**LEDBURY TOWN COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT WORKING PARTY HELD ON**

**25 JULY 2022**

**Present - Councillors Howells and Hughes**

 **Non-Councillors: Tim Barnes and Steve Glennie-Smith**

**Also Present - Angela Price – Town Clerk**

 **Charlotte Barltrop – Minute Taker**

**TMWP 147 ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON FOR THE MEETING**

 **RESOLVED:**

**That Councillor Hughes be elected as Chairman in the absence of Councillor Bannister.**

**TMWP 148 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bannister, Manns and Morris.

**g**

**TMWP 149 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

 None received

**TMWP 150 MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT WORKING PARTY HELD ON 27 JUNE 2022**

 **RESOLVED:**

 **That the minutes of a meeting of the Traffic Management Working Party held on 27 June 2022 be approved and signed as a correct record.**

**TMWP151 ACTION SHEET**

**Councillor Hughes advised that all outstanding items listed within the action sheet, in red, were on the agenda for discussion.**

**RESOLVED:**

**That the action sheet be received and noted.**

**TMWP152 NEWENT TO LEDBURY BUS PROPOSAL**

Councillor Howells gave a brief synopsis of the basic figures from the report. He advised that he had considered worst case, best case, and average/mid-range case scenarios of the implications for contributions from Ledbury Town Council as follows:

**Worst case:**

Maximum expected annual cost:               £325,000

Minimum income expected:

         Gloucestershire CC contribution:             £ 70,000

            Herefordshire CC contribution:      £ 70,000

            Ticket sales:                                    £ 60,000

            Total minimum income:                 £200,000

Gap between income and expenditure to be funded by parish Councils               £125,000

**Best case:**

Minimum expected annual cost:                £250,000

Maximum income expected:

            Gloucestershire CC contribution:             £100,000

           Herefordshire CC contribution:      £100,000

            Ticket sales:                                      £ 80,000

            Total minimum income:                  £280,000

Gap between income and expenditure to be funded by parish Councils:               £0

**Average/mid-point case:**

Annual cost (approx.):                                 £290,000

Income expected:

            Gloucestershire CC contribution:             £ 85,000

            Herefordshire CC contribution:      £ 85,000

            Ticket sales:                                      £ 70,000

            Total minimum income:                  £240,000

Gap between income and expenditure to be funded by parish Councils:               £50,000

Assuming this means Ledbury, Newent, and Ross councils = approx. £17k pa for 3 years each on a population basis (Ledbury and Ross approx. £10k each, Newent approx. £5k)

**Proportionate contributions:**

Ledbury and Ross = £20k pa for 3 years each

Newent = £10k pa for 3 years

Which is in line with the £24k pa contribution pledge requested from Ledbury

Key issues to consider:

* Main reasons for travel by bus (not work)
* Main destination/route (Newent to Gloucester)
* Concessions/income impact (approx. 50% of passengers on no-pay concessions)
* Absolute number of passengers (quite low, biased towards the elderly)
* How much numbers could be increased in the 3 years by promoting tourism/visitors to use buses more.”

Tim Barnes of Community Action Ledbury, raised the following points:

1. He advised that it is difficult to get the numbers for potential users for a service such as this. The villages only have 1 or 2 people who might use the service. He felt that if there are only 6 service users, £75k is a lot of money per head.
2. Type of licence to run the service, there are 3 types of licence
	1. Free service
	2. Fares at cost (the report appears to be based on this option)
	3. For profit, the Council is not permitted to run a service for profit.
3. Running this type of service is challenging. Who will be responsible for the running of the service? Who will maintain the fleet etc.?
4. Recruitment of sufficient licenced drivers. Due to changes to the licencing policy drivers over the age of 40 who are recruited are likely to be required to take a PSV test in order to drive any size of bus, including a minibus (D1 licence category).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. **That the working party receive and note the information provided in the report and attachments.**
2. **That a recommendation be submitted to the Finance, Policy & General Purposes Committee on whether to support the request from Buses4US for a pledge of £24,000 to provide financial support from within the Council’s 2023/24 budget.**

**TMWP153 REPORT FROM MEETING WITH LOCALITY STEWARD IN RESPECT OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER SUBMISSION**

Councillor Howells offered his apologies and stated that he has been unable to complete the report at this time and that he will have time to complete the report in order that it may be included in the agenda of the next meeting for the TMWP which is to be held on 22 August 2022.

 **RESOLVED:**

 **That the report be prepared by Councillor Howells and presented at the next meeting of the Traffic Management Working Party to be held on 22 August 2022.**

**TMWP154 PARKWAY GATES**

Councillor Hughes stated that there seems to be an issue as to where the gates are sited in relation to the 40/50-mph signs. The suggestion from the transport manager is that they should be sited where the 40-mph signs are located. However, there is a potential concern in respect of the 40-mph sign on the way into Parkway just before the petrol station as this may interfere with traffic exiting from the properties.

The Clerk stated that the transport Manager had advised that the gates could be customised in order to meet the requirement and therefore did not consider it a problem that could not be overcome, however he did suggest dialogue with the residents to advise them of the proposal to install gates. He suggested that L shaped gates could be fitted in three of the locations and single gate could be placed to ensure that the sight line was not obscured.

Councillor Hughes stated that this is a matter of judgement to recommend to the Economy & Planning Committee as to what should be done.

Councillor Howells stated that he felt that a face-to-face meeting with the residents would be the next step for this item. He suggested that the Clerk and one Councillor should meet the residents who would be affected by the gate and discuss this with them.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. **That Members make arrangements to speak to the residents, face-to-face, near to the exit between 40-mph sign and the garage at Parkway in respect of the proposal to site traffic calming gates at the 40-mph sign.**
2. **That an application be made via the Community Commission Model to request the installation of traffic calming gates at both entrances to Parkway be investigated.**

**TMWP155** **RESIDENTS PARKING**

Members were provided with information received from Herefordshire Council Traffic Management Team in respect of residents parking in Ledbury:

“At the moment we have the following requests for residents permit parking schemes to be implemented in Ledbury.

Queens Court: This is at No 43 in the list

Belle Orchard & Orchard Close: This is at No 46 in the list

Masefield Avenue: This is at No 51 in the list

New Street: This is at No 66 in the list

As indicated these are all sat in our Prioritised Traffic Regulation Order List of requested schemes. At present we currently install in the region of about a dozen TRO’s each financial year so I’m afraid the likelihood is that none of these schemes will be progressed in the near future unless finances and resources alter going forward.

Not aware of anything for the Southend being received at any point I’m afraid.”

The Clerk informed the Members that there are a large number of complaints received regarding Queens Court and the parking situation therein.

Councillor Howells stated that this had been discussed with the locality steward during their meeting and had reached the following conclusions:

1. **Queens Court**- a residents parking scheme may create a problem rather than a solution. A Residents Parking Scheme would remove the three disabled spaces which are currently in existence, which may disadvantage some of the residents.
2. **Masefield Avenue** - there didn’t appear to be a clear case for Masefield Avenue to have a resident parking scheme the majority of properties have driveways with space for two vehicles to park. The perceived issue in this area is that it is used by commuters taking the train, these commuters often park irresponsibly which could cause access issues for emergency vehicles.

There followed a discussion regarding Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) and whether it would be more productive to have a list of items that would qualify for a TRO in order that these can be applied for together.

The Clerk informed Members that whilst multiple items can be applied for under a TRO they must be of the same type, i.e., parking scheme, yellow lines etc.. Therefore, the work which has been completed over the past months will generate several TRO’s.

Councillor Howells confirmed that his reasoning for grouping the requirements is that it would be easier to prioritise which is required first. In some instances, safety grounds must be considered.

The Clerk read a short extract from a communication that she had been copied into by Graham Hornsby, of Herefordshire Council:

“Unfortunately, the first thing that we have to say is that installing yellow lines isn’t as straight forward as you may have been hoping for. In summary it is unlawful to install double yellow lines on the Highway without a signed and sealed legal TRO document in place to enable both lines to be painted on the road and also for enforcement to take place. Before a TRO can be signed and sealed, we must follow a procedure that is set out in national legislation and in addition we must also comply with certain requirements from Herefordshire Council. The time associated with the procedure to introduce a TRO is, on average, about 9 months but on top of that we must advise that we have a long waiting list of applications for TROs for locations throughout Herefordshire. The cost associated with the procedure to introduce a TRO is funded by Herefordshire Council and will be in the region of £8,000 and the cost of installing double yellow lines will be in the region of £1,000.”

 **RESOLVED:**

**That this item be discussed in more detail at the next meeting of the TMWP on 22 August 2022, once Councillor Howells has provided his report on the meeting with the Locality Steward.**

**TMWP156** **DROP KERBS**

Councillor Howells spoke about the dropped kerbs which had been raised during the walk around meeting, advising that these would be included in the report which he is producing for the next meeting.

1. Crossing of Orchard Lane under the footbridge for the Ledbury Trail – cycle/walkway has a dropped kerb onto the road coming from the New Mills tarmac cycle and walkway, but to get to the opposite dropped kerb onto the rec means a left diagonal crossing over the road near to a dangerous corner on a busy cut-through route also by a busy primary school exit/entrance, especially dangerous for disabled buggies, prams etc. New drop kerb onto the pavement opposite to the one from the rec needed so that it is straight crossing.
2. At Long Acres there are no dropped kerbs to aid crossing Margaret Road, Queen’s Way, St George Close. A number of disabled buggy users prefer this route into town since going through the rec along the narrow and rough path is not user friendly either – this will all get busier once the Bloor development route into town also comes through New Mills onto this same exit onto Orchard Lane, so needs to be addressed now before the development is started (their S106 infrastructure improvement plan ends at Orchard Lane).”

The Clerk advised of two further drop kerb issues that had been raised with the Locality Steward:

a. HORSE LANE ORCHARD

 b. KNAPP LANE, HOMEND

 **RESOLVED:**

**That the Clerk provide a full list of drop kerbs required to Balfour Beatty.**

**TMWP157 REQUEST FOR FUNDING IN SUPPORT OF LEDBURY BUS AND TRAIN TIMES BOOK**

The Clerk provided a report to inform Members of a request received from Rail and Bus Herefordshire for funding towards the Ledbury Bus and Train Timetable booklet they have produced.

 **RESOLVED:**

**That the members receive and note the information provided within the report supplied by the Clerk, noting that it was included on the Finance, Policy & General Purposes Committee agenda for consideration.**

**TMWP158 RAIL & BUS FOR HEREFORDSHIRE – SUMMER 2022 NEWSLETTER**

**RESOLVED:**

 **That this item was received and noted.**

**TMWP159 IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (STANDING ITEM)**

 **RESOLVED:**

 **That this item was noted.**

**TMWP160 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**RESOLVED:**

**To note that the date of the next meeting of the Traffic Management Working Party will be 22 August 2022 at 3.00 pm in the Committee Room**

**That the meeting closed at 4.00pm**

**Signed …………………………………….. Dated ……………………………… (Chair)**