

SOUTHOE & MIDLOE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

Held on WEDNESDAY 2nd JULY 2014

In SOUTHOE VILLAGE HALL at 7.30pm

Councillors Present:-

Mr. A. Marnes	AM	Chairman
Mrs. S. Penton	SP	Vice Chairman
Mrs. S. Gadsby	SG	
Mr. D. Felce	DF	
Mr. M. Rawson	MR	
Mr. R. Saw	RS	

Also present:-

County Cllr. Mrs. J. Wisson (JW), District Cllr. Mr. T. Hayward (TH), 27 members of the public and Michael Anker (Highways, Cambridgeshire County Council)

1. APOLOGIES – Cllr. Mrs. H. Ramply and Mrs. L. Barnicoat (LB) (Parish Clerk)

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATION of INTEREST for items on the agenda
None declared.

3. A Grant of £10,000 has been received from Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) to make the High Street safer, towards which the Parish Council will have to make a contribution of 10%. It must be noted that £10,000 is the maximum amount the CCC will pay towards the chosen option. AM explained that the Parish Council has been urged over the years to take some action in making the High Street, in particular in the vicinity of the Village Hall access, safer for pedestrians, vehicles and any other road users, which is why the above-mentioned grant was applied for and subsequently obtained. He outlined the following options as listed on the Agenda:-

- A **platform** outside no. 28 High Street and **yellow lines** from the corner of the drive of the house opposite no. 28 along past all 4 houses up to the barrier at the footpath entrance to Thurly Close.
- Anti speed 'humps'** in the area of the High Street near the village hall entrance with **no yellow lines**.
- Flat bed** across width of entire High Street near the village hall entrance with **no yellow lines**.

Mr. Michael Anker (Highways, Cambridgeshire County Council) had previously been consulted and met with AM on 22nd May. The original draft plan had been circulated to councillors prior to June's Parish Council meeting. Another meeting was arranged by DS, one councillor and some residents attended on 23rd June. Mr. Anker attended the meeting tonight and presented the options in more detail as follows:-

Option 1 (see 3a above) – Priority Give Way Feature

A small build-out construction situated adjacent to the existing wall of property no. 28. The road would be narrowed to 4m or 3.5m if agreed between the Parish and users of agricultural vehicles.

A tactile crossing could also be included to encourage pedestrians to cross at this point.

No yellow lines will be placed on the road but residents/visitors would have to be aware that parking close to the build-out might restrict access especially for larger vehicles.

PROS

No physical features to drive over so less noise.

Vehicles will be passing by the VH access on the other side of the road, further away from pedestrians exiting access.

CONS

Vehicles only have to slow down if they meet something coming the other way.

Less parking spaces as cars couldn't park adjacent to build-out.

Reduced turning circle into the VH. A car will be able to enter/exit normally but fire engine, ambulance etc. may have difficulty.

Increased chance of vehicle collision.

More signing required.

Approx. cost including construction, signing and lining - **£4,500**

Option 2 (see 3b above) Road Hump

A round top road hump stretching the entire length of the road between the wall of property no. 28 and the footway opposite.

PROS

Vehicles will actually have to slow down as they approach and go over the hump.

No parking will be lost.

All vehicles can manoeuvre in and out of the entrance as they do now, as there is no feature to drive round

Maintains traffic flow so less chance of vehicle collisions.

Less signing.

CONS

Noise as cars travel over hump especially from agricultural vehicles.

Vibration as larger vehicles travel over hump.

Approx. cost including construction, signing and lining - **£8,680**

Option 2 (Add On) – GATE

Approx. cost £800 - £1,000

Description and Pros and Cons not included here as the majority of residents present dismissed this option.

Option 3 (see 3c above) Raised Table

This option was previously discussed and due to several factors it was decided that it probably wouldn't be feasible to pursue this as a viable option. A lot of planning would need to go into this option and timescales may prevent it from moving forward.

Also the Grant is only up to £10,000 and **Approx. cost** including the raised table with relevant kerbing, drainage, signing and lining would be in the region of **£15,000 - £20,000**

TRANSCALM speed hump to be considered along with Option 1.

Mr. Anker also suggested a new possibility and produced a leaflet advertising a responsive speed control. It consists of a speed hump that flattens if driven over at a slow speed but does not flatten if driven over at a fast speed. It is simple to install and is screwed down onto the highway and, therefore, is removable. He emphasised that Highways had not yet approved it. However, he will make further enquiries as there was some interest shown in this.

Approx. cost £3,000

Mr. Anker left the meeting after the conclusion of his presentation at 8.30pm and then all options were discussed at great length among the residents and Councillors.

The general consensus was for **Option 1** and many of those present adjourned outside to the roadside for further discussion.

It was agreed that Option 1, Priority Give Way Feature was the best option and leaving a 3.5m road width. However, Councillors and members of the public understood there could be a temporary feature put in place quite quickly to help us understand how the permanent one would work.

Councillors reconvened in the VH and after a short discussion agreed to pursue that option.

Also, the installation of the TRANSCALM speed Responsive speed control covering the remaining road width, as this could be reassessed at a later date if it was found to be a problem.

GATE – No decision was made on this option and this will be held over until the next meeting.

Once Councillors have had time to confirm that is their understanding of the situation then **AM** will ask **LB** to write to Mr. Anker with official confirmation of the Parish Council's preference.

The option to lock the gate into the play area was discussed. There was a show of hands but not counted for or against and no decision arrived at. This is to be covered at a later meeting.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS - None

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm

Signed:-
Chairman