

ROBERT EVEREST

14 Feb (6 days ago)

to me

Dear Tracey

I was somewhat taken aback to read the contents of the draft minutes of the most recent meeting.

With reference to Item 195 I do not consider the comments made by me reflect what I actually said. To recap I said that I felt I was speaking on behalf of the majority, if not all, of the residents of Station Road when I said that we had not been properly consulted by the Parish Council as to the proposals for the traffic islands. At that point I also said that I was submitting an apology for absence on behalf of Mrs Ward who was similarly not happy with the current proposals and which particularly affect her two access points to her property. I did say that in the light of the proposals to now reduce the speed limit there was surely no need to have gone to the expense that is now being incurred in installing a central refuge crossing (although I did not mention that this has necessitated the removal and re-siting of two light columns, removal of a footpath put down probably no more than 10 years ago and widening the roadway to accommodate the refuge islands and also taking up the widened footpath installed in January 2014 for the cycleway), when surely a simple pedestrian crossing could be installed. I suggested that this should have been explored in more detail by the Highways Department before making any commitments. On this basis I commented that had this procedure been adopted I considered an awful lot of money could have been saved. These comments were addressed to the County Councillor and NOT the Parish Council.

I did NOT blame the Parish Council for poorly managing the project but I felt that the PC had probably been ill-advised in the light of the above comments. I am fully aware that the PC does not "manage" such projects. These are the responsibility of the County Council's Highways project managers.

Following my comments, and this is not minuted, Mr Chesterman then read out a letter which he and other residents have received from the County Council in reply to letters of comment and to remind you I quote extracts from a letter dated 30th October 2017 and which was received on the 9th November 2017, from the Project Manager at Cambs CC -

"At this stage in the project we are undertaking feasibility of this proposal to determine whether the island can be situated in this location without impeding residents accesses.

"At this time we are still assessing the proposals and liaising closely with the Parish Council. When the final designs have been completed and the Parish Council is in agreement, all local residents within the vicinity of the feature will be consulted with appropriately."

A subsequent e-mail to another resident dated 15th January 2018 from the Policy & Regulations Department stated that the " Project Manager understood that the PC had determined the comments/objections" previously made and "had decided to continue with the proposal to install the traffic island".

No further contact has been made by the Highways Authority with any of the residents and the next communication received was a letter from the Project Manager dated 5th January but delivered by hand on the 16th January 2018 advising us of the commencement of works which include amongst other things "Installation of pedestrian/cycle islands near No 7 Station Road, High Street junction, near Hollidays Road junction and outside the cemetery". This was obviously a 'fait accompli' and does not amount to any consultation of the residents on the part of any Authority either PC or Highways and this is what we are all disturbed about.

Although Mr Crisswell repeated his oft repeated comments about the difficulties of putting in a pedestrian crossing and imposing speed limits it is, I understand NOT the role of the Police Authorities to decide what type of crossings are installed, if any, nor for that matter imposing speed limits, and this was my reason for suggesting that the PC may have been ill-advised. There are numerous examples of pelican and pedestrian crossings in the area which fall within 30 mph limits. The old adage of "carts and horses" spring to mind.

With reference to Item 205, this did not I believe reflect what the Chairman said. I was under the impression that he had said words to the effect that "he would not let the matter of lack of traffic refuge

islands and higher speed limit rest on his conscience and that of the PC in the event of a future accident". I did not feel that my comments were in any way an attack but merely comment and to reinforce my earlier comments at previous Council Meetings when I have said that I felt that there was a perception of speeding when in fact the various traffic surveys had confirmed that there was little evidence of speeding. I also have said previously that I felt that people - both pedestrians and motorists - are more alert if vehicles are travelling at 40 mph than 30 mph or less particularly on the rural location of this road, and this has been borne out in various areas of the country where traffic speed limits have been reduced. As pedestrians, aswell as motorists, we have to respect other users and I believe this is the view of the majority. However in this respect my husband and I have both signed the District Councillors' petition for a 30mph speed limit.

Finally, I would respectfully suggest that if Mrs Lumb has matters of highways safety etc to report, her report should be brought forward and made available to our County Councillor BEFORE he leaves the meeting. I am particularly referring to the reference to Wheatsheaf Crossroads which a lot of the residents of the village believe is a serious traffic hazard and needs to be addressed as a matter of extreme urgency.

Would you please ensure that this email is included in correspondence for your next meeting which I presume will now be in March and will be on the Agenda and read out at that time.

Yours sincerely

Susan Everest