

CORRESPONDENCE for 9th January 2020 meeting.

From Mark Hadley re A40 Traffic calming – section 106 money paid 2nd December

The amount is higher as the developer has paid an additional money to us to cover the surfacing work that was planned as part of their S278 works. This will allow a uniform surface and not leave you with an interim patch and mismatched lining.

Mark

From Paul Stevenson re HGV's on the Pontshill to Bill Mills road

Paul Stevenson <paul.stevenson8@gmail.com>

Fri 20/12/2019 03:14

Dear Parish Clerk

I thank the Parish Council for their letter regarding HGVs accessing Cobrey Farms. The contents of the letter I find very disappointing for a number of reasons.

- a. It does not state who the local residents were that met with the company in October: they certainly were not from Bill Mills.
- b. Paragraphs 5 and 6 are confusing. Para 5 states all (presumably includes HGVs) traffic leaving the Poultry side of the business are by condition and appropriate signage requires traffic to leave towards Walford thereby avoiding Pontshill altogether. However, Paragraph 6 discusses HGV traffic arriving and leaving via Pontshill.. On that basis, there is no requirement for the Poultry side of the business traffic to not arrive and leave via the village. Why wasn't the same condition applied to the Vegetables/Fruit Farm as the 2 businesses are close to each other?
- c. Paragraph 7 states the journeys are quite lawful. Given the present signage it is obvious they are. However, the sign at the entrance to the unclassified road from the A40 states 7.5 Tonnes except for access. My question is, 'Does that also mean return journeys EXITING back to the A40, a distance of 2 miles, are also lawful?' In my view, No. If the return journeys were made via Coughton Corner Walford as per the Poultry side of the business this would reduce the number of movements through the village to 3 per day during the peak picking season. As stated earlier, the entrances/exits from the Poultry Farm and the Vegetables/Fruit Farm are within close proximity to each other. Also, it would mean no conflict in traffic between HGVs and other vehicles from the A40 Junction as the vehicles would be travelling in the same direction thus avoiding the need to reverse. The reason it is not done is because HGVs wishing to gain access to the A40 would have to do so via Kerne Bridge/Whitchurch and this means an increase in miles and time leading to an increase in cost.
- d. Mr Chinn may well talk to the contractors regarding speed and general driver discipline but I suggest he is whistling in the wind. Why? Again it is obvious. If an HGV driver is faced with a car/SUV and similar vehicles in the unclassified road through Bill Mills Pontshill, which driver is more likely to reserve their vehicle? I doubt it will be the HGV one.

e. In my original letter to the Parish Council I pointed out there is a bridge at Bill Mills that to people I have spoken to does not appear to have had a survey carried out to determine if the bridge is structurally capable of taking 44 Tonnes HGVs. The Parish Council's letter has not addressed this issue. I have already pointed out the flooding risk to properties should the bridge collapse due to HGVs using it and the cost to the Parish Council to restore properties and contents to their previous condition.

In earlier correspondence you advised me you would provide the planning application number that placed no conditions on the access to Cobrey Farms. This has not been received.

Furthermore, I refer the Parish Council to Herefordshire Planning Application 192657. This application seeks the removal of Condition 1, Ref DCSE2009/0901/F which restricted the original grant of a commercial business to 10 years from 5 August 2009 after which the current caravans were to be removed from the site. This has not been carried out and application 192657 seeks to INCREASE the current number to 145: it does not state from which current number. The Parish Council will see there are considerable objections to this application and increasing the number of caravans for the workers will lead to an increase in the number of HGVs using the unclassified road through Pontshill and Bill Mills: more workers mean an increase in crops to harvest.

Yours faithfully.

Paul Stevenson

Friday 3rd January From Chris Bailey re SID's

As far as I can make out from the parish council minutes and accounts, expenditure on the SIDs until now amounts to £2,053: see the attached note. That is double the figure Rod Barker gave you and it omits deployment charges which are currently in dispute.

It would be good practice, normally adopted in other walks of life, for the person managing a project, such as setting up SIDs, to keep a record of expenditure on that project.

Item 6.5 in the minutes of the meeting on 7th November 2019 records that "Barker is to obtain costings for the council to purchase its own SID". This will be throwing good money after bad for various reasons.

First and as I have pointed out before (see my e-mail to the council of 10th October 2018), the significantly increased volume of traffic on the A40 through the village over recent years has led to a reduction in average speeds. That moderating effect is likely to reduce average traffic speeds even more as additional residential and commercial development in this area increases the volume of traffic on the A40.

Secondly, the Transport Research Laboratory's review of the effectiveness of SIDs noted, on average, an overall speed reduction of only 1.4mph, that the SID is most effective in the first week of operation and declines thereafter, that the SID has negligible effect on speeds between 200m and 400m after passing the device, that there is no lasting effect after the SID is removed (ie in the other

months of the year) and that SIDs are least effective during the day on weekdays: see <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/effectiveness-of-sids.pdf>

Transport Research Laboratory

Transport Research Laboratory Effectiveness of Speed Indicator Devices on reducing vehicle speeds in London by LK Walter and J Knowles PPR 314

content.tfl.gov.uk

. Other independent surveys demonstrate that SIDs do not do much to reduce traffic speeds.

Thirdly, it is recommended that batteries should be rotated every fortnight because leaving them on site for a whole month depletes their effectiveness. Solar powered SIDs help to get around this problem but they cost a lot more than the battery run SIDs. Deploying the SIDs and rotating the batteries will involve quite a lot of work over the years and recharging the batteries will also cost more. Connecting to a mains supply of electricity is the best way of maintaining and keeping SIDs fully operational but that too will cost extra. Another way of making batteries last longer is to set the SID to operate only above a certain speed (eg 30mph) so that they are not “on” all the time. There is more than the bare cost of a SID to be considered if the council seriously wishes to buy its own SID.

Fourthly, Balfour Beatty propose to install a roundabout outside the Weston Cross Inn along with warning signs which will render the SID site immediately to the west of the Weston Cross superfluous. Furthermore, they propose to move the eastbound bus stop to a position roughly where the eastbound SID site is currently located. That will reduce the village to just one SID site. There would be no point in looking for a second site at the western end of the village, because that has already been assessed by Balfour Beatty, and little point in setting up a second site eastbound at the eastern end of the village. A new SID would be relatively little used.

If the council is going to extract some value from the £2,053 already spent on SIDs, it should press Balfour Beatty to deploy SIDs in both established locations over the next few months before the resurfacing work starts. That may be only once on each site between now and May. Whether the westbound SID serves any purpose after Balfour Beatty have completed the road works depends on what signs they install to control the approach to the proposed roundabout.

Chris

C R Bailey

Friday 3rd January from Ros Davies re Footpath Stiles

Hi John

I have been advised to let you know of my experience of trying to walk with my Labrador many of the permitted paths in and around the parish of Weston under Penyard and Hope Mansell.

I am I believe a good dog owner, keeping my dog under control at all times, on lead if necessary, never walking in fields with livestock, always picking up dog waste and taking home and always closing gates .

I have been frustrated by many of the stiles that do not allow my large Labrador to negotiate. As he is a large heavy chested dog he cannot jump up over the stiles and I cannot lift him so our lovely walks have to be abandoned unfortunately. I live at Dancing Green and tend to avoid the forest at the moment due to the amount of boar so the local field walks are very important.

Could I ask if there is any hope in the future that a very simple lift up panel adjacent to a stile that the larger breed dogs could go through be introduced. I am aware of one such excellent example a neighbour of mine has added to the existing stile. I do not believe it would be a huge cost just a little extra thought given .

I welcome your kind thoughts on the subject.

Kind Regards

Ros Davies

Pool Hill

Dancing Green

Sent from my iPhone