

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE APPEALS PANEL HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOMS 1/2/3, CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND ON FRIDAY, 24 JUNE 2011 AT 10.00AM .

Present:

Councillor R D Jenkins - Chairperson

Councillors

K J Watts
C Westwood

Officers:

J Duddridge - Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering
P Gavigan - Principal Solicitor
H Roblin - Legal Officer
J Monks - Democratic Services Officer – Committees

Invitees

Councillor D Sage - Deputy Leader
Councillor J Spanswick - Ward Member - Brackla
Councillor P Hacking - Ward Member - Brackla
Ms J Thomas - Chairperson – Bridge VIS

256 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

257 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor T Hacking – Ward Member, Brackla, due to work commitments.

258 TRAFFIC CALMING, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER AND FORMAL PEDESTRIAN CROSSING PROPOSALS, WHITETHORN DRIVE, BRACKLA IN CONNECTION WITH THE NEW ARCHBISHOP MCGRATH COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the procedure that would be followed.

The Principal Solicitor informed the Panel that Ms Julie Thomas was present at the meeting and wished to be granted leave of the Chairman to speak. After consulting with the Panel Members, the Chairman said that Ms Thomas would be permitted to make representations as to why leave should be granted. The Panel heard from Ms Thomas who said that she wanted the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Bridgend and District Visual Impairment Society (Bridge VIS) and other similar groups in respect of the proposals. After consulting with the Panel Members, the Chairman advised that it had been decided that in the interests of fairness leave would be granted to Ms Thomas.

The Principal Solicitor then left the meeting.

The Chairperson invited The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering to present the case on behalf of the relevant department of the Authority.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering introduced the report, the purpose of which was to seek a resolution to the formal objections received in relation to the proposals at Whitethorn Drive, Brackla for Traffic Calming, Traffic Regulation Order and Formal Pedestrian Crossing in connection with the new Archbishop McGrath Comprehensive School development.

As part of the proposals to site the new school at Brackla, planning consent was granted in 2009, subject to a number of planning conditions. The condition imposed on the application that led to the report is Condition 11 of the planning consent notice which states:

“No works whatsoever shall commence on site until such time as a comprehensive scheme has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority for traffic calming restricting 85% tile traffic speeds to 20 mph on Whitethorn Drive, 100 metres either side of the school access junction and between Whitethorn Drive and the Community Route crossing point east of the bus/staff school access..... Such scheme, as agreed, shall be implemented as agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being brought into beneficial use.”

The Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering informed the Panel that the new school would accommodate 750 pupils over three floors, with a co-located purpose built ‘Leisure Block’ adjacent to the school’s sports hall; the sports hall would be made available for community use outside of school hours, with current plans for outdoor facilities to be operated by the Authority. These facilities would be served by an on-site car park.

The decision to site the school and attached community leisure facility in its present position was taken after an extensive study had been carried out. The study concluded that the site benefited from the recently developed cycle route to the south, connecting it to a network of urban cycle and pedestrian routes, and demonstrated that the proposed development should have no perceptible detrimental impact on the local network as the anticipated development traffic could be accommodated within the existing highway system, taking into account the likely increase in traffic. The bulk of pupils would be transported to the school by bus, with 10% of pupils walking to school.

He advised that in order to comply with Planning Condition 11, a number of options were considered. The traffic calming method previously introduced in Brackla consisted of build-outs and road narrowings, but that system had proved to be unsuccessful as it caused congestion, and in some cases accidents. Therefore the only appropriate calming feature deemed appropriate to achieve the 20 mph requirements at Whitethorn Drive were vertical displacements, as speed cushions would allow buses to travel freely, but restrict the speed of traffic. The proposed scheme, shown at Appendix A to the report, would achieve the Planning Condition of *“restricting 85 percentile traffic speeds to 20 mph on Whitethorn Drive.”*

In addition, there was a long standing parking issue alongside Oak Tree Surgery which caused problems and had raised significant concerns by local Ward Members and residents. Loading and unloading also caused obstruction and it was proposed to introduce waiting restrictions by the surgery with the introduction of a Traffic Order. The proposed scheme would also introduce prohibition of waiting restrictions to keep Whitethorn Drive, and the nine cul-de-sacs/side roads which lead from it, clear of parked vehicles. It was therefore deemed appropriate to extend the zone to include those cul-de-sacs, as both Central Government and Welsh Government were encouraging local authorities to introduce 20 mph speed limits wherever possible.

The Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering informed the Panel that the proposal was to put five sets of speed cushions along Whitethorne Drive as well as a humped zebra crossing to assist pedestrians in crossing the carriageway. There was currently a central reservation which could no longer be retained and would have to be removed. However, as there would be approximately 80 children accessing the school on foot, a zebra crossing with a raised feature was considered important. He stated that the proposed scheme at Appendix A had adhered to all statutory requirements and if the scheme were to be introduced, it would reduce traffic speed to 20 mph or lower.

He advised that consultation was undertaken on an informal basis and as a result, the Authority had received five written responses, shown at Appendix B to the report. The responses had not shown any major negative concerns related to the scheme being proposed and it was on that basis that Officers then sought delegated power to go out for public notice. Notices were sent to the relevant statutory bodies and to residents on Whitethorn Drive. However, in discussion with the Legal Officer and local Ward Members, it was agreed that all residential properties which access Whitethorn Drive should also be consulted as they would be using the road on a daily basis. After that process, the Authority received 28 formal objections to the proposal, in addition to representation from Bridge VIS, and an extension to the closing date was given to allow the objectors to be registered. At the end of that period, 29 objections were received, summarised at Appendix C to the report, with the letters and e-mails associated with the objections shown at Appendix D.

It was considered that relatively strong representations had been made on the scheme and therefore in discussions with the local Ward Members it was agreed that a lesser scheme should be developed. That scheme reduced the number of speed cushions from five, as shown in Appendix A, to two speed cushions, as shown in Appendix E. The reduced scheme would retain the zebra crossing and the gateway feature would be moved from the roundabout and situated near to Brackla Triangle shopping centre. In addition, there had been representations made which related to the loading and unloading aspect of the Traffic Order and it was considered that removal of that element would not significantly adversely affect the proposed scheme.

In conclusion, the Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering advised that the proposed scheme, shown at Appendix A, had been developed to achieve the planning conditions associated with the school and if the scheme were to be introduced on Whitethorn Drive, it would achieve the 20 mph speed limit. He stressed that if the proposed scheme, shown at Appendix E were to be adopted as the preferred option, then a monitoring regime would need to be put in place to consider and view whether the speed limit was being adhered to; if not, then further measures may have to be introduced in the future.

He referred to the recommendations outlined in the report and asked the Panel:

- a) to refuse to agree to the objections received to the proposed raised traffic calming scheme on Whitethorn Drive and authorise either the implementation of:
 - i) the calming scheme detailed in Appendix A which is the preferred option
 - or;
 - ii) the calming scheme detailed in Appendix E with the requirement for it to be monitored to assess whether it meets the planning condition and that additional measures be introduced if it does not;
- b) to refuse to agree to the objections received to the 20mph speed limit zone detailed in Appendix A/Appendix E and authorise the appropriate permanent traffic regulation order for the speed limit;
- c) to refuse to agree to the objections received to the no waiting at any time restrictions but agree to the removal of the accompanying loading/unloading ban and authorise the making of the appropriate permanent traffic regulation order;
- d) to agree to the establishment of a humped Zebra Crossing.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering explained that he had not addressed the issue raised by Bridge VIS, as he believed it was more appropriate to respond after Ms Thomas had aired her concerns and identified the perceived problems.

The Panel asked what the advantages of a raised zebra crossing would be.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering explained that there were two factors. Firstly, that the raised crossing would form part of the traffic calming scheme and ensure that there were calming features at appropriate distances. Secondly, if level zebra crossings or controlled crossings were not in use on a regular basis, drivers had a tendency to ignore them, which had caused a number of accidents. As a safety measure, by introducing a vertical displacement on the zebra crossing, drivers' perception was raised and they had to slow down.

The Panel asked why Condition 11 was required for planning consent, as there were schools in the Borough which did not have traffic calming features.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that both Central Government and Welsh Government had introduced a mandate stipulating that there should be 20 mph zones in front of all new schools and where possible to introduce them in front of established schools.

The Panel enquired whether other forms of transport such as buses and motor cycles would be affected by the speed cushions.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that buses would be affected to a lesser degree than smaller vehicles. Motor cycles would not be affected as they would be able to travel between the speed cushions.

The Panel asked why a pelican crossing with traffic light control had not been considered in the proposed scheme.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering explained that there was no actual requirement for a zebra crossing at Whitethorn Drive, but by removing the central refuge, the crossing had to be introduced and a raised zebra crossing was an acceptable specification.

The Chairperson then asked the local Ward Members to present their case.

Councillor Spanswick informed the Panel that there were many more people than the 29 objections the Authority had received who were objecting to the proposed scheme. He stated that Condition 11 of the planning consent had not been complied with as the school had already been built and whatever happened with a scheme for Brackla, the school would open in September. He questioned why the central refuge was to be removed and the structure was being changed because it could not cope with the proposed scheme.

He stated that a mini roundabout outside the school had not been discussed with the Ward Members or members of the public and suggested that the reported number of accidents was misleading as there had only been two accidents, one outside the Oak Tree Surgery and one outside Brackla Triangle shopping centre, in the last 10 years.

He then referred to the traffic survey which had been carried out between the 20th and 31st May 2011, and had shown the average speed to be 24 mph, which he stated was not a major problem. However, he advised that there was a problem with parking outside the Oak Tree Surgery and suggested introducing yellow lines or an emergency parking bay as it would be less intrusive.

With regard to the alternative proposed scheme shown at Appendix E of the report, he explained that although he appreciated that Officers had taken on board the views of the local Ward Members, and although that scheme was an improvement on the original proposed scheme, nevertheless he did not believe it was the best scheme for the area.

Councillor Spanswick then referred to the raised zebra crossing, which he stated would be welcome. However, he was not certain whether all options had been explored as he believed that the zebra crossing needed to be positioned in a more suitable location so that people would use it, and suggested there should be a further crossing at Brackla Way. He added that if cost was not an issue, it needed to be a pelican crossing which he believed was the safest option.

He concluded by saying that a scheme was needed that would work for everyone who lived in Brackla and as there was no rush to implement the scheme, it was important to get it right. He suggested meeting as a group with Officers, local Ward Members and members of the public to look at the whole picture.

Councillor Sage expressed that during his 15 years as an elected member, he had not had so many members of the public contact him over a particular issue, and an unprecedented number of complaints had been received by local members. He believed the main objection was to the speed cushions and the reason was that within 200 yards of road there were a number of turn offs from just one road leading to the surgery, dentist and pub off one street. He suggested that if the

proposed scheme was to be implemented, there could be resultant consequences in the future.

He made reference to Norman Baker's report, the Minister for Local & Regional Transport Department, in which he had stated that he wanted to end the era of top down Government and to see local communities saying what they wanted to see in such schemes. Councillor Sage believed that the proposed reduced scheme could still be achieved in support of public opinion, but also remove the speed cushions element. He pointed out that the speed limit at the other end of Brackla housing estate was between 50-60 mph, which was reduced to 20 mph. Also, in Coity a road reduction scheme was implemented where the road was narrowed.

At this point Councillor Sage tabled photographs of the traffic calming measures which had been introduced at Parc Derwen, the new housing estate in Coity.

Councillor Sage suggested that a similar scheme could be implemented in Brackla as it would be more suitable than the proposed existing scheme, which he believed would affect the quality of life of many people in that area, due to the fact that there was only one entrance and exit to the estate from the Bridgend town end. He questioned why two speed cushions were necessary as the buses only travelled half way down the route before they turned into the school grounds.

In conclusion, he advised that as Chair of the Equalities Forum he supported a controlled pelican crossing as it was important for the visually impaired in the community.

Councillor Hacking expressed that although the four Councillors present were on different sides politically, they were all in complete agreement that the proposed scheme would not work. She stressed that Whitethorn Drive was a well used road, as a large volume of people used the Brackla Triangle shopping centre, and the new school would add to the volume of traffic, which would create a tailback of vehicles impeding entry to the shopping centre.

With reference to the two speed cushions, Councillor Hacking believed that they were surplus to requirements and would not serve any particular purpose as they were unnecessary. She stated that she also had a problem with the fact that the proposed 20 mph speed limit could not be enforced by the local Police.

She concluded by saying that a number of local residents had approached her stating that they were unhappy with the proposed scheme, and she believed that more consultation was needed in order to listen to the views of Brackla residents.

Ms Thomas thanked the Panel for affording her the opportunity to speak on behalf of Bridge VIS.

She advised the Panel that she lived the other side of the Brackla Triangle shopping centre and at the moment found it extremely hazardous to access the shopping centre and Oak Tree Surgery. She explained that she had lost her sight two years ago and as a result, was passionate about the problems the visually impaired encountered in getting from A to B and informed the Panel that there were 844 visually impaired people on the register in Bridgend. She had been required to learn the road in order to access the shopping centre and surgery, but the entrance had since been moved and now she had to guess when it was safe to cross the road. She therefore believed it was essential to have a light controlled crossing outside the shopping centre.

Ms Thomas informed the Panel that she had contacted Councillor Spanswick expressing that she had difficulty getting to her local bus stop and that she could not access any of the local facilities on her doorstep due to the traffic conditions.

She advised that with the building of the new school, it presented an opportunity to improve the facilities and the traffic situation in Brackla. She did not believe a zebra crossing was the correct choice for the visually impaired and the speed cushions on the crossing would be confusing as it would be difficult to ascertain whether cars were stopping or merely slowing down to cross over the speed cushions and suggested that it would be an accident waiting to happen. She stated that there should be further consultation to discuss all scenarios so that the visually impaired are not excluded.

Referring to the children who would be attending the new school, she advised that a large number of them would want to go to the shopping centre, which is situated on the other side of the road from the school, therefore where the crossing is located would be up for debate and she believed that a light controlled crossing would suit the needs of everyone.

Ms Thomas concluded by highlighting the importance of getting the right scheme the first time to avoid having to go back and improve on it, which would cost money. She asked the Panel to reconsider the proposed scheme which she did not believe would work.

The Chairperson thanked all parties for presenting their submissions.

The Panel asked the invitees what scheme in their view would be acceptable.

Councillor Spanswick suggested that a separate meeting needed to be set up between Officers, local Ward Members and the public in order to put the options on the table, as he did not believe they had all been explored.

The Panel had been given the impression that the proposed scheme shown at Appendix E had been acceptable.

Councillor Spanswick explained that a meeting was held with Highways Officers, who had come up with an alternative proposed scheme which Ward Members had stated was a more acceptable recommendation. He specified that the speed cushions were unnecessary and advised that there was enough land available outside the school to place a mini roundabout. He also wanted to see a controlled light crossing in the area.

All parties were offered the opportunity to sum up.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering commenced his summing up by reiterating that the proposed scheme related to a planning condition for the new school which had been very precise. He disagreed with Councillor Spanswick's suggestion that the condition had not been complied with and that the developer had in fact complied with that condition.

He explained that the developer had provided the proposed scheme shown at Appendix A to the report, which was then agreed as a suitable scheme to go for consultation and it was on that basis that work on the site was allowed to commence. The Condition attached to the proposed scheme specifically asked

for a traffic calming restriction to 20 mph. The Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering advised that the worst case scenario would be if no scheme was agreed. If that were the case then the developer, who had complied with the Condition, would be within his rights to have the Condition removed in that a scheme had been submitted but not agreed due to objections, therefore the Condition would become ultra vires which means it could not be legally enforced. Therefore on that basis no work would be carried out on Whitethorn Drive and the school would still open on time.

Referring to Ms Thomas' statement in which she had indicated that he was all too aware of the problems she encountered, the Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering advised that he had walked the route with Councillor Spanswick and Ms Thomas, and agreed that it was virtually impossible for her to cross on the junction leading into Brackla Triangle shopping centre. He explained that the noise from the roundabout, which was in close proximity, was extremely confusing and he had been unable to detect where the noise was coming from. There was an alternative access route through the shopping centre, but it was on private land, which was cluttered with papers and advertising boards displayed by the retail properties on the site, therefore Ms Thomas was unable to use it. He had as a result petitioned the retailers, but had been unsuccessful in reaching a solution.

He stated that the fundamental issue was in Ms Thomas crossing the road to the shopping centre and the option to relocate a crossing to the side of the roundabout could not be supported on road safety grounds, as vehicles stopping at that point could cause issues on the roundabout, which had a history of accidents.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that he could see only one logical way to overcome Ms Thomas' problem and that was to introduce a section of footpath to the south west corner of the roundabout to gain access from Princess Way and form a crossing on Brackla Way which would be the right side of the road. He explained that this would give access to everyone, including access to Oak Tree Surgery and believed this was the only scheme which would be viable to resolve the problem.

He believed that the local Ward Members would make representation for that scheme to be put forward as a preferred option for local management traffic schemes.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that there was nothing in the proposal which was directly related to the school that could be amended to facilitate Ms Thomas' problem and he was disappointed as an Equalities Impact Assessment had been carried out, which had identified that there were no adverse effects from this scheme to anyone with a disability, but also no benefits. He stated that he had been mindful that if the scheme could have been improved on, it would have been, but did not see how Ms Thomas' problem could be dealt with in relation to the proposed scheme.

He continued to say that two locations were looked at either side of the school access and the speeds associated with the main speed and the 85 percentile speed had been registered. As indicated previously, the main speed overall was around 24 mph on the west of the access which meant that the 85 percentile was between 29-30 mph, therefore 85% of traffic was travelling up to 30 mph which was the issue he had to deal with.

He stated that he was more concerned with the access point situated east of the school, which is the access nearest to the cul-de-sacs. The traffic travelling towards the roundabout at that location had a much higher mean speed of 27 mph. On that basis the percentile speed was above 30 mph, which was where it was proposed to put the two speed cushions.

He informed the Panel that the speed of cars travelling out of the cul-de-sacs appeared to be higher and the object of the exercise was to reduce the speed to 20 mph. He stressed its importance as the statistics had identified that in urban areas of this nature a reduction in speed of 1 mph is likely to reduce the potential for accidents by 6%, therefore the speed cushions were crucial when considering vulnerable groups such as school children.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering referred to Councillor Spanswick having identified that he did not consider that the infrastructure in Brackla had been designed with a school in mind. He advised that a school or an educational facility had been identified at that area of Brackla housing estate for many years and was included in the Unitary Development Plan.

He explained that the central refuge outside the school had been located there as part of the Planning Condition related to one of the shops in the Brackla Triangle shopping centre, to allow people to cross safely at a proper location. An upgrade to a zebra crossing was considered the most appropriate option to replace the central refuge, which would allow buses to turn into the school.

He advised that the options included a plateau or mini roundabout and by introducing the plateau, it would serve as part of the calming feature. Two locations were put forward for a mini roundabout, but one near the community centre, was not viable as it would not allow easy access for the buses and there would not be sufficient land to accommodate it. The other suggested location at the bottom of Whitethorn Drive was also not viable either, as drivers tended to just drive over them. He gave the Panel an example of a mini roundabout located in Cornelly which had caused such problems.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering informed the Panel that there were numerous types of features which could be introduced, but the proposed specific requirement to achieve 20 mph speed limit was the most appropriate option. Although he understood the concerns which had been raised, he believed that the preferred scheme was the one detailed in Appendix A, which consisted of five speed cushions. He advised that if the Panel were mindful that the objections were valid, the developer could provide a reduced scheme consisting of just two speed cushions, if that were the case, he could not guarantee that the reduced scheme would achieve a 20 mph speed limit, but it would ensure that the traffic flow was reduced to a reasonable speed and it could be monitored with other features being introduced if necessary.

He agreed with Councillor Hacking's comment that the 20 mph zone could not be enforced by the Police, but that only applied if it was not supported by physical features. However, in this case the Police fully supported the identified schemes and on that basis it would be an enforceable scheme.

In her summing up Ms Thomas explained that her main concern was that it had been almost a year since the Group Manager – Transportation & Engineering had walked around the site with her and nothing had been done since then. She explained that there would be an increase in traffic which would make the route

she walked to the shopping centre more hazardous and she would still not be able to get easy access to the facilities; the footpath option would not solve her problem of being able to cross the road and it would still be a no-go area on her doorstep.

She believed that the Highways Department were viewing the scheme from an engineering perspective and not from a practical point of view and the suggested crossing would create the same situation as the current crossing on Princess Way close to the roundabout on the other side of the road.

Referring to the option shown at Appendix A, Ms Thomas' view was that it would be very expensive to put in a footpath over a structure which was not safe and a safer route to the shopping centre should be explored.

She concluded by saying that a year had passed since her concerns were highlighted to the Highways Department and she still could not walk around her local area. She believed that the speed cushions would worsen the situation. She stated that she was not prepared to accept the proposed scheme as the only option and more consultation was needed to discuss the matter further.

Councillor Sage was elected to sum up on behalf of the four Ward Members.

He pointed out that the scheme involved approximately a 200 yd stretch of highway with seven roads leading off it and on behalf of the local community, he thanked the Panel for listening to the representations made today.

He explained that rules and regulations changed over time and referred the Panel to the recommendations made by Central Government and the Welsh Government on the 9th June 2011 which had recommended that if local authorities and local communities wanted to put in place 20 mph schemes on residential roads, or use traffic calming measures, they should be able to do so. He asked the Panel to review the proposed scheme to allow for further consultation so that a scheme could be put in place which would be satisfactory for the Brackla community as a whole.

Councillor Sage informed the Panel that one scheme which had been proposed by him as a local Ward Member was a traffic management scheme based on the Equalities Impact Assessment. He advised that the Authority needed to put in place the correct scheme and for that reason more consultation was needed. Local opinion had to be taken on board as it would affect the daily lives of people using the facilities in Brackla.

He questioned why the 20 mph speed limit was not introduced initially as the speed survey had established that there was no speed issue with the findings showing that the average speed on Whitethorn Drive was 24 mph. As far as accident statistics were concerned, he stated that there had only been two accidents over the past 10 years on that route.

He referred to the fact that although the four local Ward Members came from different political parties, they wanted the same result for the area, which was a safe environment for the local community and to that end, every option should be explored with further consultation taking place.

One Panel Member referred to the traffic survey which had been carried out and asked if it was done over a 24 hour period or at specific times during the day, concentrating on times that the school would be opening and closing.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that as well as the speed of traffic, the survey had also taken into account the number of vehicles by way of loop detectors which were placed on the ground for the complete period. He explained that the late evening speed of traffic was slightly higher, but the number of vehicles at that time of night were so low, they had not influenced the average speed as on average only one vehicle an hour used that route at that time as opposed to hundreds per hour which did not have any significance to the 85% percentile.

The Legal Officer asked whether the proposed zebra crossing would have beepers.

The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that it would not have beepers as they were specifically related to pedestrians who were mobility and visually impaired and traffic driving at 20 mph would already be slow approaching the crossing. He said that beepers could not be accommodated but that the raised surface on the zebra crossing does take into account visual impairments.

The Chairperson thanked the objectors and members of the public for their conduct at the meeting and after agreement with the local Ward Members and The Group Manager - Transportation & Engineering advised that the Panel would make their decision within the week and that this would be made available in writing.

The meeting closed at 12.12pm and the Panel retired to make their decision on the Appeal, after which it was

RESOLVED: That the Panel reached the following unanimous decision:

- (1) Having considered the objections and also having heard from the local Ward Members and Ms Thomas, the Panel decided that the proposals in respect of the raised traffic calming scheme contained in recommendation (a) be accepted, provided that in the interests of fairness, the traffic calming scheme detailed in Appendix E is implemented instead of the scheme detailed in Appendix A. The Panel decided that the scheme contained in Appendix E would suit the needs of the community better.
- (2) In respect of recommendation (b), having considered the objections, the Panel decided to approve the authorisation for the appropriate permanent traffic regulation order for the speed limit in respect of the 20 mph speed limit zone as detailed at Appendix E for the same reason as outlined above.
- (3) The Panel decided that the proposals contained in recommendation (c) in respect of the 'no waiting at any time' restrictions be approved. The Panel agreed to the removal of the accompanying loading/unloading ban and authorised the making of the appropriate permanent traffic regulation order.

APPEALS PANEL - 24 JUNE 2011

- (4) Having taken into consideration the objections, the representations made by the local Ward Members and in particular Ms Thomas, the Panel resolved that recommendation (d) be accepted, except that the proposed zebra crossing be amended to provide for a pelican crossing, in the interests of equality and fairness to groups in the community who would benefit more from a pelican crossing.

The meeting closed at 12.12pm.