

## WATERBEACH PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Highways Committee held on the 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023 at 7.00pm

### 22/01 THOSE PRESENT / APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

**Present:** Cllrs I Gilzean (IG), J Williams (JW), B Williams (BW), M Bavester (MB).

**Apologies:** Cllr D Smart (DS).

**In attendance:** V Fowler (Assistant Clerk), District Cllr P Bearpark (PB), J Grant (JG (via Zoom)), 1 member of public.

### 22/02 - OPEN FORUM

A member of public noted that they have emailed the Parish Council to state concern regarding traffic that travels along Denny End Road (towards the A10 junction) and how difficult it is to safely cross the road with her children on school runs (near Providence Way/Winfold Road). It was questioned when the MVAS would be installed and how speeding traffic can be slowed. The member of public asked whether measures such as build outs, chicanes, narrowing of roads or speed bumps could be implemented to slow traffic and make the area safer. It was mentioned that a lot of this gets raised at planning meetings and is already within the Neighbourhood Plan, along with the 20mph speed limit that needs to be implemented.

This item was further discussed under agenda item 22/11.

### 22/03 - MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No interests declared.

### 22/04 - MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes from the 18<sup>th</sup> August 2021 were approved and will be signed as a true record.

**In favour:** Cllrs BW and IG      **Abstentions:** 2 (Cllrs JW and MB were not present at the meeting)

### 22/05 – HOW TO ACCESS S106 FOR VILLAGE PUBLIC REALM

PB noted that Tam Parry (TP) could not attend the meeting, however when questioned how the S106 will be delivered and who will be responsible for delivery it, County Council or the developers, TP informed PB that U&C will have to deliver the S106. PB added that it is in progress to decide who will get what of the S106 money, adding that Waterbeach will get the bulk of the money (which is approximately £450k in total). WPC need to think about funding in the realm, and there may be some RLW funding also, however this is taking a long time to progress. It was noted that we need to consider how items get progressed together on the Greenway and the S106. PB added that the S106 agreement is a condition of the planners and needs to go in before 750 houses are occupied (a scheme has to be proposed by U&C). The S106 would be between Waterbeach, Landbeach and Cottenham. PB noted U&C would like for WPC to agree a concept or suggest alternatives that could be agreed to, in order that this is progressed. It was added that any potential agreements will need to be taken to the villagers to allow for their comments.

It was suggested that Way Lane should be dropped out of the scheme for U&C and wait for the money to come from RLW to progress with Way Lane, as RLW have responsibility for that area, then concentrate on the other areas, such as the 20mph zones, safe walking route, school crossing etc. PB noted that the greenway will come through the village all the way to the barracks entrance, the benefit is that this will provide funding that will add to the S106 (the consultation for this has not yet happened). Concern was raised over the route of the greenway, due to parking and traffic already within the village.

PB stated that the item currently being debated is how close to the railway the greenway will be positioned, one concern about it being so close to the railway, is that the area is prone to flooding, so it may be brought closer to the A10. There were 2 proposed routes, one that came through the village, and the other that went along Cambridge Road.

Cllr JW stated that she had been to a GCP workshop and asked if GCP could communicate with WPC stating that it will be poor if WPC only find information out via consultations.

**Action PB** to contact GCP and request that they come and speak to WPC about the greenways.

## **22/06 – DISCUSS ANDREW CAMERON’S PRESENTATION**

Standing orders were suspended.

It was noted that there will be lost parking which could negatively impact local business. Cllr IG stated that a number of residents contact him to state that they are already unable to park near the village amenities and added that commuters park their cars in Waterbeach when catching the train into London. It was also mentioned that a number of cars are parked and left overnight. It was suggested that a study could be arranged to monitor how much traffic there is, how many people are on foot and how busy areas are around 9am to see where people are parking and where they go. PB added that there are some measures that could impact parking, such as the large junctions within the village, these could be reduced potentially. It was argued that large HGV’s and agricultural vehicles use the junctions. PB further noted that County Council would be able to provide the measurements actually required at a junction. A consultation was proposed to send to the villagers in order to get their feedback to provide a snapshot of the village at various times throughout the day. For example, a leaflet drop or a survey from WPC to all residents both face to face and online if necessary. It was suggested that this could be done through the Waterbeach Forum. It was noted that the first step would be to get an estimate of costs for certain proposals (i.e., a crossing at the school/chicane along Denny End Road) to provide an itemised list of items that villagers can then prioritise on their requirements. **Action - PB** to ask Andrew Cameron to provide estimates of itemised costings to allow residents to choose their preferred priorities to then go to consultation (in conjunction with the Neighbourhood Plan) which could be communicated out via Beach News. It was noted that the member of the public that spoke at the start of the meeting would be useful in terms of giving her opinions and experience of traffic.

It was further noted that the consultation on the greenways will be in June/July followed by a second consultation, this could overlap with WPC’s potential consultation, which highlights the need for GCP to come and speak to WPC. It could be that the two are combined, however it was further added that WPC do not wish to dilute from the village need.

It was questioned whether U&C had input into the greenways, PB noted that he put GCP and U&C in touch as the two schemes could potentially cover some of the same ground. PB stated that he would contact the GCP to ensure they are communicating with WPC going forwards **action PB**.

Standing orders were reinstated.

## **22/07 – UPDATE ON GREENWAYS**

Covered under agenda item 22/06.

## **22/08 – CONVERSION OF STATION ROAD LEVEL CROSSING TO FULL**

JG provided an update on the Station Road level crossing noting that the public enquiry will start on the 12<sup>th</sup> April 2023 and runs for the week. It was noted that the project is mostly to upgrade the signalling at Waterbeach’s section of railway along with a few others. There are seven level crossings that need converting, 1 is on old fashioned gate and the other 6 are half barriers. The proposal is for full barriers (called ‘manually controlled barriers with obstacle detection’). Currently when the train is 30/40 seconds away, the train goes over a treadle, which starts the sequence for the barriers to

come down, then 20 seconds after that, the train passes. However currently if there is anything obstructing the crossing there is no way to stop the train and it is currently easy for people to walk over the railway even when the barriers are down, as such they want to upgrade to full barriers. The item that starts the sequence is further away, the lights come on, the left hand barrier comes down, a check occurs for anything on the crossing, once that is clear, the right barrier comes down and it checks again that there is nothing on the crossing, only then will the train be allowed through. Most of the current ones, the sequence has to be started by the signaller, who then has to look at CCTV to see if the crossing is clear which means that timings can be random. JG noted that it was stated in a meeting that the signals would be positioned as close as possible to keep the time down, however it will ultimately be longer as the signals will be further back. Part of the problem is due to the modelling that has been done, so we don't have definite numbers as yet, but we should get them for how long the barriers will be down.

The remit will include the effect on passengers but more information will come out in the inspector's report.

JG stated that there will not be any issues as a result of the new town development, as there is no level crossing there. They will also want to replace Bannold Road, but that is a different project, which is part of the Ely North Junction Project. They also want to do something on Burgess Drive, but again this is a separate project. It was questioned whether Burgess Road crossing will remain open, JG stated that it has to, even if it gets closed to vehicles, they will have to keep it open to pedestrians.

It was questioned how far traffic would be queuing back when the gates are closed on Station Road, PB added that on the traffic modelling report detailed this, but within the report, the delay was listed as 7 seconds, which is more likely to be 7 minutes.

**Action - JW** agreed to send out the enquiry website link to all.

#### **22/09 – BURGESS DROVE**

It has been reported that the fire brigade cannot access Burgess Drive at the crossing, farmers used to roll the area, but can no longer do so because of what has been laid down instead. PB stated that as the County Council have adopted it, they should be maintaining it. **Action – PB** to ask District Councillor Anna Bradnam which officer WPC should be contacting about this issue. It was further noted that this has previously been raised with network rail, adding that the barrier also prevents the IDB from digging the ditch.

#### **22/10 – GIBSON CLOSE**

Issues were raised regarding the inconsiderate parking along Gibson Close which poses a health and safety risk to both pedestrians and other road users. It was added that there was a proposal to change this in some way, in line with the Neighbourhood Plan. It was suggested that WPC write to Highways to ask for help on stopping the parking along Gibson Close as it is Highways owned land.

**Action VF** – request that this goes to the next full Parish Council meeting as an agenda item.

#### **22/11 – DENNY END ROAD**

Standing orders were suspended.

The member of public stated that she and her children cross the road on the corner of Providence Way at Denny End Road and then continue up to cross outside the school with the lollipop lady. It was noted that the lollipop lady does not always feel safe as a result of the speed of the traffic travelling through the village. The member of public stated that the village would benefit from speed calming measures between Winfold Road and Providence Way such as a chicane or a pelican crossing, which would force traffic to slow down (the example of Milton speed calming measures

were provided). It was added that speed bumps create a lot of noise for residents that are next to them, especially at night. The member of public noted that the traffic tends to speed up as it is heading out of the village, in the A10 direction. A narrowing of the road was suggested, with an island in the middle, however it was stated that users would not feel safe waiting in the middle of the road. It was noted that when construction traffic starts to come along Denny End Road, the issue could be heightened. An LHI could be applied for, but this could not be done now until 2023. It was further noted that there are S106 obligations, but it was questioned what could be done in the meantime. The MVAS could be located along Denny End Road and a narrowing of the road would be effective in slowing traffic, ultimately it would be County Council's decision. It was suggested that WPC should contact Highways to ask for support and that the member of public could help evidence the issue.

It was agreed that the speed reducing measures along Way Lane are not effective.

It was also noted that a proper crossing should be put in place outside of the school. It was agreed that WPC would contact Highways order to ask what measures can be taken to reduce speeding traffic and to be advised on what is available in order to get a petition going.

Standing orders were re-instated.

It was further noted that there was an agreement in place to tarmac pathways from Denny End Road up to the cycle path on the A10, adding that there are no cycle provisions and that there is currently just mud along the route. PB stated that he made attempts to have a condition that included pathways, however it was rejected. JW also added that councillors raised the footway and lighting and stated that Tam Parry reported that it does not need to be done as part of the innovation, as it is covered under the U&C remit. SCDC were to provide an update on the progress.

#### **22/12 – ZEBRA CROSSING MAINTENANCE**

It was noted that there are a large number of potholes opening up and that maintenance work to fill in the holes was inadequate. As such, the zebra crossing needs to be properly repaired and re-painted. **Action – IG** to contact District Councillor Anna Bradnam to request that the work is done again expressing disapproval that the job was not done properly in the first place.

#### **22/13 – 20 MPH RESTRICTIONS ON THE VILLAGE**

PB stated that WPC need to make a submission if we want to proceed with this item. WPC need to agree where they want the restrictions to apply. It was further noted that this is being looked into on a case-by-case basis, therefore it is vital that any facts included are accurate.

#### **22/14 - MOBILE VEHICLE ACTIVATED SIGN**

IG noted that he would be happy to erect the MVAS, but would require the help from another (Nigel Seamarks has previously agreed to help). IG stated that he would initially like to install it on Bannold Road and it could then be moved around to other areas such as Denny End Road. It was questioned whether WPC can have data from the other traffic measures within the village, JG noted that he would send IG an email with some more information on this matter **action JG**.

Meeting closed: 21:05.