



PEACEHAVEN TOWN COUNCIL

TONY ALLEN
TOWN CLERK
TELEPHONE: (01273) 585493
FAX: 01273 583560
E-MAIL: townclerk@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

TOWN COUNCIL OFFICE
MERIDIAN CENTRE
MERIDIAN WAY
PEACEHAVEN
EAST SUSSEX
BN10 8BB

DRAFT Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Highways Committee held in the Anzac Room, Community House on Tuesday 19th July 2022 at 7.30pm

Present: Cllr Alan Milliner (Chair), Cllr Isobel Sharkey (Vice Chair), Cllr David Seabrook (Vice Chair of Council), Cllr Sue Griffiths, Cllr Cathy Gallagher.

Officers: George Dyson (Deputy Town Clerk & Civic Officer), Vicky Onis (Committees & Assistant Projects Officer).

One member of the public was in attendance.

1. PH1421 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair opened the meeting at 19:27, welcomed everyone and went through the building fire procedures.

2. PH1422 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mike Gatti, from Peacehaven Focus group, read out the following statement:

On behalf of Aimee Harman and the 'Heathy Browers' residents group, they would like to thank Cllr's Sue Griffiths and David Seabrook and also Vicky Onis of PTC for their help and support with the planning application LW/22/0380 to install a phone mast on Heathy Brow. They are most grateful for their kind assistance.

This planning application has raised an important issue. That of the woeful notification of planning applications to residents, and the abysmal planning portal website, that unless you know how to navigate it, is impossible to use. Even our LDC District Councillor couldn't find the logged comments!

May I ask that this committee requests that a review of the notification process and the planning portal is made to ensure that it is fit for purpose, in order that residents can be given sufficient notice to consider applications, and make comments and take action as they see fit. As there are more of these masts proposed for the town this is becoming more of an issue with residents.

Vicky Onis (Committees & Assistant Projects Officer) reported that she has already contacted Lewes District Council by email about this concern and is currently waiting for a response.

3. PH1423 TO CONSIDER APOLOGIES FOR ANY ABSENCES AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies were received from Cllr Paul, Cllr White, and Cllr Harris.

4. PH1424 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

There were no declarations of interest.

5. PH1425 TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF 28TH JUNE 2022

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey. Seconded by: Cllr Griffiths.

The minutes of the above meeting were **resolved and adopted**.

6. PH1426 TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE FROM CLLR CATHY GALLAGHER ON THE EMERGING NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Cllr Gallagher informed the Committee work on the Neighbourhood Development Plan is progressing at quite a pace now in preparation for the schedule 14 consultation.

The plan will be going to full council meeting in September as August is now too soon.

Nancy Astley will now be giving her training session on the use of the neighbourhood development plan design guides & policies in response to planning applications at 7pm on 9th August 2022.

This report was **noted**.

7. PH1427 TO NOTE AND REVIEW THE COMMITTEES BUDGETARY REPORT

The Committee **noted** this report.

8. PH1428 – TO REVIEW THE PLANNING CODE OF GOOD PRACTICE POLICY

After a discussion on this policy, the Committee felt it would be a good idea to send the policy to Nancy Astley to get her comment on the policy at the next Committee meeting.

9. PH1429 – TO NOTE AND DISCUSS CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FROM CLARKE TELECOM

Cllr Seabrook raised some concerns with regard to the correspondence from Clarke Telecom, including:

- Some of the details in the document do not appear to add up, in particular why the new masts are needed to operate at a frequency that they're not using.
- It would be good to see a 'bigger picture' – if these masts will need to be put in at approximately half mile intervals, what other sites are being looked at.
- A 20m mast (as is proposed) is around the height of a 6 storey building – considerably higher than the nearby flats at the proposed site.
- What effect might this have on Honeybees and insects – Professor Dave Goulson from Sussex University has expressed concern about the lack of research done on 5G and insects.
- Why aren't these masts being shared by multiple phone companies.

Cllr Seabrook also asked whether phone masts are mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan, and whether Lewes District Council have a policy on the subject.

Cllr Gallagher asked whether we need to contact Lewes District Council about any plans relating to policies on phone masts, or whether it is just done on an ad-hoc basis.

Cllr Griffiths asked if there has been any consideration for mitigating against visually impaired people walking into the mast, and pointed out the correspondence had been sent to District Councillors in the North ward, whereas the proposed development is in the West ward.

Cllr Milliner suggested that we should make comments back, and to make enquiries with Lewes District Council as to whether there is a policy relating to phone masts.

Action – Town Clerk to respond to the correspondence from Clarke Telecom with appropriate comments from this Committee.

Action - Committees & Assistant Projects Officer to contact Lewes District Council regarding whether there is a policy relating to phone masts.

10. TO COMMENT ON THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS FOLLOWS:-

PH1430 – LW/22/0447, 213 Arundel Road West

It was proposed that the Committee support this planning application.

Proposed by: Cllr Sharkey. Seconded by: Cllr Griffiths.

The Committee **resolved** unanimously to this proposal.

PH1431 – LW/22/0414, 60 The Promenade

Lewes District Council are not accepting comment on this application as it is a permitted development.

The Committee **noted** this application.

PH1432 – LW/22/0392, 196 Arundel Road

It was proposed that the Committee support this planning application.

Proposed by: Cllr Seabrook. Seconded by: Cllr Sharkey.

The Committee **resolved** unanimously to this proposal.

11. PH1433 – TO NOTE THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATION DECISIONS

LW/22/0261, 36 Cornwall Avenue
LW/22/0344, 38 Vernon Avenue
LW/22/0302, 128 Arundel Road
LW/22/0346, 29 Neville Road
LW/22/0292, 95 Malines Avenue
LW/22/0225, 82 The Promenade

The Committee **noted** these planning application decisions.

12. PH1434 – TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE P&H ACTION PLAN AND AGREE ANY ACTIONS REQUIRED

The Committee highlighted that the action plan had not been updated following the previous Committee Meeting.

Cllr Seabrook asked that in relation to agenda item 1, that the Town Clerk investigate whether Barratts would be open to giving Peacehaven Town Council the concrete path from Lower Hodder Farm to Centenary Park along with the green area they have already agreed to. **Action** – Town Clerk.

Actions to also be added onto the action plan as per agenda item PH1424.

The next meeting of this Committee was confirmed for 9th August 2022.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 20:14.

Detailed Income & Expenditure by Budget Heading 27/07/2022

Month No: 4

Cost Centre Report

	Actual Year To Date	Current Annual Bud	Variance Annual Total	Committed Expenditure	Funds Available	% Spent	Transfer to/from EMR
<u>200 Planning & Highways</u>							
4851 Noticeboards	0	650	650		650	0.0%	
4852 Monument & War Memorial	122	600	478		478	20.4%	
4853 Street Furniture	0	600	600		600	0.0%	
Planning & Highways :- Direct Expenditure	<u>122</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>1,728</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,728</u>	<u>6.6%</u>	<u>0</u>
4101 Repair/Alteration of Premises	0	700	700		700	0.0%	
4111 Electricity	49	1,092	1,043		1,043	4.5%	
4171 Grounds Maintenance Costs	417	500	83		83	83.3%	
4850 Grass Cutting Contract	8,864	8,864	0		0	100.0%	
Planning & Highways :- Indirect Expenditure	<u>9,330</u>	<u>11,156</u>	<u>1,826</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,826</u>	<u>83.6%</u>	<u>0</u>
Net Expenditure	<u>(9,452)</u>	<u>(13,006)</u>	<u>(3,554)</u>				
Grand Totals:- Income	0	0	0			0.0%	
Expenditure	9,452	13,006	3,554	0	3,554	72.7%	
Net Income over Expenditure	<u>(9,452)</u>	<u>(13,006)</u>	<u>(3,554)</u>				
Movement to/(from) Gen Reserve	<u>(9,452)</u>						

Agenda Item: PH1442
Committee: Planning & Highways
Date: 3rd August 2022
Title: Joint purchase with TTC of a Speed Indicator Device (SID)
Report Author: Victoria Onis – Committees and Assistant Projects Officer
Purpose of Report: TO DECIDE

Summary of recommended actions

To consider the purchase of a joint SID with Telscombe Town Council

Introduction

At the SLR meeting in January 19th 2022 a SID was discussed. Ian Johnson confirmed that a device could be purchased by The Town Council at a cost of approximately £3500. This could be a joint program across the two Towns or arranged separately.

Telscombe Town Council has asked if PTC wants to purchase a SID device for joint use.

Background

The use of SID's by a number of Town and Parish Councils has shown them to be effective in reducing the speed of vehicles. Modern versions can store speed data for later downloading.

Analysis

The approx. cost will be £3500 for a SID – one quote attached.

The Town Councils would need to apply for a licence from East Sussex Highways for the locations that the device will be used for a limited period per location. One licence would cover all locations.

These devices could not be placed within 30 metres of a junction on a 30mph road or on the opposite side of the road and must be clearly visible.

Implications

The Town Council has a duty to consider the following implications:

<u>Financial</u>	Est. £1750 cost.
<u>Legal</u>	Licence from East Sussex Highways for the locations and conditions for use.
<u>Environmental and sustainability</u>	Safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
<u>Crime and disorder</u>	
<u>Climate</u>	

Appendices/Background papers

Councillor Christine Robinson (Chair) – ESCC and Telscombe Town Councillor
Councillor Chris Collier – ESCC and Peacehaven Town Councillor,
Ian Johnson – ESCC Traffic & Safety Manager
Bianca Buss – Telscombe Amenities Officer
Vicky Onis – Peacehaven Administration & Support Officer
Councillor Cathy Gallagher – Peacehaven and Telscombe Town Council
Councillor Lucy-Jo Symonds – Peacehaven Town Council
Councillor David Seabrook – Peacehaven Town Council
Cllr Ron White – Peacehaven Town Council
Councillor Emilia Simmons – Peacehaven Town Council

Next Meeting: Hosted by Peacehaven Town Council, date tbc.

Meeting to discuss Traffic & Safety issues within Peacehaven & Telscombe Towns

19th January 2022 10.00am via Zoom

Minutes

1. Request for Controlled Crossings

The Amenities Officer advised that Telscombe Town Council are requesting two controlled crossings in Telscombe Cliffs. One is located at Kirby Drive opposite Chatsworth Park North Playground and the other is located at Telscombe Cliffs Way, next to the local primary school. The crossing at Kirby Drive is a recommendation provided from an access report of the park undertaken on behalf of the Town Council. The request for a crossing at Telscombe Cliffs Way is due to a long standing issue with parked cars and congestion around the school, making it hard for pedestrians to safely cross the road. There have been crash incidents in this location, most recently in September when a child got hit by a vehicle. Both requests had previously been made to the County Council, who advised that with limited funding available, they have assessed the requests through their prioritisation process but they do not meet the criteria required for further detailed appraisal. They have suggested that the Town Council may wish to investigate this further with a community match scheme. The Amenities Officer stated that the price to implement a crossing even with the scheme, is too high for the Town Council to consider as they have limited funds. Ruby Brittle advised at the last meeting that if a controlled crossing is requested, the Town Council should firstly undertake a feasibility study at a cost of £500 as this also provides other options if a crossing is not suitable in the requested area. The decision lies with the County Council, who consider applications across the whole County, based on crash incidents, police reports, economic and social impacts, etc. As these requests need to be considered by the County Council, it was agreed to discuss this item with Ian Johnson at this meeting.

Cllr Seabrook also enquired about a crossing being added on the A259 road next to the Sutton Avenue roundabout or near to the Hoddern Avenue junction. The Sutton Avenue roundabout has been widened and is a struggle to cross safely due to the speed of vehicles travelling and their visibility. A crossing at Hoddern Avenue will allow residents to safely cross by the bus stops. *Post meeting note: The Hoddern Avenue request discussed at the*

meeting has been brought to the attention of the team looking at the Major Road Network proposals by Ian Johnson. Peacehaven Town Council should also raise it, and the one near to Sutton Avenue, during the forthcoming consultation period. Cllr Symonds also raised a request for a crossing in north Peacehaven.

Ian Johnson reconfirmed Ruby Brittle's comments that a feasibility study would need to be undertaken by the Town Council in the first instance. Any requests are put forward to the Traffic and Safety team, who complete a desktop assessment. Ian advised a copy of this assessment had previously been sent to Peacehaven's Town Clerk, to provide a list of what takes priority. This assessment score would need to meet the benchmark of 70 or higher, to be considered for capital funding. The County Council also have limited funding, which needs to be prioritised to the areas most needed. Last year 59 sites were recorded across the county with 4 or more personal injury crashes being recorded, which need to be prioritised. Other requests will need to be taken forward through the match funding scheme. The Amenities Officer asked if a copy of the assessment sheet could be forwarded to Telscombe Town Council and Ian Johnson advised he would send one over. *Post meeting note: form forwarded to Telscombe Town Council.*

Ian Johnson provided statistics for some of the requested areas; Telscombe Cliffs Way has been assessed in 2018, 2020 and 2021 for a crossing, with scores of 45, 31 and 48 respectively. In 2012, Kirby Drive was assessed by Tesco Express with a benchmark score of 48 and in 2013 was assessed near to the junction of Northcote Lane with a score of 40. Sutton Avenue has been assessed many times since 2012, with scores ranging from 33 to 55. Unfortunately none of these requests come close to the benchmark score. If the Town Councils would like any areas in the towns to be initially assessed, they will need to make a request and the Traffic & Safety Team will carry this out. A zebra crossing will cost approximately £35,000 and a puffin crossing will cost over £120,000, depending on the need for additional infrastructure improvements.

2. Road safety in Peacehaven

Cllr Symonds' report provided to Ian Johnson prior to this meeting, outlined concerns with the lack of safety measures and investment in north Peacehaven. There are no cycle routes, limited bus routes, increase in traffic and increase of housing. She stated that there are no safe crossings between the Good Companions public house at Roderick Avenue to the junction of Rosemary Close at Pelham Rise. Residents had contacted her, highlighting concerns with crossing roads to access Meridian Primary School. The road at Pelham Rise has sharp bends, making crossing unsafe and many vehicles speed in this location. Cllr Symonds asked Ian Johnson to walk round the sites with her, so she could highlight specific areas of concern and it was agreed the Amenities Officer would provide Cllr Symonds with Ian's email address. Cllr Symonds also confirmed there had been many 'near misses' and small car accidents. Ian Johnson advised he had visited the site and noted there was a lack of visibility at the Glynn Road junction into Pelham Rise due to the presence of parked cars and no double yellow lines. He recommended that the Town Council make a request to the Parking Team at Lewes, to ask for double yellow lines to be painted in this location. Cllr

Simmons advised she had previously requested for yellow lines to be added in this area and it had been turned down. Ian Johnson confirmed this is the decision of the Parking Team and this would need to be taken forward with them.

Cllr Symonds asked if Ian was consulted or asked for comments on any new developments, and if so, could he confirm if he was consulted for Chalkers Rise. Ian responded that all requests go to the Transport Development Control Team, who ask for various departments to comment, including himself. These are collated and passed back to the District Council. Ian advised that he did not recall providing comments for Chalkers Rise and asked Cllr Symonds to contact his colleague Alex Jack, head of the Transport Development Control Team for further advice and information.

Cllr Symonds also advised that at Chalkers Rise, there is a kerb due to be dropped at the new development side of Pelham Rise, but was not aware if the kerb opposite has any plans to also be dropped. Cllr Seabrook confirmed that both kerbs on either side of the road are due to be dropped.

4. Road safety for roads next to Telscombe Cliffs School – speed signs and request to reduce speed limit to 20mph.

The Amenities Officer advised she had attended the site and believed the signage in this area to be sufficient, and noted that the speed limit is 20mph in this location. She asked if a digital speed indicator sign could be added to educate drivers on their speed. Ian Johnson advised that there are strict rules on digital speed indicators (Vehicle Activated Signs) and would forward the County Council's policy documentation concerning this. *Post meeting note: the Vehicle Activated Signs Working Practice has now been forwarded to Telscombe Town Council.* He did confirm that the Town Council could invest in a mobile speed device at a price of approximately £3,500. This could be a joint programme across the two towns or arranged separately. The County Council would not need to assess the crash records of these sites as it permits the devices to be used as an educational tool. The Town Council would need to apply for a licence from East Sussex Highways for several locations for the device to be used for a limited period per location and this should be explored before purchasing a device. These devices could not be placed within 30 metres of a junction on a 30mph road or on the opposite side of the road and must be clearly visible. Cllr Robinson asked if a licence would need to be applied for each separate location and Ian responded that the licence would cover all the locations.

Cllr Symonds noted that the other primary schools in the towns have signage and speed management, e.g. speed bumps, but Meridian Primary School do not. Ian Johnson advised that the school signage is placed at each end of both Cripps Avenue and Roderick Avenue, and that it is unusual to have them also on approach roads. It was agreed to discuss this further when Cllr Symonds and Ian Johnson attend their walk around the area.

5. Road Markings

Cllr Robinson had previously raised concerns at the last SLR Meeting with the road markings on the A259 at Longridge Avenue, where the road goes from

two lanes into one lane travelling from Brighton. Cllr Robinson felt that this was dangerous and asked if the road markings could be changed. Cllr Gallagher advised that the first four houses after Longridge Avenue, which sit in front of the road markings, come under Brighton & Hove City Council. It was agreed this item needs to be considered by Brighton & Hove City Council. *Post meeting note: This has been brought to the attention of the team looking at the Major Road Network proposals by Ian Johnson. Telscombe Town Council should also raise it during the forthcoming consultation period.*

Meeting ended at 1128hrs

Next meeting to be arranged in May 2022 at Peacehaven Town Council – date, time and location to be confirmed once agreed with both County Councillors, ESCC Traffic & Safety Manager and Town Councils.

VEHICLE ACTIVATED SIGNS (VAS) – WORKING PRACTICE

(Updated and published – January 2020)

Introduction

The safety benefits of permanent VAS are proven but these can be lost through proliferation which lessens their impact and can lead to drivers disregarding those signs which have been installed at sites with significant crash histories. The Department for Transport has published guidance on the use of such signs in the form of Traffic Advisory Leaflet (TAL) 1/03 this states “VAS should be considered only when there is an accident problem associated with inappropriate speed that has not been satisfactorily remedied by standard signing and where safety cameras and related signs are not a cost effective or otherwise appropriate solution”.

In addition, the cost of running and maintaining VAS, which require regular calibration, as well as replacement when damaged or life expired is significantly more than for standard fixed signing and the benefit of a proposed installation should be clearly defined before a sign is approved for installation.

The signs which can be installed in the form of VAS are regulated by the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. Only authorised signs will be considered for use within East Sussex. The ongoing funding for running costs and maintenance will need to be secured for future years. For any community funded project, agreement on the funding for the ongoing maintenance and replacement or decommissioning of life expired signs will need to be considered and included within a formal agreement if appropriate.

In addition to permanent installations, a locally funded scheme for semi-permanent signs, triggered by passing vehicles and which display the speed of that vehicle, will be considered. Such signs will be permitted only as a temporary installation, lasting no more than three months, but may be moved from site to site within a specified area. The criteria for the provision of semi-permanent signs is more flexible to reflect their temporary nature but must still be met to ensure their continued effectiveness is not lost through over use.

A scheme to provide temporary signs must be fully funded by the local community including any ongoing programme of relocation to new sites. The applicant will be responsible for all aspects relating to licensing of the signs and gaining the necessary permits and permissions. The applicant will also be responsible for all aspects of public liability insurance, establishing the structural integrity of the support structure and must indemnify the County Council against all claims relating to the sign.

This working practice sets out the process to be followed to determine if a VAS should be installed at any location.

Assessment

There are a number of reasons why a sign might be considered

- As a Local Safety Scheme (either single site or part of a route treatment)
- To enhance speed limit compliance or as part of a traffic calming/ management scheme
- At the request of local Communities (including Community Match schemes)

Except in exceptional circumstances the use of VAS is reserved for sites where there will be a benefit in terms of casualty reduction. All such sites should initially be considered for other forms of treatment before a VAS is installed. Each site should be inspected to ensure that all the appropriate standard signs and road markings are in place and in good condition. Consideration should be given to more traditional speed reducing engineering measures and VAS should only be used if these have been ruled out as impracticable or have been installed and further measures are required. Once this initial assessment has been undertaken and it is considered a VAS may be appropriate **all** the following criteria for the specific scheme type must be met before a sign is implemented:

Scheme Type	Casualty History	Speed	Other
Local Safety Scheme	<p>Identified High Risk Site with 4 or more crashes involving personal injury in a three year period.</p> <p>Identified High Risk Route with high rates of crashes involving personal injury per km.</p>	<p>Hazard warning VAS: Inappropriate approach speeds for hazard as determined by crash data analysis.</p> <p>Speed Roundel VAS: Average speed of vehicles exceeds East Sussex speed limit criteria by 2mph or more⁽¹⁾</p>	The Road Safety Team should have identified a trend that can be targeted by VAS. Other practicable remedial measures have already been implemented.
Speed Limit Compliance or Traffic Calming	<p>Identified site with poor speed limit compliance and either of the following conditions apply:</p> <p>a. at least one speed related crash involving personal injury</p> <p>b. 4 or more identified crashes involving injury in the most recent three year period</p>	<p>Speed Roundel VAS: Average speed of vehicles exceeds East Sussex speed limit criteria by 2mph or more⁽¹⁾</p>	The crash record should be analysed to ensure there is a trend which can be targeted by VAS. No other practical speed reduction measures suitable for the site.
Community Scheme for permanent VAS installation	<p>At least one speed related crash involving personal injury in the most recent three year period.</p>	<p>Hazard warning VAS: Inappropriate approach speeds for hazard as determined by crash data analysis.</p> <p>Speed roundel VAS: Average speed of vehicles exceeds East Sussex speed limit criteria by 2mph or more⁽¹⁾</p>	<p>For consideration of signs not meeting the above criteria where alternative funding is available.</p> <p>A scheme must be fully funded including ongoing running and maintenance of the sign and replacement/ decommissioning as appropriate. No other practical measures suitable for the site to address the particular concern.</p>

Continued/

Scheme Type	Casualty History	Speed	Other
Community Scheme for Semi-permanent Advisory Signing	Not applicable- signs permitted as an educational tool to amend driver behaviour and reduce risk.	Not applicable- signs permitted as an educational tool to amend driver behaviour and reduce risk.	<p>For consideration at sites not meeting the requirements for a permanent VAS installation.</p> <p>Signs will only be considered for use on roads where a speed limit of 40mph or below applies and only on a time limited basis, (up to a maximum of three months display), to ensure that they retain their effectiveness. The location of such signs will comply with the requirements for siting Speed Indicator Devices set out in the Sussex Police Community Speedwatch policy that are relevant to this type of sign.</p> <p>A scheme must be fully funded including ongoing programme of relocation to new sites. The applicant will be responsible for all aspects relating to licensing and gaining the necessary permits and permissions from East Sussex Highways. The applicant will also be responsible for all aspects of public liability insurance and establishing the structural integrity of the support structure and indemnify the County Council against all claims relating to the sign. The applicant will also be responsible for all aspects of fixing and relocating the signs including all necessary risk assessments, method statements and the appropriate training of anyone involved in the installation and operation of the sign/s.</p> <p>Signs must comply with the principles of sign design set out in TAL 1/03.</p>

⁽¹⁾ The average speed to be exceeded for the provision of a VAS is set out below based on the current approved East Sussex speed limit criteria plus 2mph:

20mph speed limit = $24 + 2 = 26\text{mph}$

30mph speed limit = $33 + 2 = 35\text{mph}$

40mph speed limit = $42 + 2 = 44\text{mph}$

50mph speed limit = $52 + 2 = 54\text{mph}$

60mph speed limit = $62 + 2 = 64\text{mph}$

To: -
Vicky Onis
Peacehaven Town Council
admin@peacehaventowncouncil.gov.uk

29th July 2022

Our Ref WSQ12799

Dear Vicky,

Thank you for your valued enquiry regarding vehicle activated signs. I have pleasure in submitting our quotation as below.

To Supply: -

- ◆ **Portable Mini Speed Indicator Device (miniSID), battery powered complete with spare Lead Acid battery, 'intelligent' charger, sign weatherproof cover and bracket set for a cost of £2,760.00 each plus VAT.**

- **Upgrade to Lithium batteries for additional cost of £252.00 excluding VAT. (Reduces weight by 3.5kg)**



Weight: 7.5kg
Weight with Lead Acid: 11kg
Weight with Lithium: 9kg

- ◆ **Portable Speed Indicator Device (SID) with SLOW DOWN Legend beneath, battery powered complete with spare Lead Acid battery, 'intelligent' charger, sign weatherproof cover and bracket set for a cost of £2,940.00 each excluding VAT.**

- **Upgrade to Lithium batteries for additional cost of £620.00 excluding VAT. (Reduces weight by 5.5kg)**



Weight: 12kg
Weight with Lead Acid: 23kg
Weight with Lithium: 18kg

- ◆ **Portable Speed Indicator Device (SID) with Smiley / Angry Face beneath, battery powered complete with spare Lead Acid battery, 'intelligent' charger, sign weatherproof cover and bracket set for a cost of £3,045.00 each excluding VAT.**

- **Upgrade to Lithium batteries for additional cost of £620.00 excluding VAT. (Reduces weight by 5.5kg)**



Weight: 12kg
Weight with Lead Acid: 23kg
Weight with Lithium: 18kg



t: 01362 853124 e: sales@westcotec.co.uk w: www.westcotec.co.uk

Registered Office: Westcotec Ltd 34 Bertie Ward Way Rash's Green Ind Est Dereham Norfolk NR19 1TE

Reg'd in Cardiff No: 4208260

- ◆ **Portable Speed Indicator Device (SID) with 20mph/30mph/40mph roundel beneath, battery powered complete with spare Lead Acid battery, 'intelligent' charger, sign weatherproof cover and bracket set for a cost of £3,145.00 each excluding VAT.**
 - **Upgrade to Lithium batteries for additional cost of £620.00 excluding VAT. (Reduces weight by 5.5kg)**



Weight: 12kg
Weight with Lead Acid: 23kg
Weight with Lithium: 18kg

- ◆ **Portable Speed Indicator Device (SID) with Thank You / Slow Down Legend beneath, battery powered complete with spare Lead Acid battery, 'intelligent' charger, sign weatherproof cover and bracket set for a cost of £3,340.00 each excluding VAT.**
 - **Upgrade to Lithium batteries for additional cost of £620.00 excluding VAT. (Reduces weight by 5.5kg)**



Weight: 13kg
Weight with Lead Acid: 25kg
Weight with Lithium: 20kg

OPTIONAL PORTABLE SOLAR POWER SYSTEM:

If you require your sign to be Solar Powered (portable) please add the below cost per sign.

- ◆ **10W Portable Solar Panel for a cost of £650.00 per sign excluding VAT.**



Solar Panel Dimensions:
H 355mm x W255 x D34mm
Solar Panel Weight: 3.3kg

DATA COLLECTION OPTION

- ◆ **Data Collection Unit (Bluetooth to your existing Android Device, running on 7.0 or newer version, App download required from Google Play Store) for a cost of £379.00 per sign excluding VAT.**

OPTIONAL EXTRAS:

- ◆ **Additional bracket sets for a cost of £52.00 per set excluding VAT.**
- ◆ **Additional bracket for Solar Panel for a cost of £147.00 each excluding VAT.**
- ◆ **Combination Padlocks (pack of 3) for a cost of £31.00 per pack excluding VAT.**



t: 01362 853124 e: sales@westcotec.co.uk w: www.westcotec.co.uk

Registered Office: Westcotec Ltd 34 Bertie Ward Way Rash's Green Ind Est Dereham Norfolk NR19 1TE
Reg'd in Cardiff No: 4208260

IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING PORTABLE SOLAR SYSTEM

We suggest four weeks in one location before changing batteries and moving the device. Even if the unit is still operational, swap the battery to ensure regular charging cycle for both.

- All of our portable signs come complete with our comprehensive **THREE-YEAR WARRANTY** which covers everything except vandalism, impact damage, theft and batteries*.
* Batteries include manufacturers ONE-year warranty

At present we could deliver the above products within approximately 6 – 8 weeks from receipt of written Official Purchase Order.

This quotation is valid for a period of thirty days from the above date and is subject to our Terms & Conditions of Trading as per attached.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information and I will be happy to help.

Best Regards,
Will Spinks
Sales & Marketing



t: 01362 853124 e: sales@westcotec.co.uk w: www.westcotec.co.uk

Registered Office: Westcotec Ltd 34 Bertie Ward Way Rash's Green Ind Est Dereham Norfolk NR19 1TE
Reg'd in Cardiff No: 4208260

