



Minutes – Road Safety Committee (RSC) Meeting held on 1st. April 2019 in the Memorial Hall.

Present: Ian Bell (IB) - Chairman, Chris Jennings (CPJ), Colin Johnson , Debbie Hall (DH) & Simon Ingram (SI – Part Time for Hall committee).

1. **Apologies** – Received from Steve Wright (SW) and John Lewis (JL).
2. **Approval of previous minutes and items arising.** – Were mainly agreed and approved. CPJ expressed a hope for more action regarding cyclists on Church Hill. IB said that this would be addressed more fully under Item 6 of the agenda.

IB expressed a wish to read out a statement for formal recording in the minutes as follows.

This is the 6th meeting since our inaugural meeting. We were set up at the instigation of the OPC who gives us 100% support.

Our constitution, in part, reads as follows:-

“The main purpose of the Road Safety Committee (RSC) is to monitor and provide actions, as necessary, to ensure the highest levels of safety on the roads within the Parish. Such actions will be aimed at reducing danger to villagers and visitors within the boundaries of the parish.”

I am pleased to say that the Committee has given its fullest attention and ability to achieving these ends. Not only that but with professionalism that has made my appointment, as Chairman, easier than it might otherwise have been. The committee has responded to perceived issues of safety in the parish & village, not with preconceived views but in response to analytical findings and responses to observations and complaints received from parishioners.

My confidence in the committee’s ability to achieve the objectives of our constitution is, therefore, unquestionable and I just wanted this fact to be placed on the record.

3. Discussion with Memorial Hall Management committee representative regarding parking issues outside the hall.

IB said that the previous comments presented by SI had been passed to the committee. They had been asked to come prepared to comment as they saw the situation. It was also mentioned by IB that the two absent committee members should, provide and inputs as to their opinions. Before this was to be carried out, he asked if SI had anything further to add.

SI suggested that we needed to come up with a joint solution for any further obstructions either on the pavement/road. He indicated that any ongoing issues should be, preferably, resolved by discussion than any harder action via the police. IB referred to the two inputs on this matter from SW & JL and these are attached to these minutes.

During the further discussion several points were made.

IB indicated that parking on the pavement is an issue plus vehicles left too close to corners. The RSC had received complaints about parking and as a result CPJ, via the RSC's interface with Police, contacted them. The Police had, at previous meetings indicated that as and when the RSC received complaints, they should pass them on and they (the Police) would take appropriate action. As a result of the complaints notifications, the Police visited the village and placed stickers on cars.

It was agreed by all that people have currently stopped parking on pavements and/or causing obstructions. Both corners at top and bottom of the Camp Road, where the issues had been, have now been resolved.

IB also referred members to that part of his interface with JL which indicated that the grass verge opposite the hall was not able to be excavated in any way due to its being part of the Toot.

The final agreed action was that, moving forward, the RSC would only act if complaints were received. In that event the RSC would first discuss this with either the Hall, if it was outside, or with parties direct. For their part SI indicated that the Hall management would ask Hall users to park sensibly.

ACTION: RSC & HALL

This being considered a satisfactory resolving of the issue IB indicated the matter closed and that SI was now free to leave the meeting.

The meeting then continued with ongoing Agenda Items.

4. Safety serviettes in Village Shop.

IB indicated that whilst Darren Blanche had undertaken to seek better printing solutions than previously obtained, he had not been successful. The Proposal, therefore, was now that the RSC take the action they had discussed at the last meeting. This being that the cost of carrying out any printing of the serviettes would not only be prohibitive but that there were also negative impact affects with the action that were not worth the exercise. The matter will now be dropped.

It was I indicated by CJ that perhaps the efforts of the school's children should not be wasted and could still be used to apply some sort of 'publicised' affect. From the discussion it was agreed that DH would laminate the children's posters previously chosen and IB would then display them around the village on the Notice Boards. It was also agreed that DH would add copies to the Oldbury Pigeon article.

ACTION: IB & DH

5. **Road Audit.** – As indicated and agreed in the previous RSC meeting minutes this action will be undertaken commencing in May.

ACTION: IB, SW & AT

6. **Cyclists.** – CPJ had indicated that it might be better to install some form of speed bumps on the hill to deter cyclists coming down at speed. IB indicated that the requirements (legally) and costs incurred for this via the SGC would be highly prohibitive. The chances of getting such action agreed, as well as with parishioners, was virtually impossible. CPJ accepted this fact.

7. **Parking.** – This had been fully covered under agenda Item 3.

8. SGC Interface.

a) **VAS** – IB referred all to the report issued as a result of his and SW's meeting with SGC (attached to these minutes). It was felt that the meeting had been very fruitful and he was encouraged by the actions undertaken by the SGC. It now remains for their input to be received and when they have been confirmed he would be able to produce an action and costed plan to be presented to the OPC for approval. This would be anticipated to be carried out in the next few months.

ACTION: IB

b). Stock lane and Kington lane update. – IB had previously sent the latest scheme action drawing to the committee and the work was now in hand via the SGC to be actioned accordingly. The drawing is attached to these minutes. **ACTION: Ongoing**

9. Anti-Speeding activities – Wheelie Bin Stickers.

IB indicated that we now had costings for the purchase of 30 & 20 M.P.H. stickers to be placed on the side of parishioner's SGC supplied bins in order to attract vehicle driver attention. His prime concern now was how to advise and ask for the parish to support the action. After discussion it was agreed that the best way would be for IB to write an article for the 4Ward, on the News Desk site and on the parish Notice Boards. Before doing this, however, there was the need to seek OPC approval for purchase of the stickers as if that approval was not forthcoming there would be no need to go further. It was agreed that IB would write to the chairman of OPC identifying the costs and plan and to ask their agreement to purchase the stickers. **ACTION: IB**

10. Report on Community Engagement Forum (CEF) meeting.

IB had previously forwarded the report of the recent meeting with the CEF and this is attached to these minutes. He reiterated that for the RSC to attend was only relevant for a very small proportion of the meeting and that it was of far more interest for the OPC to attend. This had been advised to the OPC and it was decided that, in future, the RSC would only attend if felt to be of value. **ACTION: CPJ**

11. Police interface. – The responses from the police were, at best, sparse and at worst non-existent and CPJ confirmed that he had received no response to several e-mails sent. It was agreed that this was something that could be brought up at the next CEF meeting. **ACTION: CPJ**

12. Presentation. – This is an ongoing action that will be picked up on in due course when felt to be timely. **ACTION: IB**

13. AOB – No extra items raised.

14. Date of next meeting. – This was set as Tuesday 4th June 2019, commencing at 19.45 in the hall's meeting room.



STEVE WRIGHT'S THOUGHTS ON PARKING AT MEMORIAL HALL – TO BE ADDED TO MINUTES OF THE RSC'S 1ST. APRIL MEETING UNDER AGENDA ITEM 3.

Ian

A good place to start is the Highway Code (HC). Page 82 refers to parking on the footway and throughout the Highway Code there are statements of MUST NOT and SHOULD NOT. Putting it simply the MUST NOT's have primary legislation from which to prosecute i.e. it's against the law to do it. The references to SHOULD NOT are not offences *per se* and to prosecute there must be some the primary legislation related to that subject.

The HC states that you SHOULD NOT park on the footway unless signs are evident which permit it. So, there is no primary legislation that absolutely forbids parking on the footway. Simon has quoted S22 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 as the primary legislation which states that you MUST NOT leave your vehicle in a dangerous position. Any prosecution for parking on the footway under S22 must therefore be proved as dangerous, would be subjective and open to interpretation. S22 was not created to prosecute parking on the footway but can encompass such.

The HC, somewhat perversely, mentions an unnecessary obstruction, which was used historically as a catch all for all sorts of parking offences. However, S22 does not mention 'unnecessary obstruction' nor does it mention signing which permits parking on the footway. It would be S22 that our police would use and the offence would be unnecessary obstruction, not dangerous – unless of course it was clearly dangerous. However, we all know that one man's 'accident waiting to happen' is another man's inconvenience.

On a practical sense, it would be South Glos who would put up signs but they would be reluctant in the extreme for reasons of precedent. I do not know of any other area (outside of London) where such signs exist but they are and are approved under Schedule 4, Part 4 of the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions (such a sign does exist and is approved for use in London).

I can't find any *change* in legislation – it may be that Simon had dealt with the obstruction element historically but not realised until now that the legislation is S22.

I do understand Simon's practical solution and is full of commons sense. However, if the police condone it then they would have a liability. Sadly, now that they have stickered some cars, they can't deny knowledge of the problem and a liability would be upheld. In addition, there is a vagueness to the suggestion that a double buggy should not be impeded etc. What else can and cannot be allowed? It sets a precedent elsewhere that is - it's ok to park on the path outside the hall so why can't I do that outside my house. People will take advantage of it.

I'll probably speak to Simon re this and see if he concurs with my interpretation of it.

Steve.



JOHN LEWIS'S THOUGHTS ON PARKING AT THE MEMORIAL HALL – TO BE ADDED TO THE MINUTES OF THE RSC'S 1ST. APRIL MEETING UNDER AGENDA ITEM 3.

NOTE: There was a need to clarify the initial response as is detailed below.

Hi Ian

Apologies again for being unable to attend the meeting. My thoughts on the hall parking are as follows:-

I feel this is a difficult situation to resolve adequately simply because of the width of the road. In an ideal world the best solution would be to remove some of the grass verge on the other side of the road from the hall in order to widen the road sufficiently to allow parking on the road and still leave enough room for vehicles to pass safely. This as you know would involve finding out who the land belonged to and getting planning plus the cost could be quite significant but would ultimately be the perfect solution

In the meantime, I am not sure that asking people when using the hall to park at the Anchor car park is very practical. It might be ok during the day but at night and during inclement weather I doubt people will bother to either come or simply ignore the ruling

I think the only practical solution for now is to allow people **ONLY WHEN USING** the hall to park on the pavement. I think it is more important to allow vehicles to get past especially emergency vehicles etc than to block the pavement as most people can walk round parked cars without too much difficulty. It is also important that they leave a clear access to the adjoining properties

I feel that up to now we have had some success in persuading people to park their cars and trailers off the pavement and think it is important to stress that parking on the pavement for the use of the hall is only "allowed" when there are functions on in the hall

And at all other times people should be encouraged to park sensibly

Ian Bell responded:-

Hi John,

Thank you for your input but before I accept it can I mention two issues that might make you consider altering what you have said.

In looking at all of this I have found out that the bank opposite the hall is owned by the SGC. The thing is, however, that the bank is part of the toot and is, therefore, recognised as being a safeguarded monument or however you want to call it. What it means is that if the SGC were to decide to 'shave' some of the bank away they would find it almost impossible to get over the legal requirements imposed on them to keep it as is. Apparently, this was all set up after a campaign by Jane Bradshaw some years back.

It is not for the RSC to 'allow' anyone to do anything other than to mention to the police issues if we have complaints which is what we have had so far. These complaints have only, in part, been about parking outside the hall and more about further up and down from the hall. We can. Of course, ignore things but if we receive complaints, we are duty bound to pass them on to the police to consider. Failing that we could do our own placing of stickers on cars but that it's kind of leading with our chin! Finally, we could just ignore it but I can tell you that the Chairman of the OPC would not be happy in that event.

I leave it to you to decide if, as a result of the above, you wish to restate your comments. I'm not trying to lead you here only pointing out, especially where the bank is concerned, that that option is a nonstarter.

John Lewis then responded:-

Hi Ian

With regards to point 1 I had my suspicions that this was part of the toot but was hoping that it might just have been possible under the circumstances to shave a bit off. However, it was a long shot so no surprise when you agreed it would be almost mission impossible to widen the road

With regards to point 2. My choice of words was perhaps misleading. I was trying to say that I think we have little alternative now but to let people park on the pavement during the time they are using the hall without taking any action against them such as putting stickers on windows or reporting them to the authorities. I would prefer that to parking on the road restricting access for other vehicles trying to get down camp Road, particularly emergency vehicles etc

The ideal solution would be for the hall to have its own car park at the rear but as I understand it the land belongs to Mr Knapp who is not keen on the idea to say the least

My other point is that I am keen not to encourage certain people to start parking their cars/ trailers back on the road as they do seem to have taken notice of our efforts to improve the road safety down camp road

As I said, I don't think there is a simple solution to this problem

Hope this clarifies my remarks

John.



REPORT FOR RSC ON MEETING HELD WITH SGC TO ESTABLISH ISSUES/APPROVAL FOR INSTALLATION AND USE OF A VAS SYSTEM IN OLDBURY VILLAGE.

Attendees: Steve Wright (SW) & Ian Bell (IB) for the RSC. Rob Wiltsher (RW) & Rob Joyce (RJ) for SGC.

Objective.

RW had already supplied a lot of data concerning getting approval and surrounding issues to purchase, commission and install a Vehicle Activated Speed (VAS) system in Oldbury on Severn. Due to surrounding extra questions a meeting had been set up to receive comment/approval/agreement from the SGC regarding the RSC's plans.

Meeting.

IB explained the background that there was a considered speeding problem in Oldbury and that the RSC had been set up by and with the full ongoing support of the Oldbury Parish Council (OPC). The RSC's remit was to identify, for the OPC, specific problems and recommended solutions. It had been determined that the acquisition of a VAS unit, would help mitigate the speeding issue.

IB indicated that the enablement of the VAS system was being considered as a 2 Phase approach and that the RSC was now seeking some guidance and assurances from the SGC before the OPC was required to fund the activities. Phase 1 being to mount the VAS unit on an existing pole in Chapel Road and Phase 2 being to install a new pole at the foot of Church Hill. After purchasing one Morelock VAS unit, it would then be used in either pole location as determined by vehicle monitoring requirements

Before explaining the content of the 2 Phases, IB passed over a series of photos taken with respect to where the siting of the VAS was hoped to be made (See attached data).

It was explained that Phase 1 was to seek approval from the SGC that the Morelock VAS unit, identified by the RSC (See attached data), was suitable and complied with SGC requirements. RJ wanted assurance that the VAS system complied with the necessary regulations, that is TSRDG (Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions). Morelock have indicated that it does meet these regulations and SW confirmed that in his understanding, from his previous background, that the specification complied. RJ seemed satisfied and SGC will confirm their acceptance in the near future. Once that is established the OPC would then be able to consider costs.

SW asked SGC to identify which specific 'ergonomic' displays on the VAS that they would be happy to have displayed and they agreed to let the RSC know. This being because not all the signs that are displayed from the VAS's 'library' are TSRDG approved.

Phase 1 is proposing that the existing pole that the SGC has sited in Chapel Road be used for mounting the VAS system. This pole has been used on many occasions by the SGC for traffic analysis and would suit the RSC's purposes very well. It was proposed that the SGC transfer ownership and liability of the existing Chapel Road pole from their asset register to that of the OPC. IB will check the extent to which the current OPC insurance of assets could cover all this in terms of public and personal liabilities. RW agreed to consult with their legal section in order to action this request.

Phase 2 involves the supply and erection of a second pole on a small section of land at the bottom of Church Hill. SGC were asked to establish ownership of this and RW agreed to do this. In addition, he agreed to check for any underground services through his NRSWA (New Roads and Streetworks Act) that might cause an issue. This was indicated as taking about four weeks. Once this was done and confirmed the RSC are then to contact the SGC's Streetcare Unit (Contact details were given to SW) in order to obtain a 'ballpark' costing for the pole and associated works. At that point IB could then provide a full costing to the OPC. RJ did mention that the SGC might be able to carry out the work at no cost to the OPC but this would need to be determined and confirmed later.

SGC would prefer to do the work themselves as it may involve works on the highway itself but in any case, the OPC would require S50 and S117 licences to be approved under NRSWA terms. The RSC already has data on these licences and applications would be completed once the RSC had established ownership of the installation site and approximate costs (if any). The OPC would have to pay for the licences but again these costs would be established with the SGC's Streetcare Unit later.

It was confirmed that such licences are not required for any activity that merely involves mounting the VAS unit on the pole in Chapel Road. SGC also confirmed that they would not require any Risk Assessment of method statement for such an activity. The OPC's ownership of that activity and their work method would be their responsibility.

POST MEETING NOTE:

Subsequent to the meeting IB received the following confirmation/comment from RW.

The area identified at the bottom of Church Hill is confirmed as an adopted highway and, therefore, under the auspices of the SGC. Due to the proximity of some separated properties at the proposed location it will be necessary to consult with their occupants. The properties in question are named as Christmas Cottage and Pill House and objections, if any to the proposed pole installation, will be taken. RW has said that he will carry out this task at the same time as the NRSWA action.

RW also confirmed that transferring the pole ownership in Chapel Road will form part of our Section 117 application.

Finally, RW confirmed that he would start the NRSWA utility search that day (25th. March or the day after) and will advise IB of any aspects that the RSC should be made aware of.



REPORT ON ATTENDANCE AT THORNBURY, ALVESTON & SEVERN – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FORUM (CEF) – 19.03.2019.

NOTE: Due to CPJ not being able to attend, IB & SW attended in his place. As SW is not available IB has chosen to record this report formally and especially as it is believed that the OPC has a need to consider the comments made.

Report.

IB has attended these meeting before when he was an Oldbury councillor. The key to the CEF's is in the title in that it is a forum for the community to engage with the SGC, Police & Fire Service plus others. Equally, it is a means of updating attendees as to actions that are and/or have been taken regarding various issues.

What must be decided is the 'worth' to anyone attending and that needs to be considered by the OPC as well as the RSC as it is far more relative to the OPC in overall content than for the RSC.

In terms of this attendance, therefore, I have recorded that which I deemed to be relevant to the RSC.

Thornbury has a far higher issue with speeding in and around the town than we have in Oldbury. That is not to say, however, that we should discard this as it is an issue that the authorities see and any issues, we bring forward on that score would not fall on deaf ears!

Conclusion.

A lot of what goes on is irrelevant from the RSC's point of view but there are 'nuggets' within the 2 hours spent there that cannot be ignored.

One key issue is that it gives one the chance to 'network' with all the parties and to make ourselves 'visible' to the authorities. This is also the potential that opens us, once we are known, to raise our own issues as and when they occur.

The RSC needs to decide as to whether it is acceptable to send a member to the meetings for a couple of hours every four months or so.

I will add my report to the next RSC meeting agenda for discussion as to what we wish to do with respect to attendance at the CEF meetings.

20.03.2019.