

'Unconfirmed minutes – subject to approval/ amendment at the next meeting of the East Crawley County Local Committee'

East Crawley County Local Committee

9 May 2006 - At a meeting of the East Crawley County Local Committee at 7.30 p.m. at Maidenbower Junior School.

Present:

Duncan Crow	-	Member for Tilgate & Furnace Green
David Dewdney	-	Member for Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower
Gillian Joyce	-	Member for Northgate & Three Bridges
Henry Smith	-	Member for Pound Hill, Worth & Maidenbower
Matt Hall	-	Democratic Services
Mike Link	-	Highways and Transport
Tracey Webb	-	Highways and Transport
Ralph Wright	-	Highways and Transport

Declarations of Interest

1. None.

Minutes

2. Resolved – That the minutes of the County Local Committee held on 7 February 2006 be confirmed as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

Urgent Matters

3. David Dewdney requested that attention was drawn to the need for school governors in Crawley.

Chairman's Update

4. The Chairman notified the Committee of actions and events that had taken place since the last meeting, which included:
 - Traffic lights at Haslett Avenue square about were operational
 - Phasing of the traffic lights at junction of Haslett Avenue and College Road remained under investigation, improvements had been made but results were still being monitored
 - Youth service provision in East Crawley had been raised and the Chairman had considered an item for the next meeting of the CLC. Members of the Committee agreed
5. Resolved – That provision of youth services in East Crawley is on the agenda for the next meeting of the County Local Committee

Public Question Time

6. The Chairman informed the Committee that a written question had been received from Mr Brady, who was unable to be at the meeting:

“Motorists entering Crawley via Three Bridges traffic lights will, at some point, have encountered a 30 mph limit. If, however, they enter via Southgate Avenue and make a right turn into Hawth Avenue, they will then be in a 40 mph zone that is not subsequently reduced to 30 mph. Indeed, there is a ‘40’ repeater on the approach to the ‘squareabout’. This means that motorists who approach from Hawth Avenue may drive legally in both directions along Haslett Avenue at 40 while fellow motorists travelling west from Three Bridges station or east from the town centre are constrained to 30. This situation has pertained for some weeks now; surely the speed limit should not depend on the direction from which a motorist has driven.”

7. Members noted that physical surroundings of a stretch of road, which were the same in either direction, determined the speed limit. The different speed limits, highlighted by Mr Brady above, had been noted and would be changed.

8. Members of the public requested that the meeting dates and venues of the County Local Committee were established well in advance and publicised more widely. It was noted that a schedule of meetings at least one year in advance was under development and that measures for publicising the date and venues were under consideration.

9. Lenny Walker informed the Committee that traders on Maidenbower Square were concerned that trade may have been lost because of a lack of signage that indicated where the shops were. It was suggested that the Committee investigated the possibility of installing signs to Maidenbower Square.

10. Resolved – (i) That methods of communicating the date and venues of meetings be looked into.

(ii) That the instalment of signs indicating the location of Maidenbower Square be investigated.

Update on Three Bridges Parking Issues

11. Ralph Wright, Highways Manager (Crawley), informed the Committee that a public exhibition of proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for roads around the town centre end of Three Bridges was to take place on Thursday 18 May 2006, from 3.30 p.m. until 8.00 p.m., at Three Bridges Junior School. It was noted that the exhibition preceded the formal process of advertising a proposal and represented an opportunity for local residents to inform the decision making process. Residents of Three Bridges were to be notified of the public exhibition by letter.

12. Members of the public commented that the TRO would create problems if it was not implemented along with a Residents Parking Scheme. It was felt that a Residents Parking Scheme was required as early as possible.

Feasibility Report for a Proposed Pedestrian Crossing on Maidenbower Drive

13. Tracey Webb, Assistant Highway Manager, introduced the report on the proposed zebra crossing for Maidenbower Drive. There were reported to be a number of factors that made a zebra crossing more appropriate for Maidenbower Drive than other options, which included those set out below:

- The desire-line, the path where pedestrians naturally wished to cross, was more suited to a zebra. A Toucan crossing would need to be placed further from the roundabout, which meant that it was possible that pedestrians would cross in the wrong place
- Many motorists currently stop for parents and children at the raised "table-tops" on the road. A zebra crossing formalised the arrangement that already existed
- Drivers were forced to slow down at zebra crossings and actively look for pedestrians
- Pedestrians did not assume that they were safe at zebra crossings and made eye-contact with motorists before they stepped out
- Training was to be provided to teach children how a zebra crossing was properly used. The West Sussex Road Safety Team provided a Footsteps programme that demonstrated how to cross the road and this would be targeted towards children at the Maidenbower Schools

14. Members of the public made a number of comments about the report, which included those set out below:

- The "table top" humps in the road had created confusion on the part of pedestrians and motorists, which made it unsafe to cross the road
- Zebra crossings did not force motorists to stop in the same way as signal controlled crossings. *Tracey Webb informed the Committee that motorists were compelled to stop once pedestrians had stepped out onto a zebra crossing*
- Signal controlled crossings gave pedestrians clear indication of when it was safe to cross. *Ralph Wright informed the Committee that signal controlled crossings created the impression of safety but that complacency on the part of pedestrians who used the crossing was dangerous in itself. Accident statistics indicated that pedestrians were not completely safe when they crossed the road using signal controlled crossings. Pedestrians often assumed that approaching vehicles would stop and failed to look to make sure before crossing*
- Maidenbower Drive was a busy road, a signal controlled crossing allowed for pedestrians to cross but was adjustable to allow a steady flow of traffic
- Crawley had a diverse population. In Europe motorists were not required to stop for zebra crossings. Maidenbower had a number of Toucan crossings that the residents had become accustomed to
- The 20 mph limit signs were too close to the roundabout, where it was impossible to drive at 20 mph. *Ralph Wright informed the Committee that the advisory 20 mph limit could be extended on either side of the roundabout as part of the scheme when a crossing was installed*
- Toucan crossings were preferred over zebra crossings because they beeped, which made them of use for disabled people
- Four years was too long to wait for a crossing to be installed at Maidenbower Drive. *Tracey Webb informed the Committee that the County Council employed a rating system based on reported accident rates to determine the priority of schemes across the county. The four year wait for a crossing at Maidenbower Drive reflected its position in the rating system*

15. It was asked whether the proposed crossing in Lucerne Drive, which was part of the residential development in the area, was to be a zebra crossing. It was also asked whether the crossing was to be installed before the development was

finished. *Ralph Wright informed the Committee that he did not have the answer immediately available but would report back to the Committee.*

16. Members discussed the merits of both Zebra and Toucan crossings. Whilst it was felt that the arguments for Zebra crossings were valid, overall it was felt that a Toucan crossing was most appropriate for Maidenbower Drive as they were familiar to residents of Maidenbower. It proposed that an amendment was made to the recommendation in the report. Members agreed to the amended recommendation as in minute 21 (iii).

17. Resolved – (i) That the type of crossing due to be installed at Lucerne Drive is determined and reported to the Committee.

(ii) That the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport is briefed on the issues of the tension between local and countywide priority of schemes in the Highways and Transport Works Programme.

(iii) That every effort is made to identify sources of funding for a Toucan Signal Controlled pedestrian crossing. Should funding not be identified within 18 months, the recommendation that the Highways Manager arranges for a detailed design and implementation of a zebra crossing on the existing flat top road hump adjacent to the access road into Maidenbower Infant and Junior Schools be approved.

Crawley, Maidenbower – Matthews Drive Near Ruston Close: Proposed Traffic Signal Controlled Pedestrian Crossing

18. Members noted that there had been one objector to the proposed crossing, who was not present at the meeting. Members felt that the crossing was of benefit to the community and agreed with the proposal.

19. Resolved - That the pedestrian crossing at Matthews Drive near Ruston Close, Crawley, be installed as advertised.

Public Service Agreement (PSA1) Funding for County Local Committees

20. Members discussed how they wished to approach the allocation of the Public Service Agreement funding of £20,000. A number of issues were raised during the discussion, which included those set out below:

- An application process risked disappointing many people if those who had applied for funding outnumbered the resources that were available
- A flexible approach allowed the Committee to respond to requests or concerns as they arose
- Continued funding beyond 2007/08 was not guaranteed and grants were not to be considered for projects that required continued funding over a longer period
- Crawley Borough Councillors were welcomed to make suggestions to the relevant local member on where grants might be allocated

21. Members were asked to put forward ideas for where the funding might be allocated. It was suggested that ideas would be circulated by email for consideration of the Committee.

Date of Next Meeting

22. The Committee noted that the next ordinary meeting of the East Crawley County Local Committee would be held on Tuesday 5 September 2006, venue to be arranged.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting finished at 9.06 p.m.