that we could not take silence as implying consent, in part because this may cause us problems later, particularly with regard to funding. If we can

demonstrate greater engagement, then we have a better chance of getting external funding for our project. People may also wonder why we did not act decisively in the face of low return rates.

It was decided that in his report to the Parish Council GW would emphasise that responses were still coming in and in the light of some complaining that they were struggling with the technology, we should seek permission from the PC to extend the deadline for return of the consultation forms by two weeks. This will then provide us with two weeks to digest responses ahead of the next PC meeting on 22 November, when we expect to provide a final report and findings of the consultation.

**ACTION** - GW to present interim report to PC at its 18 October meeting and seek permission to extend deadline by two weeks.

**ACTION** - IG (helped by CG?) to place a note on Nextdoor setting out how to attach a completed consultation form to an email and encouraging people to send in their responses as soon as possible. This note should also explain that if residents find the technology too difficult, they should print off their responses and deliver them to the post-box next to the Village Hall.

Failing an improved response, we will need to put a consultation form through the letter boxes of those households that have yet to respond. We cannot defend a position where people suggest that we made responding too hard for them.

**ACTION** - GW to draft a letter to go with the printed out consultation form, with a photo of the VH letter box, with an instruction that the completed form should be put in there.

#### **6) Getting quotes for the work required by HCC/HH for next stage of Safety Audit.**

This still needs to be progressed. IG has commenced the thinking around how best to commission the quotes, including finding out if HCC provides such a service. IG would follow up with his contacts having first devised the requirements against which interested parties can bid for the design work.

It was suggested and agreed that CC/IG/GW should get together in the coming days to complete the process of deciding what needed to be commissioned and to how best to go about it.

**ACTION** - CC suggests CC/IG/GW should get together at 14.00 on Tuesday 19 October 2021.

#### **7) 20s plenty for us - Hampshire campaign - CC**

CC reported that there had been a recent burst of activity with a number of campaigners across Hampshire coming together under the 20s Plenty for Us banner,

supported by Adrian Berendt, the SE Area head of campaigns. The aim is to take advantage of the coming meeting of HALC AGM where a motion will be tabled requesting that Parish Councils should write to HCC requesting that 20MPH should be put in place in all built up areas and villages.

**ACTION** - GW to seek Beech PC agreement to support this motion at the coming meeting of the PC on 18 October 2021.

IG warned that HCC will want to put in a chicane at each end of the village to help reduce speeds down to 20 mph and it may be considered that this would be sufficient. We must emphasise that our scheme, which already has in principle approval from the Safety Audit team, will work well with any 20mph scheme which is subsequently put in place and that the two objectives are not in conflict.

Regarding Central Government's encouragement of walking and cycling, we will need to ensure that HCC and other authorities, particularly those who might fund our project understand that the scheme is friendly both to walkers and cyclists. However, we will also need to be clear that an on-road footway of 1.5m will not be sufficiently wide for mixed use.

**8) Actions/timings agreed at BRSWG meeting:**

See ACTION items above.

**Date of next meeting:** West Dene on Tuesday 9 November 2021 at 1100am.