

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY GROUP

WEDNESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 2020

Present: Cllr A Hadley – **Chairman**
Cllr Dr F Rice – **Vice-Chairman**

Cllr S Bull, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Howell and Cllr T Trent

Officers: Julian McLaughlin, Director of Growth and Infrastructure
Martin Baker, Senior Road Safety & Network Management Engineer
Philip Elias, Senior Rights of Way Officer
Gary Powell, Head of Engineering Services
Steve Hoyle, Sustainable Design Team Leader
Chris Parkes, Traffic Management Team Leader
Simon Philp, Highways Design Team Leader

Members of the Public in Attendance: approximately 30

12 Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr N Brooks, Cllr N Geary and Cllr M Greene.

13 Substitute Members

Cllr T O'Neill substituted for Cllr M Greene.

14 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest made on this occasion.

Other interests which Members wished to declare

Cllr A Hadley had been to visit the access route in question that related to Agenda Item 6 and had spoken to neighbours.

Cllr F Rice had also visited the aforementioned site and spoken to neighbours in the vicinity.

15 Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2020 be confirmed and signed by the chairman as a correct record.

16 Public Issues

The Chairman reported that one question had been received and three statements as follows:

Question from Vicky Moss

Is the Canford Cliffs Ward included in the Local Walking and Cycling Improvement Plan that is currently being developed?

Response by Senior Walking and Cycling Officer

Yes. The proposed Strategic Cycling Network (SCN) is the top tier of cycling routes. They were shown on maplets for the Canford Cliffs area in green above and were currently being audited and assessed for potential improvements. Stakeholders will be invited to comment

and suggest improvements of their own. All schemes will be costed and prioritised into a long-term investment programme: The Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

Secondary cycling routes and local access routes will be reviewed in the future. These haven't been developed yet because the process for developing proposals is very resource intensive.

Three Core Walking Zones (CWZs) comprise the top tier of walking routes – one for each of the main town centres. The western edge of the Bournemouth CWZ is shown as a solid black line, with a 2km buffer shown as a dashed line; the 2km buffer for Poole is shown on the left. Key Walking Routes (KWRs) between the buffer and the CWZ are shown in blue and are currently being audited and assessed for potential improvements. As with the SCN, stakeholders will be invited to comment and suggest improvements of their own. All schemes will be costed and prioritised into the LCWIP.

Other, lower tier CWZs will be reviewed in the future, including the local centre on Haven Road. It's been necessary to break down the CWZs into different tiers because the process for developing proposals is very resource intensive.

Statement from Vicky Moss

The Canford Cliffs Ward within the BCP Area is particularly strategically located and the network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes that lead from the more intensively populated areas of Branksome, Parkstone, Penn Hill and Westbourne to the Beaches are currently under-utilised due to inaccessibility caused by:

- Lack of safe pedestrian points across roads with high volume/high speed traffic Lack of signage for footpaths Lack of traffic calming/speed enforcement Flooding on footpaths caused by run off from development.
- Lack of public transport around apartments with high concentrations of over 65yrs + Inaccessible pedestrian routes to/from Branksome Station & Penn Hill due to the above.

This leads to reliance on car usage around this area, is in turn leading to congestion/pollution/unhealthy lifestyles/social isolation.

Statement from Jerry Mogg

My family have lived at 22 James Road for 5 years. This is not a truthful application with any recent use and it is not supported by the majority of James Road residents.

There is a private right of way at the James road section which we wish to remain for access only. I have never seen anyone transit the route of this application.

We already have serious security issues in the area and this would only exacerbate the situation giving an unlit thoroughfare to and from James Rd.

This adds no benefit whatsoever to the residents of James Road

Statement from Margaret Kay

I live at 47 Wroxham Road corner of Sheringham Road directly opposite the proposed footpath. I don't understand why the council wish to open a footpath that has not been used to my knowledge, for at least twenty years according to local residents.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:

- A) It only leads to a road that is a cul-de-sac and therefore is of no benefit to anyone.
- B) It invites anti-social behaviour, and as crime in the area is on the rise, it seems a detrimental step in trying to keep the area safe.

17 **James Road to Sheringham Road, Record Unprotected Footpath (currently blocked) as a Public Right of Way (PRoW)**

The Senior Rights of Way Officer presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Mr Atherton and Mr Haywood, Objectors, were invited to express their views as to why the order should not be made.

Mr White and Mrs O'Brien, Supporters, were invited to express their views as to why the order should not be made.

Cllr Johnson, Ward Councillor expressed his views and indicated that on this occasion he was not supportive of the proposal.

Officers responded Members' comments and questions, details included:

- The access in question was now overgrown and had been for some time and was impassable at certain times of the year.
- Consistent usage of an access route over a period of 20 years gave rise to it becoming a public right of way. On this occasion, the 20-year period was cut off at 2017, when the owner/occupier of a neighbouring property blocked off the access.
- If the Order was made as advertised, the pathway would have a use because it would connect two roads that were otherwise disconnected which would benefit local residents that were otherwise having to walk around to access local facilities. It was unlikely that the public at large would use the pathway.
- It was inevitable that the prospect of anti-social behaviour occurring as a result of the order being made could raise some concerns, but legal framework that was in place did not allow rights of way officers to consider such implications.
- It was possible for land to be a public right of way regardless of its ownership.
- The rights of way team had visited the site in question twice and despite, restricted access at the time of both visits, had felt satisfied that he was able to determine the lay of the land.
- Ordinance Survey Maps often referred to access routes as "FP", however, this had no legal standing.
- When determining matters of this nature, it was not possible to consider crime in terms of the evidential test. There was the possibility of utilising a public spaces protection order to block the path usage (if confirmed) at a later date, although this was a lengthy process.
- If the order was made, it would be the Council's responsibility to ensure that the right of way was passable and was kept that way, which would be an ongoing cost.

Mr Atherton summed up his views and reiterated that he had not done anything unlawful when blocking access, as the strip of land concerned belonged to him and the access route was not regularly used.

Mrs O'Brien summed up her views and reiterated that despite other claims, the access route was commonly used, was passable and no steeper than the road.

RECOMMENDED that:

Permission is granted to create an order to record the unprotected footpath as a Public Right of Way.

Voting: For – 5 Against - 2

18 Branksome Park and Canford Cliffs Residents Association Road Safety Petition

The Senior Road Safety & Network Management Engineer presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Vicky Moss, lead petitioner, introduced herself and set out the reasons for bringing the petition forward which primarily came down to the safety of residents and exercising a desire to apply to spend CIL monies on making improvements to the cycling and walking network

When asked about the involvement of Ward Councillors, the Lead Petitioner explained that she had liaised with Cllr Haines who was fully supportive. She had also contacted Cllr Iyengar, but had not received a response to date, although he had previously indicated that applications for CIL monies could stand more chance of success if a particular area was focussed upon, which the Branksome Park and Canford Cliffs Residents Association was not prepared to do because this was an issue that affected a large geographical area and therefore needed to be looked at as a whole.

Officers responded to Members' comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- It was not possible to provide Road safety statistics for the BCP area at this meeting as they were not to hand, although the number of KSI's had been reducing over the years and currently were at their lowest historical figures, although there were still a significant number of hotspots across the conurbation.

Cllr T Trent declared that he was a Member of the CIL Panel, as did the Chairman and the Director of Growth and Infrastructure

- CIL charges could not be levied against development projects based on direct impacts that would occur as a consequence of a development being built, instead this was left to a Section 106 Agreement which would be agreed as part of the planning application process.
- The neighbourhood element of CIL was administered through a poole-wide bid process. The strategic element of CIL had a timescale for officers to come back with a strategic position – this was “a separate pot” based on the level of development. If the council determined that there was a strategic need in terms of highway infrastructure, then this could be added to a list. It would be competing against other strategic needs, such as school places. There was a need for the council to be compliant with government criteria.
- On the current round of TCF funding, whilst some measures were conurbation-wide, the area in question was not included for specific infrastructure, partially due to constraints made by the Government during the bidding process, although this did not prohibit funds being sought in the future.

In summing up, the Chairman stated that he welcomed the work undertaken by the Residents Association in trying to promote walking and cycling within the area, and that there was a need to bid for any available funding for such measures, CIL was a limited pot of money, and the bid would be considered as part of that process.

Vicky Moss summed up her views and highlighted that she felt that the CIL application form was overcomplicated and that it was her aim to ensure area was funded better in terms of road safety.

The Director of Growth and Infrastructure stated that he would liaise with the petitioner to establish where there had been difficulties with the CIL form in order to help streamline the process for future bidders.

RECOMMENDED that Cabinet approves:

- a) Acknowledgement of the petitioners concerns and they be advised that in the absence of any significant accident record in this area we could not justify any road safety engineering interventions at present.**
- b) Forwarding of the petitioners concerns to Dorset Roads Traffic Policing Unit for their consideration relating to speed enforcement.**
- c) Informing the petitioners that the Council will investigate and assess options to enhance pedestrian and cycle facilities in the area but that no funding has been identified for implementing this work.**
- d) Advising the local resident group which submitted the petition that its bid for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Neighbourhood Portion funding is to be considered alongside all other similar bids received and a decision on potential funding will be made in due course.**

Voting: Nem. Con

19 Traffic Regulation Orders

The sub-reports were considered by the Transportation Advisory Group individually.

20 Traffic Regulation Orders - Advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders (Ref P2, T1 & S1 2020)

The Highways Design Team Leader and Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Officers responded to Members' comments and request for clarification, details included:

Talbot Drive

- Reference was made to a plan displayed on screen and it was explained that the proposed 3 metre reduction of available parking would provide a safe access for cyclists travelling along Wallisdown Road and allow them to enter Talbot Drive to allow access to the quieter Mossley Road route. This would involve creating a build-out which would allow cyclists re-joining the carriageway to see around parked cars before re-entering it.
- As this was only seeking to advertise, it was still possible for officers to see if there was an opportunity to allow parking elsewhere along the road or in the vicinity to address the concerns raised about loss of parking relating to use of the sports field.

Heathlands School

- The maximum ramp ratio for speed bumps was 1 in 12 although it was more common for speed bumps to be 1 in 15, although this was 1 in 20 on bus routes to provide bus

users with a more comfortable journey. There was a limitation of 75mm for the height of the hump.

- Installing a zebra crossing at the junction of Springwater Road had not been considered due to increased costs associated with installation. Raised crossings also had a higher profile although a zebra crossing could be installed retrospectively if there was a need identified.

St Stephen's Road

- In response to a general query, an officer confirmed that notices would be displayed in the vicinity of the area from at start of 21 day of public consultation or in some cases, a day or two before.

RECOMMENDED that:

The changes outlined in the appendix are advertised and implemented if no objections are received.

Voting: Nem. Con.

21 Traffic Regulation Orders - Advertisement of Changes to On-Street Disabled Bays (Ref P1 2020)

The Highways Design Team Leader and Traffic Management Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Officers responded to Members' comments and request for clarification, details included:

Aylesbury Road

- Aylesbury road was currently unrestricted parking which would be replaced with a 24hr parking space for a permit holder.

Fortescue Road

- This would be removing a disabled bay that was no longer needed.

RECOMMENDED that:

The changes outlined in the appendix are advertised and implemented if no objections are received.

Voting: Nem. Con.

22 Anti-Idling Outside Primary Schools Campaign

The sustainable transport and passenger accessibility officer presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'E' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Officers responded to Members' comments and requests for clarifications, details included:

- Recommendation b) would use the powers that permitted Local Authorities to issue PCN's to road users that do not switch off engines when asked to do so. Officers were hopeful that both teachers and parents of children at those schools within the trial programme could encourage car-users to get on board, without the need for enforcement action.

- Enforcement action, if needed, would be undertaken by Civil Enforcement Officers as only local authority officers had the power to issue PCNs.
- Work would still be undertaken to encourage modal shift.

Cllr F Rice moved to add a recommendation that would include information to schools about the carbon footprint of different types of transportation methods to educate parents on the impact of how journeys are made which was duly seconded.

- Recommendation c) was a proposal for all primary schools across the BCP area, but the council would need to work with schools to ensure that they were engaged with the project.
- The Director for Growth and Infrastructure was currently reviewing enforcement officers operations as part of the strategic car parking review, the intent being to review that the entire process was fit for purpose.
- Some money already used to purchase air quality monitors and there were resources available to install signs to “get the message across”

RECOMMENDED that Cabinet approve:

- a) An Anti-Idling Campaign be undertaken at a small number of primary schools using allocated DEFRA funding;**
- b) Appropriate enforcement action be used but as a last resort;**
- c) Should the campaign prove successful, it will be rolled out to additional schools across the BCP area in future years;**
- d) that officers include information to schools about the carbon footprint of different types of transportation methods to educate parents on the impact of how journeys are made**

Voting: Nem. Con.

23 Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership (DLEP): Programme Update

The Head of Engineering and Sustainable Design Team Leader presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'F' to these Minutes in the Minute Book. A powerpoint presentation was also given, which provided Members with site illustrations of the schemes within the DLEP programme.

Officers responded to Members comments and requests for clarification, details included:

- Officers had led an extensive consultation event for the Boundary Road Roundabout improvements in 2018 which had received over 3000 responses, there had also been face to face interviews conducted.
- Tree removals were sent out via press release and Officers had not taken removal of trees lightly and were undertaking a tree replacement programme. Works were due to commence in spring 2020 for a period 10-12 months on a phased basis, which would be confirmed at a later date once the tendering process was complete. All key stakeholders and indeed the public would be kept updated.
- Diversion routes would be advertised in advance during the construction period.
- Cycling accidents were not concentrated on one particular arm of the roundabout but there were certain hotspots spread out across the roundabout, collisions tended to be down to cars not observing cyclists already on roundabout. The improvements would narrow lanes for entry and exit onto roundabout in order to slow vehicles down.

The Chairman thanked Officers for the update report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted

Voting: Nem. Con.

24 Forward Plan

The forward plan was noted.

Duration of the meeting: 7.01 - 9.33 pm

Chairman at the meeting on
Wednesday, 26 February 2020