

These are the unadopted Crookham Village Parish Council Minutes of the extra-ordinary meeting of 23 November 2009, held in the WI Hall, The Street, Crookham Village. Please refer to the Minutes of the December 2009 meeting for any amendments.

Present: Cllr. Simon Ambler (Chairman)
Cllr. Julia Ambler
Cllr. Philip Ashton
Cllr. Peter Crawley
Cllr. David Jackson
Cllr. Robert Ney
Cllr. Lee Randall
Cllr. Brian Whyatt
Mrs. Carol Leversha (Clerk)

In attendance: County Cllr. Jenny Radley and Ward Cllr. John Bennison. There were 33 Members of the public present.

214/09 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

215/09 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed all to this extra-ordinary meeting. The Chairman explained how we had arrived at the present position with regard to the Crondall Road Scheme. He said that many had commented on the scheme advertised in the Parish Magazine. That scheme had been supported by the Parish Council and the necessary advertisements had been placed. On the original plan the 30mph had been sited down toward Zephon Common Lane. The Council had been unaware that there had been a change to the position originally agreed. He was sure that there would be debate at a future council meeting about how this had come about. What he wanted to do this evening was to concentrate on speaking on this revised scheme which was why this meeting had been called at short notice. Cllr. Radley had prevailed upon HCC to extend the deadline for the Council to form a view on the revised scheme which would be fed back to HCC taking into account representations made already and what may come out of tonight's meeting. He explained how members of the public could speak at the Public Participation agenda item and he asked that the residents concentrate on what is being proposed. This would not be a question and answer session – Councillors would listen to residents comments and then when public participation finished the Councillors would debate the matter and make a decision. He expressed sincere thanks to Cllr. Radley and all the parish councillors and the two residents who were at yesterday's site meeting in the most appalling weather. The officer who is doing the scheme cannot be present tonight but he has had confirmed by the Legal Section of HCC that a further 60 metres could be added to the 120 metres already proposed. This would take it to the most southerly entrance of Crondall House and we are indebted to our County Councillor for her intervention on our behalf.

216/09 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA

Standing declaration from Cllr. B. Whyatt as a Member of the Crondall Road Action Group – this being a personal interest.

217/09 CONSIDER CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

The Chairman reminded Members of their duty to consider any crime and disorder implications that might arise from any decision they might make at this meeting.

218/09 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (maximum of 3 minutes per speaker)

The Chairman sought permission to adjourn the meeting. He reminded those present that the purpose of the meeting was to debate the revised 30 mph limit. He asked those who wished to speak to give their name and address so that the clerk could note them for the Minutes.

Mr. & Mrs. G. Plumb – Crondall House

Mr. Plumb said he had circulated by email a draft resolution, which essentially was to seize HCC willingness to extend the limit but press for it to be further out. His main points were :-

1. He disagreed with any suggestion of acceptance and restart at another time for two reasons:
 - achievement already in 2005; no sympathy for a third attempt.
 - we have a case for improving something on the table; we won't have a case for getting that improvement as a one-off exercise.
2. He had spoken to Andy Kettlewell and asked him if this was mandatory. Mr. Kettlewell was unclear but had fixation for "correctness". However he had sent e-links and it was abundantly plain that criteria are not mandatory; they are guidelines.
DfT Circular 1/06 Where the speed limit commences at the village boundary, [signs]should be located as near as practicable to the start of the development, so that drivers see housing at the same time as the signs, reinforcing the visual message for reduced speed.
3. House density is low but danger is high. He said he knew what it's like to cut his hedge. You take your life in your hands walking with small children, or riding a horse round the bend. He has 2 dangerous exits; next exit along is from a stable; horsebox maybe exiting? The police will have a stereotyped mindset. They need persuading too.
4. Accidents - he has a full record available
 - 19 recorded in Crondall Rd - Two Ponds northwards (certain to be others)
 - 8 outside their house on the bend, any could be potentially fatal - one vehicle bounced off the telephone pole at high speed - the driver didn't see the bend.
 - 6 caused serious damage to their property
 - 3 cars ended up within their property
5. Suggestion of 40 mph on apex of bend – NO - 3 reasons
 - no visibility of what is beyond from either direction - contrary to guidelines
 - cars always slow after a sign and accelerate before. Either way involves speeding at most dangerous point
 - contrary to guidelines in DfT Circ1/06 *Where the speed limit commences at the village boundary, [signs]should be located as near as practicable to the start of the development, so that drivers see housing at the same time as the signs, reinforcing the visual message for reduced speed.*

6. That is best reason for swapping 30mph for 40mph.

- from south - visual Orchard/ZCL/blind bend
- people already used to the limit point. Most sensible place to put it.

Tony Gowerjones -Orchard House.

He said that the police view of that road is that they have threatened prosecution if vehicles are parked outside his home – by that he would find that an oxymoron if police threatened to prosecute parking on the correct side of the road.

Righard Gwynne - Kingsmead

He said that more effective safety measures would be needed eventually, The CRAG was formed last year by residents and he seemed to have taken a lead in this. CRAG wanted to make Crondall Road safer for pedestrians and other users. He then read out the aims of CRAG.

Annette Blackwell – Burnt House

She had sent an email to the PC but had not had a reply. She read to the meeting the email which she had sent about the difficulties of emerging from Zephon Common Lane..

Richard Spink – Mede House

He said he lived in Hartley Wintney previously and he cited the signs which were used in that village. He thought Crookham Village should have the same sort of signing. He thought there were insufficient 30 mph reminders.

No other residents wished to speak. The Chairman then reconvened the meeting.

219/09 CRONDALL ROAD – REVISED EXTENSION OF 30 MPH LIMIT

The Chairman invited Councillors to speak.

Cllr. Whyatt wished to draw Members attention to an email he had sent on 13 June. He read extracts from that email and asked Members to visualise Crondall Road and the Barley Mow in Winchfield – these are very similar areas and he could see no reason why the same criteria could not be used. He stated that at the far side of Winchfield, Taplins Farm Lane has a 30 mph limit 264 metres from the junction with no houses and two farm entrances.

Cllr. Crawley said that many of us would not disagree that Zephon Common Lane is the right site for the extension. He thought we should renegotiate if possible and would be happy to propose that move if it would not hold up everything.

Cllr. Ney said basically we either have to vote on the plan as it is – but including the extra 60 metres – or we can have no change to the 30mph and get the other safety measures put in. We need to give HCC the okay tomorrow. Cllr. Ney then drew attention to the various points on the screen where the safety measures were. He had been assured that if we can give an answer to HCC tomorrow that the work will be done before Christmas. If we reject the proposed 30mph limit we can still go ahead with the other safety works. As we have been

working on this for 14 months he is anxious that we get the safety measures done asap. In response to Cllr. Crawley`s question as to the likelihood of getting the 30mph extended past the present offer, he believed it would not happen. Cllr. Crawley said he thought it would probably take months to renegotiate.

The Chairman reminded Members that we had accepted the principle of the scheme with the extended 30 mph. Any changes to the speed limit require the support of all formal consultees which is why we are effectively being asked that question separately. We must go back with an answer as to whether we accept the 30mph extension but it will only go ahead if it has the support of the statutory bodies and our County Councillor. Within the response it gives you two choices support/oppose but there is plenty of space for additional comments. Whichever decision Members make tonight comments can be fed back.

Cllr. Whyatt asked for confirmation that in the last 2 hours the Chairman had received an email confirming that the extra 60 metres was possible. He was concerned that we were to vote on something for another 60 metres when we could vote for something like 120 metres.

Cllr. Jackson said as far as the facts go on the ground – if we think there is a significant advantage we should accept the current proposals now and seek further extension later if justified by data. He said how extremely irritated he is by the way this has been handled by the traffic department. TROs are dated 2006, yet the original proposals have now been changed to “meet the guidelines” – guidelines which haven`t changed in the meantime. This suggests changes are due to differing judgements by two traffic engineers. He was uncomfortable that we had been backed into a corner now and denied a chance to seek re-establishment of the original extension to the 30mph limit due to time constraints. “Experts” were paid to put this scheme on the table and they had wasted our time by changing things after our careful public consultation exercise. He wished a strong letter to be sent to the senior officer of Highways with regard to this issue.

Cllr. Radley said her understanding was that the Highways Officer`s understanding of the guidelines had led to his judgement based on his experience. She believed we needed to use the SID and follow this up when we have evidence to support revisiting the scheme.. This is the first stage of the process and she strongly believed we should support this and then move forward when we have the evidence of the SID.

Cllr. Whyatt said we have 19 years of data showing that Crondall Road is in dire need of traffic calming measures.

Cllr. J. Ambler said we are between a rock and hard place. However, it strikes her that if we accept the new position we then have the opportunity using the SID to show whether the 30 mph needs to be moved further out.

The Chairman asked for support for Cllr. Jackson`s proposal that we write to the Director expressing our dissatisfaction with the way this matter has been dealt

with and in particular that traffic engineers should have the agreement of the police to their proposals before they ever come to the table with a scheme.

RESOLVED: Write to the Director as per Cllr. Jackson`s suggestion.

RESOLVED: Confirm that this Council supports the 30 mph speed limit extension to Crondall Road as shown on the revised plan from HCC, plus the additional 60 metres as stated in HCC email of Monday, 23 November 2009.

RESOLVED: This Council supports the safety measures as previously consulted upon.

RESOLVED: That after SID monitoring of the speeds - if this shows justification to move the 30 mph out further to return to HCC seeking further measures.