

Minutes of the
Didmarton Parish Council
Held 19th January 2022
Didmarton Village Hall

Members present: - Cllrs J Hammond, R Goodwill, S White, H White
Officer: -Clerk Fiona Thornton.
Glos CC Cllr S Hirst
CDC Cllr R Morgan
No of parishioners 1

22/302.Apologies for Absence - Cllrs J Pearce, C Rogers

22/303.Declarations of Interest under the Localism Act 2011

None

22/304.Reports from County Councillor S Hirst on matters relating to the Parish

(To include discussion of The Build Back Better – Councillor Scheme)

- Precis of 2022/23 budget for Glos CC
- £30k each councillor to spend on next years highways schemes – Cllr J Hammond suggested Badminton Lane up to the boundary with South Glos Council
- Build Back Better application forms – to DVHCC and Toddlers
- Site visit to be arranged with himself, representative from road safety, speed watch and the parish council to assess reducing the speed limit on outskirts of village and also the yellow lines within the village with the potential to removal in certain areas to create ‘traffic calming’.

22/305.Reports from CDC Councillor R Morgan on matters relating to the Parish

- CDC car parking charges are increasing
- CDC will be charging the parishes for election costs from 2023 election cycle. Precise details to be confirmed in October; to include the costs for uncontested elections

22/306.Confirm Minutes of meeting held on 13th October 2021

Decision: proposed by Cllr J Hammond and seconded by Cllr S White. Agreed by all

22/307.Finance

a) Payment of accounts


F Thornton – quarterly clerk fees £624

Hathaway Gardenscapes – maintenance contract monthly £225

Hathaway Gardenscapes – maintenance contract monthly £225

Decision: proposed by Cllr H White and seconded by Cllr R Goodwill. Agreed by all.

22/308.Planning Applications for consideration

Ref. No: 21/04635/FUL Extension/Conversion of garage, remodelling of roof and addition of loft space 
20 The Street Didmarton Badminton Gloucestershire

Council expressed concerns that this application had not been received in the due time frame so as to make comment. As a statutory consultee this should have happened.

Council therefore request an extension from the planning authority to make comment.

21/04423/FUL | Alterations to garage to form ancillary accommodation, insertion of x2 roof lights, infill the garage doors with a glazed screen with doors and insertion of a ground floor window, insertion of a first floor side and ground floor windows | Glenhoy House 49A The Street Didmarton Badminton Gloucestershire GL9 1DS

Minutes of the
Didmarton Parish Council
Held 19th January 2022
Didmarton Village Hall

Council discussed the previous planning history on site and are concerned that this incremental approach to submission of planning applications on site is at odds with previous planning history on site. Previous planning decisions should set precedent; however, this seems not to be the case. If this application is approved then it should carry a condition that it is dependent ancillary accommodation to the property and that any future planning application to remove such conditions should be refused.

Historically planning was never granted for 2 dwellings and council wish to see a continuity and upholding of previous planning permissions, comments and refusals by the planning authority itself.

22/309. Correspondence/Communication with Parish Council

- Cllr S Hirst forwarded request from parishioner asking for zebra crossings in village
- Election costs CDC - The figures shown are for a by-election in a parish or town which is not combined with any other election. At the ordinary 4-yearly election, these costs will be shared with the District elections taking place on the same day. **Action: budget be created in May one year end balances are known and budget is revised.**

22/310. Council to consider funding for a village community day and horticultural show in 2022 and then annually.

It was agreed at the previous meeting that this item first be considered under The Build Back Better Councillor Scheme. If unsuccessful it will revert to Council for discussion.

Cllr S White reported that DVHCC wish to host a joint venture to coincide with the Queens Jubilee celebrations.

Action: Agenda next meeting

22/311. Speed Watch

Cllr S White

As we move out of 2021, our speed watch group have conducted a total of 46 speed meets equating to 46 hours which taking into account the covid restrictions during the first part of this year is impressive. During this time, a total of 492 motorists were caught at 35mph or more with the highest speed recorded at 56mph. This is in addition to those caught by the police camera van who regularly support us. Despite the alarming figures, this is slightly down on previous years and things are slowly improving.

Thanks must go to our team of volunteers. Without them this would not be possible.

22/312. Council to discuss requesting a 40mph speed limit at both ends of the village prior to the 30mph supported with extra street lighting.

Response from Glos C.C.

Firstly I would like to assure you that we share the same ambition as you to create as safe as environment as we can for all users of our highways within Gloucestershire and that speed limits can contribute towards this aim. Thank you for providing an explanation in your letter for seeking to introduce a transition limit in advance of the 30mph limit through your village with the hope that vehicles will be slowed down to this 30mph upon entry. I understand this was why there are two VAS one on each approaches into your village to provide the same function.

I am not sure what you know about how GCC approach speed limit requests so I apologise in advance if you are familiar with the details of the next few paragraphs. My colleagues in the road safety team have advised me that regrettably many years of experience backed by a great deal of research at national level shows that a lower speed limit does not necessarily guarantee that all motorists will comply with it or that a safer environment be established with one. Indeed evidence suggests that setting unrealistically low speed restrictions leads to a high level of non-compliance, and the abuse of more critical limits and it is therefore critical to set realistic speed limits, which road users will respect and understand and that can be enforced. I am further advised that research shows that the speed at which motorists choose to travel at is not so much governed by the posted limit but

Minutes of the
Didmarton Parish Council
Held 19th January 2022
Didmarton Village Hall

more by how they perceive local conditions. This research shows that drivers respect and comply with speed limits that the average driver considers to be reasonable with a variety of factors such as location-rural/urban, geometry, adjoining infrastructure, road side friction (parked cars) influencing how they respond and perceive risks. The average motorist will drive at a lower speed when there are more potential risks, having said this I am aware that there will always be an element of drivers who despite having a responsibility to be aware that speed limits are not targets and they should ensure that their driving takes into consideration the constraints of the road, the prevailing weather conditions and be aware of other conditions which may also present a hazard drive at inappropriate speeds. As I am sure you are aware, through your speed watch team, it is ultimately the responsibility of the Police to enforce all speed limits along the highway network and to deal with this type of behaviour. With regards to your suggestion for a 40mph speed limit in advance of the 30mph I am mindful that the formal mechanism for introducing speed limits, or the amendment of an existing one is by the progression of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), which is the legal framework to allow enforcement by the Police. The document that Local Authorities use for this are set in accordance with Department for Transport guidelines -(Dft Circular 01/2013 - Setting Local Speed Limits), where these guidelines aim to align local speed limits to the measured mean speeds.

I am sure that you can appreciate that with over 3000 miles of highway network within the County this Authority receives many requests for traffic regulations orders and road safety schemes so consequently we have to prioritise and target our limited resources carefully to ensure that those sites selected provide good value for money, achieve the stated objectives and have a reasonable prospect of being successful as they meet the design criteria and published standards/guidance. This is in line with the outcome of the comprehensive spending review undertaken in 2010 whereby we resolve to maintain the existing network and not undertake improvements such as traffic calming or the progression of TRO, with the exception of schemes which have a proven high accident history.

Gloucestershire County Council maintains a database of all recorded personal injury accidents which occur upon the highway network i.e. those incidents which the Police have been in attendance too. After interrogating this database I note that within the last five years there has been no reported personal collisions at this location. My colleagues in the transport monitoring team have kindly provided me with some measured speed data from 2016 through the village. Regrettably this data shows that there is non compliance with the existing 30mph limit again supported by your village speed watch group.

In conclusion whilst I understand your reasoning for trying to introduce a speed limit buffer before the 30mph the low accident indicator alone would make me believe that a formal request would not attract GCC funding. This coupled with the existing non compliance of the existing limit and supported by your own observations would also make me question any effectiveness of this proposal. I think this is more a matter of enforcement when the Police resources are available. Of course I would be prepared to review my position should any of the factors significantly change in the future.

Response re: extra street lighting

I have looked through the plan of the area and noted the end of The Street in Didmarton has woodpole units and the end of the street lighting run ends at the last unit heading towards Tetbury with a woodpole which is the same for the other end of The Street.

We do not have power in the ground to enable us to install a lighting column and tap off the power easily which means we would have to speak with WPD to see if the span of network can be extended such a distance required to cover the junctions which the Clerk makes reference too.

Heading towards Tetbury from our last column and to cover the junctions closest to the village is a span of 400m and just for a trench alone would cost £16,000.

It will be 100m including a road crossing in the other direction would also cost £7,000.

Then on top of this you would have all the materials costs, including lanterns, cells, columns then the service connections which would be well in excess of 35k.

These costs are purely a quick desk top review and this would be in a best case scenario and providing extending the service network is feasible.

As for the costs GCC are not in a position to make any contributions to this as we don't add to our

Minutes of the
Didmarton Parish Council
Held 19th January 2022
Didmarton Village Hall

assets and at do not have the funding for such a project. I am happy to try and facilitate if the funding can be made.

Action: see minute item 22/304 Cllr S Hirst to organize a meeting

22/313.The coffee cup at Oldbury garage

No response received from planning enforcement

Council asked Cllr R Morgan to follow this item up as it is causing visibility problems for vehicles when pulling out from the garage.

22/314.Sowing of Wildflowers – council to identify suitable areas

No action at this present time

22/315.Review of Village Speed Signage

Cllr R Goodwill reported that having investigated, there is no benefit to changing the current interactive speed signs in the village with newer models.

Overall, Council agreed that there is a continuing need to review and refresh signage to ensure it is effective.

22/316.Items to report

(Items can be discussed but members can make no decisions)

- Collapsed drain O/S 18 The Street – repair now complete
- Drain opposite Joyces Pool – Highways to jet when machinery in area
- Drain at Leighterton Road/Creephole – safety inspection requested and necessary repairs to be actioned
- Road need sweeping from Joyces Pool up to Church
- DVHCC have received quotations for repairs/replacement to path and patio **Action: next agenda to discuss funding**

22/317.Date of next meeting – to be set following highway site meeting

Signed

Dated