



DITCHLING PARISH COUNCIL

Ditchling Village Hall 18 Lewes Road Ditchling East Sussex BN6 8TT
 Tel: 01273 844733 Email: parishoffice@ditchling-pc.gov.uk
 www.ditchling-pc.gov.uk

Minutes of the Traffic Committee Meeting held on Monday 17 2023 July at 6.00pm at Ditchling Village Hall, Ditchling.

Present: Cllr. R. Stapleton (Chair), Cllr. R. Orme, Cllr. P. Farrands, Cllr. J. Barna, Cllr. C. Mills (Westmeston PC), Cllr. T. Large (Streat), Julia Goodbourn (Ditchling Society) and Sarah Mamoany (Clerk).

Public Participation:
 1 member of the public

1.	Apologies for absence No apologies were received.	
2.	Declarations of Interest No declarations of interest were made.	
3.	To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 15 November 2022 The minutes were resolved and signed by the Chair as an accurate record of the meeting. The following updates were noted by the Cllr. Stapleton. - the survey north of Folders Lane did not proceed due to costs and relevance to the report. - a second survey was carried out on Clayton Road and the results noted that 80% of traffic was in excess of the speed limit. - a meeting was held with MP Maria Caulfield who was encouraging in respect of possible funding sources both regionally and nationally and was supportive of the 20's plenty scheme. - Jon Wheeler (ESCC Highways) did not comment on Phase 1 of the report but had sent in his views on Phase 2 which had been circulated. - a meeting was held on the 17 November with Motion and the Clerk was asked to circulate the minutes of this meeting to Traffic Committee members.	Clerk
4.	To review Phase 2 traffic consultancy report The report and associated maps were circulated and the general view was that the costs were high but a satisfactory range of solutions were offered for the various locations in the village. Cllr. Mills commented that the report was useful with high aspirations and good suggestions. The gateways were a positive suggestion and were in keeping with the rural area but too many signs can sometimes be counterproductive. Julia Goodbourn commented that she would like more feedback on costs and what measures may be the most effective and therefore be good value for money. In addition, she noted concerns in respect of the street scape which she felt little consideration had been given to and no reference made to 'quiet lanes'. Cllr. Stapleton commented that he understood there was not a way to measure the value of one scheme against another in road safety terms and the Council would need to consider	

	<p>perhaps looking at prioritising one large scheme or several smaller ones. It was noted that one of the comments Jon Wheeler had made related to the fact that whilst using brick pavers to define pedestrian crossing points might be more aesthetically pleasing it might not be viable due to higher maintenance costs.</p> <p>Cllr. Farrands noted it was important to prioritise what the village wants and supported the report and advised the committee to recommend it for approval to the Council.</p> <p>Cllr. Orme supported the report and noted this would be a long-term programme with phased implementation which would potentially be difficult to prioritise. It was noted that the design and regulatory costs needed to be added to Motion's estimates of construction cost. Based on the recent example of the Spatham Lane speed reductions these are likely to be significant additions. Cllr. Orme recommended the report was accepted and individual Councils would then need to take forward as appropriate.</p> <p>Cllr. Large noted that he supported the reduction in speed limit for Streat as speeding is an issue with traffic, including agricultural vehicles but acknowledged that as the Parish was small it would be difficult to raise funds knowing the cost of the Spatham Lane speed reduction project but appreciated that Streat had been included in the consultation.</p> <p>It was noted that in some locations speed limits needed to be introduced prior to other traffic calming measures. In respect of the requirements of the Highway Authority and Police that speed limits need to be self-enforcing, this meant that the road conditions should be conducive to the speed suggested.</p> <p>Cllr. Stapleton suggested one of the options that would potentially be effective for a limited cost would be the introduction of SID's (Speed Indicator Devices) to assist with speeding, these would cost around £7,500. The Community Speed Watch group could assist with this as well as they would need to be moved around locations and the batteries changed if they were not solar powered units.</p> <p>It was noted that it would be useful to have input from Jody Blake (Conservation Officer) at the SDNP on the report and the Clerk advised she had contacted her and was awaiting a response.</p> <p>It was resolved that the Committee would recommend the report to their individual Councils for approval.</p>	Clerk
5.	<p>To receive comments from ESCC Highways on Phase 2 Report</p> <p>Jon Wheeler had submitted his comments on the report and the main points are noted below. In addition, a further more detailed report was sent which the Clerk was asked to circulate to the Committee.</p> <p><i>Ensuring that any proposed interventions are appropriate and can demonstrably bring down traffic speeds so that the speed limit is self-enforcable (eg do not require any additional enforcement by the Police)</i></p> <p><i>Considering the whole life cost and maintenance of potential interventions – for example, I recognise the use of red brick on raised tables etc is aesthetically pleasing and in keeping with existing materials area. However, particularly in the carriageway, there are long term maintenance implications of using such materials as they can become loose over time (especially if larger vehicles go over them), start to rock and need to be replaced (which sometimes means a short term reinstatement using blacktop). There is a need to consider the whole life cost of anything that is introduced on the highway and whether more cost effective alternatives can be used which give the same look/feel (eg. imprint material that looks like brick paviours)</i></p>	Clerk

	<p><i>I note the introduction of raised tables in the area but a few words of caution. Firstly bus companies do not tend to like raised tables (particularly short ones) as depending on the vehicle type the rear end can ground on the down ramp; we have an example in Eastbourne town centre where we are experiencing this at the moment. Secondly, as vehicles go up and down raised tables (however fast or slow), they can create noise and vibration. That may or may not be acceptable to local residents/businesses particularly in the village centre and bearing in mind the close proximity of some historic buildings.</i></p> <p><i>Costs – we are seeing highway construction costs increasing especially in the last 2 to 3 years. As highlighted in Motion’s report, the costs referred to do not include non-construction costs such as design fees, survey fees, Local Authority costs (approvals, licences, commuted sums), Statutory Undertakers’ mitigation works, or legal costs for implementing any Highway Agreements or Traffic Regulation Orders. Re the survey fees, this would include topographical, drainage, ground penetration/utility, road construction & cellar surveys to help inform the design work. Would also need to include contingency for any risks/issues that occur as well as to cover the volatility in construction inflation at the moment. Therefore, these non-construction costs need to be factored into the equation.</i></p> <p>Motions response had also responded to the comments noted by Jon Wheeler which were circulated.</p>	
6.	<p>To consider approved traffic report paper in respect of mitigation from development outside the Parish</p> <p>The paper was circulated which has been approved by the full Council. Cllr. Orme advised that this will require political support including County Councillors.</p>	
7.	<p>To consider the next steps and any associated costs</p> <p>Cllr. Stapleton suggested that the Council should hold a public consultation in October/November but it was unclear what format this would be in as the report was lengthy and would require a summary report ideally. It was agreed that all the options in the report would need to be made available for the public to consider and that a survey/questionnaire would have to be put together to obtain feedback. It was noted that it should be made clear to the public that the project was work in progress with no immediate progression but to keep the momentum of the traffic consultancy work going as residents were aware the project was ongoing.</p> <p>The question the practicalities of putting together the consultation materials by the suggested date was raised and the Clerk noted that the Council were also discussing other projects/consultations but currently no timescales were clear due to the Business Plan meeting being put back to September. The Clerk would obtain costs from Motion in respect of them arranging the consultation process and materials.</p> <p>It was noted that Motion had suggested a parking survey should be carried out and the Clerk was requested to obtain quotes for this from them and check if the S106 funds available could be used for this purpose. The purpose of this would be to identify if spaces could potentially be removed under some of the scheme suggestions, by understanding who is using what parking areas and when. It was noted that Westmeston and Streat would not be included in this survey.</p> <p>It was agreed a further Traffic Committee meeting should be held in early September to discuss the practicalities around the consultation and how it could be achieved.</p>	<p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p> <p>Clerk</p>

	Westmeston and Streat both need to report back to their respective Councils for their views on the report and consultation options, prior to the next meeting. The Clerk would chase the Conservation Officer in respect of timescales for comments on the report.	Cllr. Mills/ Cllr. Large Clerk
8.	Items for information or future agenda Comments from SDNP Conservation Officer Consultation date and materials	
9.	Date of next meeting Wednesday, 6 September 2023 at 6pm it was noted this date could be subject to change.	

The meeting closed at 7.15pm

DRAFT