

EATON BISHOP PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting of Eaton Bishop Parish Council held at Eaton Bishop Village Hall on Friday 10th March 2017

Present:

Cllr. Caroline Hanks
Cllr. Leon Wolverson (Vice-Chair)
Cllr. David Richards
Cllr. Rosie Robinson
Cllr. Astrid Mick
Cllr. Matt Johnson

In attendance:

Parish Clerk Alison Wright plus the Ward Cllr Steve Williams and Lengthsman Paul Wright

Open Session:-

No items of discussion were raised.

1.0 Apologies for Absence

There were apologies received from Cllr. Ray Christopher and Tree Warden Alan Tydeman. Cllr Leon Wolverson was in the Chair.

2.0 Declarations of Interest

There were declarations made by Cllr. David Richards (pecuniary), Cllr. Rosie Robinson (pecuniary) and Cllr Leon Wolverson (non-pecuniary), in respect of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, and the declarations form was duly completed.

3.0 Minutes of previous meeting

The Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on the 10th February 2017 were signed as a true and correct record of the meeting.

4.0 To receive reports from:

Ward Councillor, PCSO West Mercia Police, Locality Steward, Tree Warden.

The **PCSO** was not present. Bulletins had been circulated.

The **Locality Steward** was not present. Bulletins had been circulated.

The **Ward Cllr** updated the meeting regarding an email he had received from the Highways Engineer. The content was as follows:

Good afternoon Cllr,

With regard to your request for us to take a look at the junction along the B4352 between Madley and Clehonger that leads to Eaton Bishop. I have now been out to take a look and can confirm that there is already a large advanced warning sign with a yellow surround and an advanced "Eaton Bishop" direction sign on the approach to the junction from Clehonger that should be enough to warn drivers on the B4352 of the presence of a junction where they need to take care.

I would suggest that the only options to try to make it even more abundantly plain to drivers on the B4352 that a problematic junction is up ahead is to add a "slow" marking next to both the large advanced warning sign and the "Eaton Bishop" advanced direction sign. The "Eaton Bishop" advanced direction sign could also be replaced with a new sign along the lines of the drawing below:



I'm afraid to say though that we do not have a budget for these sorts of signing/lining alterations and that the cost of such modifications would have to be borne in full by the Parish Council, unless there is some nearby new development from which potentially some section 106 funding could be sought.

It would also be worth pursuing with the landowner of the property on the corner if there is any margin for taking back the hedge to improve visibility to the left when exiting the junction. Or, at the very least, an agreement to ensure the hedge is kept trimmed back as much as possible so as not to impact on the visibility.

With regard to the installation of a traffic mirror at this junction the previous stance would have been that no Council, including this one, was able to provide permission or to erect traffic mirrors on the highway without the express permission of the Department for Transport (DfT). Whilst a traffic mirror may well help those joining a road from a visibility impaired junction, a traffic mirror placed in the highway was legally classed as an obstruction on the highway as it was not a specified "sign" in the "Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions" government document and therefore could not be put up without the permission of the DfT and that required extensive site investigation application information. Permission was very rarely given and was reserved only for the very poorest of busy junctions with a significant collision history and generally only on a temporary basis and until such time as junction improvements were made.

There are two main concerns relating to the provision of traffic mirrors:

- (a) the sun or headlights from a vehicle emerging from a private access may shine onto the mirror and reflect into the eyes of an approaching motorist, causing considerable confusion and possibly a collision, and
- (b) the emerging driver may rely on the mirror, even though it might have become obscured by weather conditions (rain, misting, frosting of the surface), no longer be visible (due to foliage) or indeed not even facing in the correct direction any more.

The DfT stance was always that junction improvements should be made to improve visibility rather than to rely on the dubious benefits of positioning a traffic mirror. It was also stressed that in the event of a traffic mirror being installed by Herefordshire Council/Balfour Beatty Living Places without DfT permission and a collision occurred then the Council/BBLP would have been liable to prosecution. Additionally, if a private individual were to have placed a mirror off the highway on private land opposite the junction and it was found to be a contributory factor in a collision then it was suspected that both the landowner and the individual responsible for erecting the mirror could well have been found liable, but that would ultimately have been for a court to decide.

However, at the present moment I can only advise that I am in discussions with Herefordshire Council regarding the formulation of a new policy regarding the use of traffic mirrors in the highway in Herefordshire as a result of the recent introduction of the new "Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions" government document that does vary somewhat from the previous legislation. For your information this document sets out and stipulates all the types and variations of signs and road markings that may be placed in the highway and in this case a traffic mirror is defined as a sign. Once this policy on traffic mirrors has been agreed I will contact you once more regarding this particular element of your request.

I hope this provides enough background for you to consider your next steps. If you have any further queries or wish to discuss any of the above in more detail then please contact me.

Regards,
Ray

Ray Wallace

Senior Engineer (Network Regulation) | Balfour Beatty | Services | Living Places

The Ward Cllr also commented on the Locality Steward's briefing regarding potholes. There was still ongoing fly-tipping and there were a number of ballast sacks dumped in a gateway in Ruckhall. The Ward Cllr asked if the Parish Council would like him to invite the Leader of the Council, Tony Johnson or Cabinet Member for Highways Paul Rone to a future Parish Council Meeting.

The mirror at Honeymoon had been vetoed for the present. Signage could be improved but the Parish Council would have to fund this. Cllr Wolverson agreed to speak to the householder, next to the junction, regarding the hedge line.

The Ward Cllr would chase up the letter regarding trees at Ruckhall, and other matters, as sent to Cllr Paul Rone.

The Ward Cllr advised that the planning application for a power plant in Madley had been held up due to issues over access. If there were no solution to the access problem then the application would be refused.

Brightwells had applied for an additional sales day. This was a retrospective application. There would be a public meeting held at the Brightwells site, in Stoney Street, on Tuesday 15th March 2017 from 4.00pm to discuss this. Madley Parish Council was aware of this and residents in Stoney Street had received notification via an information leaflet.

The **Tree Warden** had sent his apologies.

5.0 Finance

5.1) To note bank balances

The bank balances were noted as: Business Account £12713.05 and Treasurers Account £1241.41, as at the meeting date.

5.2) To resolve to accept payments, as per listing

The following payments were approved:

Mrs A Wright (salary £192.64, mileage £9.90)	£202.54
The Post Office Ltd (Tax)	£48.40
Cobbs Estate Services (P3)	£202.50
Longfield Services (P3)	£207.50
Cobbs Estate Services (Little Marsh)	£240.00
Longfield Services (Little Marsh)	£240.00
HALC Subscription	£393.80
Kirkwells Ltd (NDP)	£960.00
Total	£2,494.74

Resolved: that the payments were passed for payment: Unanimous

Receipts: Nil

5.3) **Village Hall Matters** – no further update

6.0 Planning Matters

- To consider applications as detailed: No new applications to consider.

7.0 Neighbourhood Plan Update

Cllr Wolverson updated the meeting regarding the Neighbourhood Plan. A reply had been received from the Local Authority and the Steering Group would be making the final adjustments to the draft plan. The Planning Authority had highlighted that the Parish could refer to the emerging plan when considering planning applications.

8.0 Village Matters

- **Honeymoon Common consideration of future plans:** there would be an initiative to keep the footpaths clear.
- **Little Marsh Common – update re projects** – a working party of twelve people had carried out works including some chain sawing. Longfield Services and Cobbs Estate Services had carried out preparatory works before the work party. Everything that had been on the list to be completed had been achieved. The common was looking very different now. Contracting work completed for winter and final grant funding claim would be presented. To be decided how to spend residual funding money by September. Ditch crossing would be organised. A Village Picnic for workshop would be arranged.
- **Mirror at Honeymoon Junction** – covered under Ward Cllr report item number 4.
- **Water Pumping Station at Eaton Bishop** – Cllr Hanks had been in conversation with Terry Wilkins of Welsh Water regarding the situation. The case details would be sent in to him for removal and this would then be raised to the Estates Manager. A number of organisations would be lobbying for the removal of the

decommissioned station. A site meeting would be held for all interested parties. There was a potential health and safety implication whilst it remained. The priority was to get the site onto the list of sites to be dealt with.

- **Letter to Cabinet Member Paul Rone – update** – the Ward Cllr would make enquiries regarding the request for action.

9.0 Parish Roads and Footpaths

9.1) To note any defects to be reported to Balfour Beatty.

Potholes had been reported in legion numbers. Some had been repaired and others left. The roads were described as being a “disaster everywhere and were falling apart.”

Footpaths

9.2) To put forward work for the Lengthsman

Works would be commencing in week beginning 20th March, in terms of works discussed and including clearance works. An assessment would be made regarding clearance the Honeymoon Common footpaths. The Lengthsman would speak to Balfour Beatty regarding obtaining the ditch crossing materials.

10.0 Information Sheet and Correspondence

10.1) To note Information and Correspondence sheet. The contents of the sheet were noted and included information on: The Great British Spring Clean.

11.0 Matters to be raised on the Agenda for the next meeting

All the usual items would be on the Agenda. Also included would be the tenancy of the Cooks Field. A site visit would be arranged. Any professional fees incurred in conjunction with the agreement revision to be paid by the Charity. Any further additional items for the Agenda would be advised.

12.0 Confirmation of the date of the next Meeting

The next meeting date was confirmed as Wednesday April 12th to be held from 7.30pm in The Eaton Bishop Village Hall.

The meeting closed at 10.11pm

Signed:

.....
Chairman

12.04.2017
.....
Date

Visit the Eaton Bishop Parish Website at: www.eatonbishoppcc.btck.co.uk