

## **Report - Traffic, Rights of Way Consultative Group.**

1. At the meeting of the Committee on 28 June 2021 Members agreed:
2. It was agreed that the Traffic Advisory Committee would be renamed 'Traffic and Rights of Way Consultative Group' to enable consideration of highways, bridleways, and cycle paths.

The Group would report back to the Committee and consist of 3-members of the Town Council, 1-member of Dorset Council, outside members would be invited to attend and contribute to meetings.

The Terms of Reference for the Group would be considered at the next meeting of the Services and Facilities Committee and that the Group would make recommendations to the parent committee and have no decision-making powers.

3. The Committee Administrator draft TofR: circulated to Members of the former TMAC at the request of the Clerk:

### **DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- The Group will consist of 3 Members of the Town Council, 1 of whom will be the Chairman and a Member of Dorset Council.
- The Committee is authorised to invite and co-opt members and representatives from Dorset Council, Highway Authority, Rights of Way team, the Dorset Police, relevant stakeholders and local residents, to attend meetings to provide advice and/or information as and when required.
- The Group will not have any decision-making powers and will make recommendations to the Services and Facilities Committee.
- The Committee will aim to identify, evaluate and consult on traffic management problems identified within the parish of Ferndown
- In liaison with individuals, Dorset Council and other stakeholders, the Group will collect and consider evidence and recommend measures that will best address the traffic management issues reported in the parish including cycle lanes and plans relating to Dorset Council's Draft Local Plan and Ferndown Town Council Regeneration Programme.
- Raise concerns relating to public obstruction of footpaths and bridleways within the Town to Dorset Council Rights of Way team to resolve any issues including recommending styles, gates, signposts and way-markers.
- The Group will encourage all people affected by any proposals and issues to submit representation for consideration of potential solutions.

4. Members of the TMAC made the following comments:

1. Sorry I don't agree with no.3. The town council have to approve applications for double yellow lines etc, and recommendations going to Services and Facilities is an unnecessary delay. Why would Services and Facilities have the right to make the decision, when they haven't been at the meeting and heard all the evidence? By all

means have the report go to that committee but send all recommendations straight to full council.

2.Regarding Cathy's comment, I understand that as it stands the group is responsible to the S & FC hence item 3. It might seem expedient to bypass the committee but I think due process should be adhered to. This would not add greatly to the delay. It could be argued that the remaining members of the S & FC would be equally in the dark regarding how the decisions would have been made, as would other council members in Full Council. However if the Group informs the S & FC of the details first, then the vote in Full Council would be more informed. Hence in balance I would keep no 3 as it is.

Cllr Willis Chair of the TMRU

In response to the proposed changes I would like to share my thoughts and observations.

### **1. Title**

I don't believe Traffic and Rights of Way is the right title. Using the term 'traffic' is too restrictive, the forum considers issues such as parking, access, speed, crossing points and more. It also covers pavements/cycle paths which are part of the highways network, these are not rights of way. I believe a more accurate title would be 'Highways and Rights of Way'.

In addition I believe that calling this a 'Group' does not do it justice, perhaps a better term would be 'Panel' as this would better reflect both its status and purpose. Therefore, I would respectfully request that the SFC reconsiders its decision and allows the forum to be titled 'Highways and Rights of Way Panel'.

### **2. Terms of Reference**

If we are putting forward a new ToR then we may as well do it right and include what the forum does and more importantly what we need it to do going forwards. I have attached a draft which I respectfully request be considered by the SFC for adoption (comments from those copied here are of course welcome).

### **3. Decision making powers**

I am concerned by the intention of not allowing the forum to make decisions and indeed would question the definition of 'decision' over 'outcome'. Here are a few examples:

- Hampreston crossroads: the forum decided/outcome agreed to broker an amicable agreement between DC and residents which involved a 40mph sign being reinstated, repainting of 20mph roundels, installation of 3-2-1 countdown markers, directional (refuge) bollards and re-lining.
- Redwood Drive: the decision/outcome was to write to the resident advising no action would be taken.
- Crossing at the entrance to Longham Lakes: decision/outcome agreed to request a crossing be considered as part of the TCF project.
- Church Road speeding: decision/outcome to formally request a speed survey.

I would question the viability of passing such 'decisions' to SFC going forwards. They would not have heard the testimony of the residents concerned, nor the views of the outside parties present on possible solutions, nor would they have been party to the subsequent debate on the best course of action. It is my opinion that this brings into question the point of having the forum at all and would suggest if SFC are to be the ones making the decisions then they should be the ones who also own the debate.

I would note is that this forum handles a lot of work and currently has 17 open issues (attached log for interest).

#### **4. Inclusion of Rights of Way**

While I don't necessarily object to this be included within the forum's remit I do question why it is no longer sitting with NEC which it did before. Their ToR includes (or it did in anyway) encouraging the community to engage with the natural environment for health and wellbeing, keeping our rights of way in good order is key to making that happen.

### **Proposed Terms of Reference (Cllr Willis)**

#### **HIGHWAYS and RIGHTS OF WAY CONSULTATIVE PANEL**

##### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. The Panel will consist of 3 Members of the Town Council, 1 of whom will be the Chairman and a Member of Dorset Council.
2. The Panel is authorised to invite representatives from Dorset Council Highways, Dorset Council Countryside team, Dorset Police, relevant stakeholders and local residents to attend meetings to provide advice and/or information as and when required.
3. The Panel will work in collaboration with Dorset Council Highways team to improve pollution levels and the movement of vehicular and non-vehicular traffic within the parish of Ferndown.
4. The Panel will hear any highways related concern raised by residents, businesses or other interested parties within the parish and work in conjunction with relevant stakeholders to consider the evidence and where appropriate agree measures to best address the situation.
5. The Panel will monitor issues relating to speeding vehicles and work with relevant stakeholders to ensure adequate speed management measures and infrastructure exist within the parish.
6. Raise matters relating to public obstruction of footpaths and bridleways within the parish to Dorset Council Countryside team to resolve any issues

including recommending improvements such as styles, gates signposts and way-markers.

7. The Group will encourage all people affected by any proposals and issues to be submit representation for consideration of potential solutions.
8. The Panel will not have any decision-making powers and will make recommendations to the Services and Facilities Committee.

**Recommendation:** Members review the proposed Terms of Reference and approve as appropriate.