

**QEB TRANSPORT STEERING GROUP
MEETING NOTES**

Date and Time: Friday 20 January 2023, 10:00

Place: Committee Room 1, Hart District Council
(Hybrid)

Present:

From Hart District Council

Cllr Alan Oliver (Chair)	- AO
Cllr James Radley	- JR
Cllr Wendy Makepeace-Browne	- WMB
Mark Jaggard (Executive Director – Place)	- MJ
Stephanie Baker (Development Management & Building Control Manager)	- SB
Philip Sheppard (Infrastructure Team Manager)	- PS
Rachel Poulter (Planning Projects Officer)	- RP
Jenny Murton – Minutes	

From Hampshire County Council

Cllr Stephen Parker	- SP
Cllr Bill Withers	- BW
Hayley Thorn (Transport Team Leader)	- HT
David Jowsey (Strategic Transport Manager)	- DJ

Item		Action
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <p>The attendees introduced themselves. There were no apologies. SB was virtual via TEAMS.</p>	
2.0	<p>Purpose of QEB transport steering group</p> <p>The group discussed the importance of having more regular meetings, and it was agreed that the working group should meet every six months.</p> <p>The Chair highlighted that the main aims for this QEB Transport Steering Group meeting were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what funds were available, • Discuss potential transport schemes, • Agree a priority list of schemes, in order for them to progress, • Understand the deadlines when money has to be spent, • Set a timeline for future meetings. 	

	<p>It was agreed that a meeting the week commencing Monday 11 September would be preferred.</p> <p>It was noted that Hart District Council and Hampshire County Council had jointly commissioned a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for Hart district. It was important the transport work coming out of the QEB meeting, and the work on the LCWIP complemented each other – and did not duplicate the work.</p>																					
<p>3.0</p>	<p>Current position on QEB funds held and already spent</p> <p>The Transport Team Leader provided an update on the QEB contributions held and spent to date:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="293 801 1233 1451"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="293 801 815 853">Item description:</th> <th data-bbox="815 801 1233 853">Amount spent:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 853 815 904">Safety Railings, Sandy Lane</td> <td data-bbox="815 853 1233 904">£4,945</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 904 815 956">Fleet Station Improvements</td> <td data-bbox="815 904 1233 956">£72,888</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 956 815 1032">Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study - Reading Road South</td> <td data-bbox="815 956 1233 1032">£2,511</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1032 815 1108">Crookham Park to Gally Hill Road Cycle Route</td> <td data-bbox="815 1032 1233 1108">£139,542</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1108 815 1160">Bus Service 77</td> <td data-bbox="815 1108 1233 1160">£112,198</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1160 815 1236">Arboriculture – Highway Tree Planting as Required</td> <td data-bbox="815 1160 1233 1236">£99,991</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1236 815 1288">Flat Top Crossings – Sandy Lane</td> <td data-bbox="815 1236 1233 1288">£36,865</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1288 815 1364">Total Spent:</td> <td data-bbox="815 1288 1233 1364">£468,942</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="293 1364 815 1451">Total Remaining:</td> <td data-bbox="815 1364 1233 1451">£2.9 million</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It was noted that the £2.9 million which remains to be spent did not include the interest earned on it. The total figure available would therefore be greater.</p> <p>It was questioned whether the arboriculture – highway tree planting was a legitimate spend of the S106 funds as required by the legal agreement.</p> <p>It was noted that if the spend on trees was not a legitimate spend this figure would be added to the £2.9 million (<i>potentially making it higher with interest</i>).</p> <p>ACTION: HT to obtain a list from the HCC Arboriculture team detailing the breakdown of the spend for Arboriculture – Highway Tree Planning and send to SB / MJ.</p>	Item description:	Amount spent:	Safety Railings, Sandy Lane	£4,945	Fleet Station Improvements	£72,888	Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study - Reading Road South	£2,511	Crookham Park to Gally Hill Road Cycle Route	£139,542	Bus Service 77	£112,198	Arboriculture – Highway Tree Planting as Required	£99,991	Flat Top Crossings – Sandy Lane	£36,865	Total Spent:	£468,942	Total Remaining:	£2.9 million	<p>HT</p>
Item description:	Amount spent:																					
Safety Railings, Sandy Lane	£4,945																					
Fleet Station Improvements	£72,888																					
Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility Study - Reading Road South	£2,511																					
Crookham Park to Gally Hill Road Cycle Route	£139,542																					
Bus Service 77	£112,198																					
Arboriculture – Highway Tree Planting as Required	£99,991																					
Flat Top Crossings – Sandy Lane	£36,865																					
Total Spent:	£468,942																					
Total Remaining:	£2.9 million																					

	<p>It was questioned whether some of the money held needed to be used by a certain date. Some documents shared in the meeting suggested a deadline for spend had passed. The document suggested £500,000 had/or would have to be handed back to the developer.</p> <p>It was noted that the County Council recently returned S106 transport funds to the developer of Edenbrook as it had not spent the funds prior to the expiry date.</p> <p>The Strategic Transport Manager stressed that handing money back to developers is not ideal, but not unique to Hart district. More focus had now been put on this process by the County Council, to prevent situations where this may occur in the future.</p> <p>A County Councillor stated that the recent reorganisation of directorates at the County Council had also focused on preventing such outcomes.</p> <p>ACTION: HT to provide a list of expiry dates for funds, and to confirm the status of this further £500,000.</p>	HT
4.0	<p>Potential transport schemes</p> <p>A County Councillor confirmed they had met with County officers prior to this meeting and agreed 5 priorities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two crossings on Reading Road South to assist with walking to school from QEB. In this case it would primarily be for journeys to Court Moor School from the south. It was suggested in the areas around Velmead Road and Baisgbourne Road. 2. A new roundabout on the B3013 Beacon Hill Road with Tweseldown Road and Bourley Road, near the Tweseldown public house 3. New pedestrian crossing in Crookham village (possibly halfway along the Street) to assist children from QEB getting to Calthorpe Park School. 4. Traffic improvements at Malthouse bridge to ease flow and to prevent vehicles hitting the structure and its surroundings. This could potentially be traffic light controlled. 5. Banning right hand turns from Tesco (Reading Road South) and Aldi (Beacon Hill Road). This may be kerbing or larger, clearer signage to the existing ones. 	

<p>The group discussed the various ways to do these schemes and costings.</p> <p>The District Councillors highlighted other schemes they would possibly like to see included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To provide an enhanced crossing in Hitches Lane between Calthorpe Park School and Hart Leisure Centre. A basic scheme is due to be funded by the developers of the Grove Farm site (in line with HCC request). But it was felt an enhanced scheme could be funded using some of the QEB money,• Improvements from Crookham Park to Calthorpe Park. A safer walking and cycling route (this scheme is similar to option 4 above). <p>District Councillors confirmed that improving pedestrian safety along Hitches Lane is a key priority for the Council.</p> <p>The Development Management & Building Control Manager confirmed that the Grove Farm development would contribute £26,500 to the Hitches Lane crossing. The group noted that an enhanced crossing would cost between £100,000 and £200,000 so there would be a significant shortfall.</p> <p>A District Councillor commented that traffic improvements at Malthouse bridge should be lower down the priority list when compared to other schemes the group had discussed.</p> <p>A County Councillor informed the group that as part of the S106 for the Watery Lane development funding is already earmarked for Malthouse bridge.</p> <p>A District Councillor questioned if a Kings Road to Norris Hill Road cycle route could include Windy Gap, to extend access to Farnborough. The Development Management Manager agreed that a link up would be very beneficial and confirmed there is a shortfall in the current funding for the Norris Hill cycle way. There are a number of reasons for the shortfall of funding, which includes the County Council's new policy on replacing trees removed to create the space for the cycle way.</p> <p>The group discussed and questioned the County Council's trees policy and how the in this case it may stifle the provision of a cycle way to promote modal shift from cars.</p> <p>ACTION: HT to provide an update on the replacement trees policy.</p> <p>District Councillors suggested the cycle route from QEB to Fleet Railway Station should be included in the priority list too. An</p>	<p>HT</p>
---	-----------

	<p>option for this cycle route via Velmead Common should also be considered.</p> <p>A County Councillor confirmed that improvements to cycle routes to Fleet Railway Station did not meet the criteria for Levelling Up funding.</p> <p>A County Councillor reported that safer crossing at Fleet Railway Station had been considered and the group discussed zebra crossings and phasing of the traffic lights.</p> <p>A County Councillor highlighted that the Hitches Lane and Elvetham Heath walking scheme is on the County Council's radar and financially could be deliverable ahead of other schemes discussed today.</p>	
<p>6.0</p>	<p>Local additional available funding sources (s106 etc)</p> <p>It was noted that there would be a further £600,000 of S106 transport funds from the Watery Lane development.</p> <p>The Development Management & Building Control Manager confirmed that the District Council did not hold any S106 funds which could be spent on transport measures.</p> <p>It was noted that there had been some DfT funding which the County Council had received during lockdown. Plus there are potentially new funding from Active Travel England, and funding from Safe Routes to Schools.</p> <p>The Executive Director – Place said when considering this list of schemes, it would be helpful to see the range of S106 funds the County Council holds (or is expecting) for transport schemes around Fleet, plus any other relevant funding the County Council holds, in order to help prioritise schemes and funding opportunities.</p> <p>ACTION: HT to circulate a list of available funding (S106 and other).</p> <p>A District Councillor highlighted there are issues with traffic calming measures and cycling / pedestrian access along Naishes Lane. They also queried the speed tables and requested an update on this.</p> <p>ACTION: SP to provide an update on Naishes Lane.</p>	<p>HT</p> <p>SP</p>

7.0	<p>Next steps and meeting date</p> <p>A County Councillor confirmed that a Cabinet paper needs to be prepared for March 2023 to enable Officers to begin investigating schemes discussed. They stressed that his key priority was school crossings for Reading Road South.</p> <p>ACTION: HT is currently working on a costings spreadsheet for Fleet, and will share with the group when completed.</p> <p>The next meeting is proposed to be the week commencing Monday 11 September 2023 – time tbc. Ideally not on a Friday, the earlier part of the week was preferred by the group.</p>	HT
8.0	<p>AOB</p> <p>The Executive Director – Place provided an overview of Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) work which Hart District Council and Hampshire County Council have jointly commissioned from Sustrans. The work is taking place at the moment, and it is expected to consult on a draft LCWIP in early summer.</p> <p>The Fleet town centre to the Railway Station existing cycle route was discussed. It was agreed it did not work, and that it most likely would be in the LCWIP.</p> <p>A District Councillor asked if a parish representatives should be invited to future meetings of this group. It was agreed if applicable they may be.</p> <p>A District Councillor asked when the developer had last carried out a traffic survey on the QEB.</p> <p>ACTION: HT to confirm the last date a survey was undertaken at QEB.</p> <p>A County Councillor asked if the District Council was aware of all the Public Rights of Way. It was noted that the County Council is responsible for maintaining the maps of the definitive rights of way. But the District Council does have these on our GIS (geographic information system) properly mapped for a number of reasons, including to ensure appropriate consultation on planning applications.</p>	HT

Meeting ended at 11:54