

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OVERMOIGNE PARISH COUNCIL

17 November 2021 7.30pm at the Village Hall

- 1 Present** Cllrs Wormald, House, Warren, Bolt, Jo Chilcott and John Chilcott, and eight members of the public
- 2 Open Forum:** Mr Andrew Buckingham referred to item 7.1, explaining that he had resigned as he was not willing to give his free time to be questioned regarding an allegation by Mr Philip Scull of bullying behaviour, which he emphatically denied. He added that the public could not expect to participate in a public meeting of the council unless permission was expressly granted.

Another resident asked about planting trees to combat pollution, and she was referred to item 17 on the agenda.

The clerk read out an email from Ms Tessa Tripp, who felt that the village would benefit from having a list of local first responders, first aiders and medically trained personnel to be called upon in the event of an emergency. Councillors felt that this was a useful suggestion which could be taken up by volunteers in the wider village. The Chair raised that South West Ambulance Service Trust had been unable to provide any training when the defibrillator contract was updated (due to staff shortages), but when training could be provided it would form a solid platform for Ms Tripp's idea. Issues were raised around insurance and GDPR

- 3 Apologies:** apologies had been received from Cllr Nick Ireland, who had forwarded a report
- 4 Declarations of Interest**  
No declarations of interest
- 5 Minutes**  
The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2021 were agreed as a true record (KH proposed, JC seconded, all in favour)
- 6 Matters Arising**  
The clerk read out an abbreviated response from Dorset Council (via Cllr Nick Ireland) which stated that his request for a dual use path along Moreton Road was unlikely to be successful.
- 7 Membership of the Council**
  - i) Resignation of Cllr Buckingham: the Chair stated how disappointed he was that Cllr Buckingham had resigned, as Cllr Buckingham had significant knowledge of all aspects of the council, especially planning and finance. He thanked him for his many years of service. All

councillors and the clerk agreed with the Chair, and offered their thanks for his support and the great amount of work he had done. Cllr Warren asked that Cllr Buckingham might reconsider his decision at some point.

- ii) Recruitment process: the Chair explained the recruitment process for a new councillor. The clerk would place an advert on the noticeboards and the website, which will state that an election will be held if more than 10 residents come forward to Dorset Council requesting one. If fewer than ten people request an election, the matter will be referred back to the parish council, who will then seek to co-opt. A co-option will require residents to put themselves forward, and all names will be considered by full council, which will then select a new councillor. There was a question regarding whether existing councillors had been elected, and it was confirmed that they were all returned unopposed in May 2019. The clerk confirmed that full council could be made up of co-opted councillors as long as proper process had been followed.

Clerk

## 8. Appointment to Offices

- i) Appointment of Vice Chair: the Chair proposed Cllr House, this was seconded by Cllr Jo Chilcott, and agreed unanimously
- ii) Appointment to Planning Group: Cllr John Chilcott proposed Cllr House, and this was seconded by Cllr Jo Chilcott. Agreed unanimously.

## 9 Finance

i) Payments:	Wessex Maintenance (Sept & Oct)	205.76
	Mr D Follis (paint for bus shelter)	54.95
	Mr D Follis (redecorate swings and trim back hedging)	320.00
	Owermoigne Village Hall rent (changed from agenda)	41.00
	MS Office 365 subscription	79.99
	Dorset Council (kerbing etc outside church)	10,640.40
	SW Ambulance Service defib support package (net funding from reserves)	2,160.00
	Stationery (printer paper)	5.00
	Plastic tags for dog signs	5.32
	Clerk's salary (15 Sept – 14 Nov)	487.39
	HMRC	121.80
		<b>£14,121.61</b>

Cllr Chilcott asked for the breakdown of the payment to Dorset Council. The whole kerbside project (including bench) cost £11,319, was funded by s106 monies (£1,086), earmarked reserves (£1,700), a donation (£20) and the Community Benefit Fund (£6,740) and the VAT would be reclaimed in April 2022 (£1,773) (full breakdown added to minutes for clarity)

ii) Receipts Dorset Council (2<sup>nd</sup> half of precept) 6,000.00

iii) The budget for 2022-23 as previously circulated was agreed, as was a precept for 2022 -23 of £12,580, an increase on 2021-22 of 4%. The Chair explained that Dorset Council were reducing the services they had previously provided. Proposed by Cllr Jo Chilcott, seconded by Cllr Bolt. All in favour. Clerk

iv) To agree new signatories for the Council bank accounts: it was agreed to add Cllr Jo Chilcott as a signatory to the Lloyds no 1 account and the NS & I account. All in favour. Clerk

## 10 Dorset Councillor's Report

Dorset Councillor Ireland had sent his apologies and a written report, which the Chair read out, which highlighted the budget process, refuse, the bund along the A352, the speed limit on the A352 and the fact that residents of Ringstead would not be going ahead with their application to become a parish meeting.

Cllr Warren noted that he had been contacted by the Dorset Council tree enforcement officer, who had said that as the bund was along an old track he planned to take no further action. Cllr Warren had asked him to have another look.

## 11 Report from Dorset Police

Nothing had been received from the PCSO

## 12 Parish Councillors' Reports

Cllr Warren reported that he had checked the ten trees which had been planted by the Council in memory of those residents who had lost their lives in the First World War. 9 trees were healthy, one had died, so he would look for a replacement bare root beech. Cllr PW

Cllr Jo Chilcott reported the skittles evening on Friday for younger people, and said she had been contacted by a company which specialised in play equipment, and they had sent her a brochure. She added that she was always happy for people to contact her directly with suggestions for the playing field.

The Chair summarised his meeting with the clerk and Dorset Council's highway officer that had taken place the previous day, where they had walked around the village highlighting issues that needed to be addressed. On the list were additional drainage in Church Lane and Pollards Lane, clearing gullies, filling holes in tarmac, a ramp to make the bus shelter more accessible, moving the rubbish bin to increase visibility at the other bus shelter. The Chair expressed a hope that Dorset Council would meet the cost of much of this work, although the clerk had to arrange it. He then started to discuss the speed limit on the A352, suggesting that village signs be placed on the A352 (just after the dual carriageway eastbound, and Clerk

opposite the farm shop westbound, to make it clear to motorists that they were entering the village. He said that the parish council would have to pay for the signs. Cllr Warren felt that this was a good pragmatic idea. Clerk to get a quote for signs. The Chair also mentioned that a sign was needed to show people where the defibrillator was kept – clerk to get a quote.

Clerk

Cllr House proposed that the clerk be instructed to seek quotes for the work as set out above, seconded by Cllr Bolt, all in favour

Clerk

- 13 Epicormic growth around trees outside churchyard:** the clerk explained that she had sought two quotes to tidy up the epicormic growth around the bottom of the two trees outside the wall of the church opposite the triangle. Dorset Council had quoted £275, and the Bearded Gardener (Mr Josh Nicklin) had quoted £120. Cllr Warren proposed that the lowest quote should be accepted, seconded by Cllr Jo Chilcott. All in favour.

Clerk

#### **14 Planning**

Cllr Warren ran through the planning applications that had been considered since the last meeting:

- P/FUL/2021/02216 Watercombe House. Extension of agricultural building. No objection (Dorset Council: approved)
- P/COU/2021/02105 Land N of East Farm Lane. Change of use, 2 flats to 1 dwelling Objection (based on the initial application for the development including the provision of affordable housing) (Dorset Council: approved). Cllr Bolt asked if the property would retain its 'affordable' status, councillors considered it unlikely and an opinion was expressed that it had actually been constructed as a single dwelling.
- P/HOU/2021 /02729 11a Kit Lane Owermoigne. Erection of single storey conservatory. No objection (Dorset Council: approved)
- P/COU/2021/03422 Brimstone Cottage Holworth. Change of use, agricultural land to domestic garden. No objection (Dorset Council: no decision yet)
- P/FUL/2021/03471 Land adjacent to A352. Replace existing with new fodder and straw building. No objection (Dorset Council: approved)
- P/HOU/2021/02329 Land North of East Farm Lane, Owermoigne. Erect garage. Objection based on response to P/COU/2021/02105 (Dorset Council: no decision yet)
- P/CLE/2021/03870P The Orchard Fishers Place Ringstead. Change of use – storage: No objection (with conditions) (Application withdrawn)
- Appeal WD/D/20/001874 The Creek Ringstead. Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of new. No change in the council's position (Ongoing)

- 15 Speed limit on the A352:** traffic speed and volume statistics from the speed recorder on the A352 had been previously circulated to councillors. It was noted that the figures were presented to show that most people complied with speed limits, but a significant number of people are exceeding them. There was a view that even if the speed limit was 30mph, people were still

likely to break the limit.

**16 Correspondence from a resident:** An Owermoigne resident, Mr Michael Barnett had requested, after correspondence with Dorset Council, that the parish council makes a formal request to Dorset Council that the speed limit along the A352 (where there are properties and businesses) be reduced to 30mph. The parish council had recently asked Dorset Council to reconsider its decision to maintain the speed limit at 50mph, and had been asked if circumstances had changed. A member of the public commented that there had recently been two separate collisions where the dual carriageway ended. There was a discussion around the issue, which concluded with all agreeing to get village signs up in new positions, and reconsider Mr Barnett's proposals after that. It was decided that the clerk should respond to Dorset Council by asking them to leave the matter open.

**17 The Queen's Green Canopy:** The clerk asked if the parish council wanted to plant a tree for the Queen's Green Canopy project, which commemorated the queen's platinum jubilee in 2022. There was a discussion about where – possibly the triangle, or at the top of Kit Lane – and what sort of tree. Cllr John Chilcott mentioned that trees were in short supply, and perhaps Dobbies or Knighton Countryside Management would care to donate one or more. The clerk would check with the highways officer from Dorset Council to check if there were any issues about planting one by the memorial stone at the top of Kit Lane.

Clerk

The meeting ended at 9.10pm.

**18 Date of Next Meeting:** Wednesday 19 January 2022 at 7.30pm

## Appendix 1

### Proposed Budget 2022-23

	2021/22	2021/22	2022/23	
	Original	Projected	Proposal	
Clerks salary	3,580	3,650	3,750	
Pension	120	120	150	
Training	300	300	300	
	<b>4,000</b>	<b>4,070</b>	<b>4,200</b>	<b>4,200</b>
Playing field inspection	80	80	80	
Playing field maintenance	400	1,500	500	
Playing field grass cutting	1,300	1,300	1,300	
Maintenance (inc retainer)	360	1,000	1,000	
Tree survey / works	280	280	400	
Road salt	150	150	150	
Donations	500	500	465	
	<b>3,070</b>	<b>4,810</b>	<b>3,895</b>	<b>3895</b>
Verge maintenance	950	500	1,000	
Safe custody	15	15	15	
Laptop	400	80	80	
DAPTC subs	200	200	200	
Payroll	100	100	120	
GDPR	300	-	-	
Audit fee	360	50	50	
Professional services	120	120	120	
Election charges	400	400	400	
ICO	35	35	35	
Hall rent	220	220	250	
Insurance	555	555	555	
Petty cash expenses	290	200	200	
Contingency for unscheduled works	985	645	1,000	
			4,025	<b>4025</b>
				<b>12,120</b>
Price inflation			360	<b>460</b>
	<b>4,930</b>	<b>3,120</b>	<b>8,410</b>	
<b>Precept proposal</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>12,000</b>	<b>16,505</b>	<b>12,580</b>
			1.375	
			4% increase	<b>3.8% RPI</b>

## Appendix 2

Traffic speed and volume statistics from Dorset Council, requested as agreed at the meeting of OPC on 15 September 2021

Dear Di

We didn't have a counter in this location over the bank holiday, we do have August data, but not for this period. I did tell you on the 17<sup>th</sup> August, that we were collecting the counter that week. If you wish to have data collected at a specific time, then you would need put in a request and there would be a charge to carry that survey out.

I have summarised a week from the most recent count for you below (w/c 9<sup>th</sup> August 21).

Workday Average Flow	Eastbound 5707	Westbound 5709
7 Day Average Flow	Eastbound 5678	Westbound 5664
85 <sup>th</sup> ile Speed	Eastbound 49.4mph	Westbound 49.0mph
Mean Speed	Eastbound 43.3mph	Westbound 42.5mph

EASTBOUND Speed Statistics – TOTAL FLOW FOR WHOLE WEEK 39744

2.82% (1119) of Total Flow were travelling above 57mph (ACPO, 10%+2)

95% of total traffic is travelling BELOW 54.5mph

1.3% of total traffic were >10mph over speed limit

0.4% of total traffic were >15mph over speed limit

WESTBOUND Speed Statistics – TOTAL FLOW FOR WHOLE WEEK 39648

1.97% (782) of Total Flow were travelling above 57mph (ACPO, 10%+2)

95% of total traffic is travelling BELOW 53.7mph

0.9% of total traffic were >10mph over speed limit

0.3% of total traffic were >15mph over speed limit

## Correspondence with Mr Michael Barnett of Owermoigne

### Summary

Mr Barnett contacted the clerk initially on 18 October 2021 to ask whether OPC had made representation to Dorset Council regarding the speed limit along the part of the A352 that abuts Owermoigne village. It was explained to him that OPC had made representations, and DC had been adamant that the stretch of road in question did not meet the criteria for a reduced speed limit. The clerk suggested that Mr Barnett contact Dorset Councillor Ireland and Dorset Council, which he did.

The parish council has reiterated its request for a reduction in the speed limit (to 40mph, as opposed to Mr Barnett's request for 30mph), and DC's answer is shown at page 5. Mr Barnett has subsequently made a request to the parish council to apply for a 30mph speed limit (page 7)

### Emails

Name: Mike Barnett

Subject: Wareham Road

Message: Has the Parish Council made any representations to DCC concerning both the speed limit of Wareham Road within the parish limits and the completely inappropriate aspects of Road design at both ends of the road section and within it? The most recent accident serves as a stark reminder of the danger to pedestrians and vehicles leaving properties at the western end of the village boundary. Given the number of properties together with the garage and garden centre plus of course the ridiculous Kit Lane/Gallows Hill crossroads the speed limit should be 30mph with cameras. The pointless dual carriageway to nowhere that prevents any safe pedestrian access to the village as well as severing bridleways and footpaths should be narrowed to a single lane well before the entry to the village. This would enable safe cyclist and pedestrian access to the village and reduce speeds entering the village. Its time for action before someone is killed.

Hi Di,

Thanks for your reply. I have a few suggestions that may help in encouraging DCC to take action.

Firstly , I do not believe making application for a speed limit based purely on speed of vehicles leaving the dual carriageway is particularly useful. As some one who lives adjacent to Wareham Road I can tell you that the majority of vehicles significantly in excess of 50 mph are travelling in the opposite direction, especially in the evening and early morning.

Secondly I do not believe 40mph is the correct speed to pursue with approaches to DCC. The application should be for 30mph and based on several criteria not just the speed of traffic. For example:-

The speed limit along Kit Lane and part of Moreton Road plus adjacent streets is 30mph. What is the justification? Housing. In which case why are remaining parts of the village, specifically the houses along Wareham Road, not similarly contained within a 30 mph limit? In other words, the existing village 30 mph limit is not correctly applied in terms of its beginning and end points. I have before heard arguments that Wareham Road has no street lighting.....Well nor does kit Lane etc!! Rather than requesting a new speed limit, the application to DCC could become one of claiming the existing 30mph zone is incorrectly applied. Support for such a claim could easily be reinforced with examples from several other villages nearby. Broadmayne is one example, Osmington is another. The 30mph limit starts where housing begins and ends when housing ends. Where are differences that suggest those areas have a continuous 30 mph limit whilst Owermoigne does not?

The case could be further reinforced by the fact that Wareham Road has incomplete pedestrian protection with no continuous pavement, a situation similar to both Broadmayne and Osmington; but pedestrians only have to cross a 30mph road....not 50mph plus!

Speed is however not the only consideration. Noise and pollution should also be taken into account.

I note from the minutes the issues regarding costs for SID etc. Surely a cheaper solution would be civilian speed gun volunteers. Masses of speed data could be acquired in this way without the costs.

Just as an amusing aside 2 years ago my usual garden Christmas lighting included a net on our front fence. I had not realized until a friend pointed it out to me after driving by, that the lights were an alternative blue and white flashing sequence! The speed of vehicles passing the house reduced considerably for weeks!

In summary I strongly suggest you build a new case based on some or all of the criteria above.

Afternoon Jack,

FYI the speed limit through Owermoigne has been an issue since before I was elected back in 2017 and continues to be so. It represents a clear and present danger to residents and those who use the facilities in the village, specifically the garage and farm shop.

Given Michael Potter has left the organisation, can you please forward to the relevant officer and request that they contact me to discuss.

Thanks

Nick

Hello Nick,

Thanks for your enquiry. I include a link to our current approach for setting speed limits.

[https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/our-approach-to-setting-speed-limits?p%20back\\_url=%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Dspeed%2Blimit%2Bpolicy](https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/our-approach-to-setting-speed-limits?p%20back_url=%2Fsearch%3Fq%3Dspeed%2Blimit%2Bpolicy) .

If you are talking about the 50mph section on the A352 coming up to the junction, then this looks to be correct in line with the guidance.

If you are able to consider the guidance and come back to me with your views, we should hopefully have appointed a new road safety manager who will be able to consider your points.

Best regards,

Jack

Hi Jack,

“It is therefore government policy that a 30 mph speed limit should be the norm through villages.”

Think that says it all ...

Best wishes

Nick

Hello Nick,

The DfT guidance does continue to caveat that statement and I think that is what we find here. I have to manage expectations that unless there is strong evidence to support a different speed limit when the full guidelines are considered, such as scheme is unlikely to meet the necessary requirements for a new limit to be enforceable or be a high enough priority to be deliverable. The funding we have available for new speed limit Traffic Regulation Orders means we can't deliver all that are requested. We have to compare requests against the guidance and prioritise them. I'd be grateful if the Parish Council could consider the full guidance so that a case can be made to the new Road Safety Manager once they are in post.

Best regards,

Jack

Hi both,

I have been copied in on your discussion so feel compelled to add some context.

Firstly I do not understand "section of the A352 coming up to the junction" reference. I am referring to the section of the A352 that lies within the limits of the village of Owermoigne.....specifically heading eastwards along the A352 beginning at the end of the dual carriageway and finishing presumably somewhere near the garden centre.

Considering the criteria in the document forwarded by Jack:-

There are 9 residential properties with drives exiting onto that section of road. There are a further 7 that have vehicle access exiting onto the bottom section of Gallows Hill.....a section of road which is a narrow country lane and a 60 MPH speed limit! In the same area there is a Telephone Exchange car park exit. The 50mph limit starts 8 metres away from the junction. 30 ton plus tractor/trailer combinations do well in excess of 30mph until metres from the junction.

The ridiculous and dangerous junction/crossroads of the A352 with Kit Lane and Gallows Hill is dangerous for both pedestrians and vehicles. Several trips a day are made by large tractors together with large trailers or slurry tanks exiting Kit Lane and heading up Gallows Hill...or the reverse. At some times of year that contractor agricultural traffic amounts to one such load every 5 minutes for several hours a day. The pedestrian "island" built there a few years ago makes that dog legged crossroads a slow manoeuvre for both that agricultural traffic and school coaches etc, yet they have to cross 2 50 mph lanes. The island has done little to make crossing the road any safer for pedestrians. Indeed standing the central reserve is pretty dangerous to say the least. Sitting duck is the phrase that comes to mind!!

Just west of that crossroads is a bus stop.....with no pull in for the buses. The road here heading west at this time of the year has a very low sun direct in the eyes of drivers. We have already seen one accident involving a van that demolished the other "pedestrian central reserve".....which no one ever uses because it is too dangerous.

Moving further East there is a garage/petrol station/used car lot.....on the brow of hill and just before the road curves to the right. Access to the garage from the west means waiting in the carriageway if there is a

queue. Egress from the garage is dangerous because there is limited vision past the brow of the hill of oncoming traffic. This area has become more busy since the farm shop also opened on the same forecourt area. At some stage the old Nursery opposite ( currently closed down) may also add to the problems there.

Finally at the eastern end of this stretch of road is the Garden Centre. Access to the garden centre from the west is along a middle 3<sup>rd</sup> lane.....except vehicles approaching from the East ( at 50mph plus) have a left hand bend then a right curve before seeing there may be vehicles exiting the garden centre to head west.....their escape route to a void a collision ( assuming they cannot brake due to speed) is into the middle 3<sup>rd</sup> lane. I doubt many of the accidents that occur there reach your report function.....I have seen 3 there in the last couple of years.

In summary, the stretch of road I have referred to is dangerous both for pedestrians and for vehicles.

My house is at the junction of Gallows Hill and the A352. The noise and ground disturbance generated by fast moving traffic and large articulated lorries is pretty bad...not helped by a sunken section of the road just past the junction on the westbound carriageway. The noise is also testament to the fact that those vehicles have given no consideration to the junction in terms of their speed.

One further point. As someone who qualified as an advanced police driver I can tell you that the number of what the police driving code describes as "hazards" along this stretch of road ( crossroads/driveways/business entrances/ limited vision due to road contour and bends) means that no vehicle should be doing more than 30 mph along the majority of it in any circumstance. There is of course also a dual carriageway beyond the village. It is fairly normal practise to provide forward notice of a dual carriageway using a road sign such that drivers know there is an overtaking opportunity ahead and therefore need not get frustrated by a slower section of road.

I echo Cllr Nick Irelands succinct summary of your document.....the section of A352 is contained within a village...so should be 30 mph.

Regards

Mike Barnett

Dear Owermoigne PC Clerk

Thank you for email below – now forwarded to me for investigation and response.

While I will respond directly to the resident stating DC Policy and Dft guidance regarding the setting of speed limits on the public highway, I can only process a request if it comes from the PC or DC Cllr for the area.

Is this something that the PC would support and if so can you give details of extent of reduction?

Regards

Stephen

Dear Stephen

Please find attached a Dorset Explorer map with provisional proposed positions for new speed limits indicated, which should help explain what Owermoigne Parish Council would seek to achieve on the A352.

The 40mph signs would be the ideal position to erect the village sign / nameboard, the siting of the sign to the east is critical, say half way between Dobbies and the Texaco garage, to avoid compromising the settlement of Galton and anything associated with same.

The parish council feels that it has explored all possible options with no avail, though we remain actively committed to finding a solution.

The Chair has a meeting planned with Mr Phil Goodland at 10.30am on 16 November in the village, and you would be very welcome to attend to discuss the matter.

Regards

Di Lawrence

Clerk to Owermoigne Parish Council

Dear Di

Sorry for delay in response, I will leave Phil and Tony to their site meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>.

Can I ask what has changed regarding the PC request for reduction to 40mph limit since the original request was made by PC in July 2020 and responded to by Mike Potter in September 2020. As both Mike Potter and Joe Allen have confirmed, it does not meet policy criteria and there is no evidence to support the reduction.

If there have been significant changes in your request (location, extent etc) or further evidence of collisions then we can reconsider, if not I cannot see an argument for overturning Mikes decision.

Stephen Mephram

Dear Mr Barnett

Owermoigne PC have forwarded an email from you to Dorset Council and I have been asked to respond.

When installing a new speed limit or making amendment to the extent of an existing speed limit, we need to go through a legal process to create a Traffic Regulation Order and Dorset Council will only undertake this process if the request is officially made by a Dorset Councillor or the Town / Parish Council. As I am sure you are aware, Owermoigne PC have recently requested a new speed limit and this was investigated and refused as it did not meet criteria as set out in DCs speed limit policy, nor did it meet Department for Transport guidance as shown on Dorset Councils website by following this link - [Our approach to setting speed limits - Dorset Council](#)

The A352 in Owermoigne does not meet criteria for a 40mph limit as set out in Department for Transport guidance/criteria for setting speed limits. The nature and layout of the A352 in Owermoigne fits most closely with the current 50mph limit rather than recommended criteria for a 40mph limit, suggesting that adherence to a reduced 40mph limit would very likely be poor; something that can result in greater levels of conflict rather than a reduction. The frequency of inappropriate overtaking and tailgating would likely increase which in turn would increase the likelihood of collision.

The collision frequency on the A352, dual carriageway and single carriageway are relatively low and would not support a reduction in the current speed limit. The details of these collisions do not reveal anything to suggest that a reduced speed limit would have mitigated the likelihood of collisions happening.

Noise and pollution are currently not included as part of the DC Policy or DfT guidance as relevant to setting speed limits.

I understand that this will be disappointing news but I must confirm that DC have to adhere to it's own policy and DfT guidance when considering speed limit requests.

Stephen Mepham

Hi,

Stephen. I have no idea how you fit into the previous correspondence and without wishing to sound rude your response here reads like a pro forma, failing as it does to address a single point raised in my summary of the situation on the A352 in Owermoigne.

I will however answer the points you have made.

I am not concerned about what process is required and the correspondence up to this point surely already demonstrates that the parish council want action and Nick Ireland supports it.

You state that the recent request by the parish council for a 40mph speed limit failed to meet your Approach to setting speed limits document. My previous response detailed all the criteria in that document that actually support my view that this part of the Village should be a 30mph limit.....and Nick Ireland agrees!!

Your document is there for guidance and the overriding factors are the safety and well being of those that live in the village. Your reply seems to place most importance on inconvenience to those that drive through the village. Indeed your comments suggest you have not even driven along this part of the A352, or you would know that there are no opportunities to overtake between the garden centre at the Eastern end to the beginning of the dual carriageway at the western end. For example, approaching from the East, you have a 3<sup>rd</sup> lane reserved for drivers turning right into the garden centre, then a left hand bend and brow of hill, then a garage forecourt entrance on the brow of the hill, then a staggered junction with a central reserve and "turn right" lane, then a bus stop and a further central reservation, then another brow of a hill and cars blending from two to one lane at the end of the dual carriageway. All of that ignores the number of driveways and other hazards along the stretch of road.

If the effect of a 30 mph speed limit on driver behaviour was indeed a key consideration there would of course be no 30MPH limits on "A" roads. Strange therefore that Broadmayne and Wool are 30mph! In reality there is no consistency in application of the speed limits locally.

Nick Ireland selected perhaps the most salient statement in that document. The Government recommends a 30 mph limit in all villages. The stretch of the A352 I referred to is as much a part of the village as any other.

The number of houses, drive accesses onto Wareham Road, the road layout ( hill crest and bends), agricultural usage of this part of the A352, businesses within the stretch of road, danger to pedestrians, noise and pollution, and the weight of traffic especially in the various tourist seasons on a primary access route to Weymouth and its huge number of camp sites, are the overriding criteria here.....not minor inconvenience to motorists for all of the 3 or 4 minutes it takes to drive this stretch of road at 30mph.

I request that the parish council and Nick Ireland jointly make formal application for extension of the village 30 mph limit to include all its inhabitants along the A352 and DCC to reconsider its evaluation taking account of the criteria I have listed.

Hopefully we can jointly enhance the lifestyle of Owermoigne residents and prevent the sort of tragedy that seems inevitable to occur on this stretch of road if no action is taken.

Regards

Mike Barnett

Dear Mr Barnett

Thank you for your email.

I am currently discussing the PC request for a speed limit reduction (to 40mph and NOT 30mph) with the PC.

The original request was considered by DCs Road Safety Manager in September 2020, using collision evidence, speed survey data and the criteria / policy previously mentioned to you, the decision was firmly against the suitability for a reduction to 40mph.

I can see no evidence or change in policy that would lead to this decision being changed.

Stephen Mepham

Hi,

I realize it will be hard to reverse the outcome of a previous investigation or indeed to draw attention to almost parallel situations in neighbouring villages where for whatever rationale 30mph limits are in fact in place. What I am asking for is re consideration...ad a 30mph limit as befits an integral part of a village...not 40mph which would make no difference whatsoever. I am asking for reconsideration based on the safety and well being of residents rather than a focus on the impact on drivers....which would be minimal.

Interesting that the accident just a few weeks ago on this stretch of A352 which involved a vehicle careering across the road and impaling itself on a tree in the corner of a resident's driveway.....necessitating the road to be closed, numerous police cars to attend plus the air ambulance.....has not been mentioned. The driver had to be cut out of the vehicle. I have no idea if he survived. Any pedestrian in that area would most certainly have been killed. Had a vehicle been approaching in the westbound carriageway at the time, it would have been even more serious.

It was the result of a very familiar trait witnessed by anyone that regularly drives into the village from the dual carriageway. Certain drivers do all they can at speed to overtake any vehicle in front of them before blending into a single lane from the dual carriageway. For strangers to that section of road the slight hill crest plus left hand bend of the road at the point it changes from 70mph to 50 mph, gives little warning of the 50mph zone. Just one example of poor road design in this section of road.

Mike Barnett