
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
MAYFIELD AND FIVE ASHES TRAFFIC COMMITTEE
HELD AT LONDON HOUSE, HIGH STREET, MAYFIELD
ON WEDNESDAY 22 OCTOBER 2008 AT 10.00 HOURS**

Chairman Peter Deller

SUMMARY OF MEETING

- Five Ashes Village speed restriction needs discussed
- 20mph speed limit proposal for Mayfield discussed
- Newick Lane and “Gateways” proposals discussed
- Police speed check policy discussed
- Present position for Mayfield parking review notified

ATTENDANCE

Councillors

Peter Deller	(PD)	Present and Voting
Graham Playfoot	(GP)	Present and Voting
Chris Lilly	(CL)	Present and Voting

Present and voting 3	Present and not voting 0	
Apologies for Absence 0	Not present 0	Other Council Business 0

REPRESENTATIVES AND ADVISORS

Helen Pain	(HP)	Apologies for absence
Annette Nabavi	(AN)	Apologies for absence
Michael Oates	(MO)	Present ESCC
Mark Dunn	(MD)	Not Present
Tamara Bennett	(TB)	Apologies for Absence Sussex Police/PCSO
Steve Etherington	(SE)	Not Present
B Banks	(BB)	Present East Sussex County Council

Also Present

David Thompson Parish Clerk (DT)
C Dowling (CD) and R Tidy (RT) ESCC County Councillors

MINUTES

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

1.1 PD was elected chairman by the unanimous vote of Council Members present.

2. COUNCILLORS DECLARATION OF INTEREST ON AGENDA ITEMS

2.1. There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 23 APRIL 2008 (8T01)

3.1. It was noted that the minutes had been approved by Full Council.

3.2. MO reported that he had not received a copy of those minutes. Hence he had taken no actions marked for his attention. Their non-delivery to that office of ESCC was inexplicable.

3.3. Actions progress was as followed:

7T1/3.4	Mayfield Roundabout – Action on planting to be taken by ESCC. No further advice received.	OPEN
7T1/	CS request that lay-bys in Newick Lane be rationalised to prevent rubbish dumping.	OPEN
8T01/4.4	Five Ashes 30mph zone – Area of zone to be worked out by MO and MH – In hand with ESCC	OPEN
8T01/4.9	Speed limit policy in Selsey Peninsular – MO and MD would report to next meeting – not done	OPEN
8T01/7.4	Parking review for Five Ashes – GP to investigate need. Reported no need for a parking review	CLOSED
8T01/7.5	HP to report on meaning of white detached lines near ‘Rosinas’ Mayfield High Street – In Hand	OPEN
8T01/8.8	James Newmarsh invited to speak to Parish Council on roundabout plans – overtaken by events	CLOSED
8T01/9.6	MO to produce design costs for the Newick Lane Traffic Calming scheme – In Hand	OPEN
8T01/10.4	Newick Lane NCN21 Design Costs. MO to produce outline costs – In Hand	OPEN
8T01/10.6	Newick Lane MO to examine costs of build outs for the first section of the lane – in hand	OPEN
8T01/10.7	Newick Lane provision of bollards and white lines on road HP to report – in hand	OPEN
8T01/10.8	White lines had not been replaced at Five Ashes following road resurfacing – HP to reply	OPEN
8T01/12.1	One way system – The Avenue, Mayfield – ESCC to comment on the suggestion – MO to reply	OPEN
8T01/13.2	Supply of ‘slow down’ signs to be provided – Done	CLOSED

4. ESCC REPORT ON SPEED LIMIT REVISIONS FOR PARISH

- 4.1. With regard to speed limits generally, MO reported that the normal process was to hold a site meeting, prepare a draft scheme and then start consultations. All objections had to be considered and, if necessary, legal advice would be taken.
- 4.2. The next village speed restriction project to be considered would be Five Ashes. A meeting between East Sussex County Council engineers and the police had been scheduled for November. It was possible that the core section of the village would be 30mph with the outer parts restricted to 40 mph. PD noted that a number of promises to walk the site area in July and September had not materialised. CD asked to attend the site meeting as an observer. The meeting was agreed for 5 November 2008.

ACTION ESCC

- 4.3. PD asked whether the regulations were statutory, discretionary or a mixture of both. BB reported that ESCC did not have a statutory duty for speed restrictions but had the power to impose speed restrictions subject to central government guidelines and best practice which has influenced council members in the decision process. BB noted that factors taken into account were:
- existing speeds
 - drivers view
 - speed limit will only lower by around 2mph
 - driver must be able to see the need for a reduction before responding
 - 15% of drivers will ignore the limits
- 4.4. GP noted the residents of Five Ashes had views as well and these did not seem to be taken into account. It was difficult to explain these processes to angry residents. BB reaffirmed that his thoughts were that it would be likely that there would be a 30mph central core with 40mph zones on either side. It was also necessary to consider the A272/A267 junction.
- 4.5 CL asked whether it would be possible to aid the Five Ashes speed restriction case by interpreting the guide lines to favour the case and whether the police would object. BB pointed out that the reason for the meeting was to examine all the issues with the police and work out the best solutions.

5. MAYFIELD 20MPH RESTRICTION

- 5.1. PD covered the background to the work produced so far and reported that he had responded to the ESCC proposals, asking for
- A restriction from the junction with Rotherfield Lane
 - Up to 30mph up to telephone exchange
- 5.2. The ESCC representatives reported that these changes could not be incorporated for various reasons and that the arrangements as shown on the circulated drawings would be instituted. The restriction project would be completed in the current financial year.
- 5.3. PD noted the position but he was dissatisfied and disappointed at the result because once again community views had been rejected. ESCC noted that there was nothing to prevent a further investigation being carried out but the Parish Council would have to meet the expense.
- 5.4. GP observed that if Mayfield achieved its 20mph limit before Five Ashes get its 30mph limit, Five Ashes residents would feel further aggrieved.

6. SUSSEX POLICE REPORT

6.1 There was no report due to absence of any police representation.

7. NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT GROUP

7.1. In answer to complaints about the lack of PCSO presence in Mayfield it was reported by RT that

- PCSO short in Wadhurst
- Lack of resources
- Resources covering the recent murder in Hastings
- However there were currently 4 trainees coming on stream

8. MAYFIELD VILLAGE PARKING REVIEW

8.1. It was reported that Mayfield had slipped down the list for the parking review and that Mayfield was now 11th. In effect it would be at least two years before implementation.

8.2. PD noted that the Highways Department were under pressure and this was affecting relationships. RT explained the budgetary reasons for the recent lack of funding which had been the need to prioritise facilities for the care of the elderly. It was now possible for a re-distribution of resources to other functions of which Highways would probably feature.

9. MAYFIELD ROUNDABOUT

9.1. The sponsorship for Mayfield Roundabout had been awarded to Roundwood Timber. Consultation with the Parish concerning planting would take place in the near future.

10. GATEWAY ISSUES

10.1. ESCC reported that the Gateways proposed for the Roundabout and Newick Lane were being examined, but because of revised safety regulations this was difficult and the new EU regulation on passenger safety had to be applied.

10.2. On the day following the meeting, MO sent the following information which reflected the Area Design Team's considerations and conclusions:

Mayfield Roundabout gateway:

- Speeds on all approaches to this feature would be controlled by the site layout (northbound by the roundabout and southbound by the bend) so passive safety is not considered to be an issue here. This means that a carved oak gateway feature of the type sketched by Jayne Bramwell could be erected without the need for adaption to enable it to collapse following a collision. It is envisaged that it would consist of a pair of gateway structures, one on each verge in line with the existing speed limit highway signs.
- If the Parish Council decides to proceed with this project it will be necessary for a site plan and elevation drawing to be prepared to enable the proposals to be formally safety audited and a highway licence issued. The licence is needed to allow a privately owned structure to be erected on the public highway and covers such things as responsibility for maintenance of the feature and its removal if damaged or at the end of its useful life.

10.3. Newick Lane gateway:

- There are fundamental problems. The proposed site on the parish boundary which crosses the lane just north of Pheasantry Farm on the west side and Broadlands on the east. However, having examined this location it was found that the west verge is too narrow to accommodate the gateway feature. The east verge is only 2 metres wide and its ownership would need to be investigated. The carriageway is only 5.6 metres wide and subject to the national speed limit of 60mph. It would not be acceptable for a contractor to work in such a confined space in the presence of traffic, so a temporary road closure would be required with a long diversion route that would have to be signed. The gateway feature itself would obviously have to be passively safe and so it would need to be 'Camber' type with a lightweight timber structure mounted on standard metal posts that would deflect in the event of a collision. The cost of supplying and erecting this type of feature on just one side of the road in this location is estimated to be in the region of £8,000 including the cost of the temporary diversion.

10.4. ESCC would question the value of providing a gateway in this location. Normally a gateway is provided at the entrance to a village to draw the attention of drivers to the fact that they are leaving the open country and entering an area where they need to moderate their speed. The gateway outside Broadlands would have little visual impact as it would be on one side of the road only and as there is open country both before and after the gateway it is difficult to understand what message is intended to be conveyed.

11. NEWICK LANE FUNDING FORECAST FOR NCN21

11.1. RT reported that there was no funding available for the NCN21 project.

11.2. With regard to minute 8T01/4.9 MO asked for clarification of what he needed to do. This would be done.

ACTION DT

12. NEWICK LANE SPEED LIMITS, TRAFFIC CALMING AND GENERAL

12.1. With regard to the rural speed limit review this would follow the work being carried out on A and B roads and would include crash record data.

12.2. At this stage it was considered that

- The northern end of the road had a 30mph limit and no review was needed
- It would be 2011/2012 before C and UC roads (i.e. Newick Lane) would be covered
- It was noted that the number of accidents along Newick Lane was not significant in determining its potential danger. Although there were a number of incidents there had not been many injuries

12.3 It was reported again that the village sign on Newick Lane had been damaged and was lying on its side. ESCC would investigate.

ACTION ESCC

13. ITEMS OF INFORMATION

13.1.No items were reported.

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 12.00 HOURS.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE TRAFFIC COMMITTEE WILL BE:

VENUE: LONDON HOUSE

DATE: 22 APRIL 2009

TIME: 1000 HOURS