

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
7th April 2016
Annual Petition Summary Report

Date Range: 1st May, 2015 to 31st March, 2016

E-Petitions – Total Received 7

2

ePetitions Title	Signatures	Response
Speeding Cars - Hillside	0	<p>With reference to your Online petition request - Speeding Cars - Hillside</p> <p>The Council is not able to accept this petition as it is has fallen below the minimum threshold of 10 signatories.</p>
Burnham Lane & Station Road Traffic Project	118	<p>I would like to respond to the petition submitted on 7th September, 2015 with regard to the proposed Station Road closure. As may be known by now, the scheme has been through a scrutiny panel and has been subject to a report to the councils Cabinet. The outturn from the Cabinet meeting was to direct council officers to proceed with the closure for Station Road.</p> <p>To help to better understand the process the council has followed, I will explain how officers have recommended the closure. Firstly, a modelling report was completed in 2014 but was not conclusive as to which option was the best, all options had an impact. Officers discussed the implications at a working group and also with members and it was agreed that some of the options be trialled, this was captured in a significant decision report. The scheme proposal for Station Road is to close the road under the bridge so that officers can evaluate the actual impact on the road network rather than rely on modelling reports. The reason for the scheme is to address the congestion issues on Burnham Lane and around the station as well as improve access to the station. The closure will also help the council understand whether future development opportunities are viable so before the council commits to the final scheme, it needs to be sure which option works well, once this has been determined the design will be completed and included in a tender.</p>

There has been some misinformation about what the council is actually proposing so for clarity, I can confirm that the entire scheme will include the following changes:

- Closure of Station Road except for pedestrian and cycle access
- Changing Burnham Lane to southbound but still maintaining access from the A4 to residents
- Alterations to the traffic signals along the A4 between Dover Road and Huntercombe Lane North
- Moving of the bus stops from Burnham Lane to outside the station
- Parking restrictions on Burnham Lane and Littlebrook Avenue

The permanent scheme will look at also the following:

- A new parking area for commuters
- Upgrades to the station car park
- New ticket hall
- Access to all the platforms at Burnham Station
- New zebra crossings on Burnham Lane
- Upgrades to the 5 points junction
- Improvements to drainage to reduce any existing flooding

The petition referred to alternate options being considered first; such as width restrictions, improved signalling and improvements to bus stops. Some of these options suggested are already incorporated into the experiment or will feature in the final scheme. We are not proposing to implement this scheme to stop bridge strikes though this does reduce incidents there is no business case to make this change on our network.

In terms of the consultation process it is clear that residents feel we have not consulted them. Experimental traffic orders do not require pre-implementation consultation but the consultation process will start as soon as the experimental scheme is implemented. The total period for the experimental process is 18 months, the first 6 months is used for consultation/feedback and the remaining 12 months affords the council time to make a decision. The consultation and the decision period do not have to extend to the full timescales and so the council can make a decision sooner if possible.

However, we are keen to engage with all those who live, work or pass through this area, to understand what the issues are once the scheme is in place and therefore we will be undertaking a leaflet drop to affected residents when a firm date for the closure has been agreed.

I hope this information is of some help to enable a better understanding of the process officers have followed, for any further questions please let me know.

Stop the sale of Land in Cherry Avenue	7	With the agreement of the lead petitioner this ePetition has been closed due to a paper petition submitted on 2nd September, 2015 relating to the same subject matter. The signatures on this ePetition will be added to the paper petition signatures.
New Shopping Centre or Facelift Required for Slough High Street	0	With reference to your Online petition request – New Shopping Centre or Facelift Required for Slough High Street. The Council is not able to accept this petition as it is has fallen below the minimum threshold of 10 signatories.
Slough Estates Proposed Parking Order	6	12/04/2016 – closing date
One Way System on Chalvey	1	12/04/2016 – closing date
Vote of No Confidence	105	29/03/2016 – closing date

Paper Petitions - Total Received 9

Paper Petition Title	Signatures	Date Responded / Response
<p>15-05 - Against One Way System on Gilliat Road</p>	<p>32</p>	<p>6th Jul 2015</p> <p>Thank you for submitting the petition opposing the one way traffic scheme on Gilliat Road.</p> <p>We have considered your request for the council to reverse the decision to implement one way traffic flow on Gilliat Road, and on this occasion we have decided to continue with the implementation of the scheme. The reason that the scheme was put forward is because Gilliat Road and Carrington Road are both roads with a narrow carriageway and substandard pavement widths. It has been observed that on a regular basis vehicles travelling in opposing directions meet, with one vehicle either mounting the pavement or reversing to a clearing to allow the other pass.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are 90 degree bends on these 2 roads, which result in poor forward visibility of oncoming traffic. The introduction of one way traffic flows on these streets alleviates these issues and improves road safety in the area. Furthermore, as a result of this scheme we are able to reconfigure the 2 wheels up parking bays on the southern kerb line between No's 30 and 60 Gilliat Road to allow residents better access from their properties as complaints have been received that vehicles are parked in obstruction of front gates etc. Furthermore, when we undertook the informal consultation, the results were 19 (16%) residents for the proposal, and 13 (11%) against. 87 (73%) of residents did not respond. For these reasons, we made the proposals to the local members who supported the introduction of the scheme and the necessary legal process was followed and signage purchased etc.</p> <p>You have raised a number of issues in your correspondence, which I have responded to below:</p> <p>1: Please address the issue raised where one resident has 12 cars (we believe this is a council tenant) - making the street 1 way will not increase car parking space.</p> <p><i>Unfortunately, we cannot control how many vehicles a household owns or parks on the highway without introducing a residents permit scheme. The purpose of the scheme is not to increase the number of parking spaces, but to improve road safety and ensure residents have adequate access to the highway from their properties.</i></p>

2: Increasing the space on the pavement and moving the lines further into the road WILL cause for residents living on the ODD numbers side will not be able to get their cars in the drive, and if they do it will mean causing damage to their cars as well as their properties.

We will ensure that the parking bays are marked in a way that will not obstruct vehicles from exiting their driveways. Please be advised that we can only keep access to the highway clear for those residents that have dropped crossings.

3: Many people on this road often have work done on their house as they like to keep a nice appearance of their property and the Saturday just passed a resident had a delivery of building materials and the lorry had to use a crane to offload - this meant the lorry had its stabilizers on the ground and could not move - this lorry was there for 36 minutes. So if the road is one way it would mean that we would have to wait 36 minutes in order to pass - god forbid there was ever an emergency. In addition to this a car came and he and the lorry driver almost came to blows - if this was one way SBC would be responsible for causing these problems where people knock the life out of each other. Two hours later the resident had another delivery and it was another lorry which was parked up for the best part of 1 hour - need I say more?

I understand that vehicles may need to service the properties from time to time, however if they require to block the road they will need to contact the council to ensure adequate provisions are put in place to divert traffic. This would be the case if the road operated 2 way traffic flow as well and one way. If works/deliveries are necessary on Gilliat Road and the correct process is followed, the council can assist to ensure disruption is kept to a minimum.

4: We understand that some council officials have spent some time on Gilliat Road observing the traffic flow and also this aided the decision to make it one way - it is all well and good sitting on a street corner for a few hours - this is far from living on the road and seeing it from the residents perspective, not just some SBC rep feeding back the flow of traffic.

The Slough Borough Council Transport Team have made the decision to implement this scheme based on the observations outlined above. Although we understand that this may cause slight inconvenience to the residents, however as the highway authority we are required to make decisions in the interests of road safety as well as considering the residents. The area in question is relatively small, and there is a suitable route for residents to access Gilliat Road without causing significant delays in journey time.

		<p><i>Slough Borough Council are implementing this scheme under an experimental traffic regulation order so that we can monitor and review the scheme when it is in its infancy, and this also gives us the ability to react quickly and make changes if we find the scheme is not working for any reason. We will accept representations from residents within the first months of the scheme's implementation, and we can then make a decision based on these representations whether we make the scheme permanent, make changes or remove the scheme all together.</i></p> <p><i>I hope this information helps.</i></p>
15-06 - Cheviot Road Shops – Anti Social Behaviour	16	<p>24th Aug 2015 Thank you for submitting the petition about the Anti-Social Behaviour at the rear of the Cheviot Road Shops.</p> <p>Through our joint working with Thames Valley Police we are aware of the work they have carried out to try and combat some of the Anti-Social Behaviour carried out in the area. We are aware that the area around the old garage site and the rear of the shops has become attractive for those wishing to commit Anti-Social Behaviour however the new properties that are replacing the old garages will result in the area being less attractive. We expect an improvement in the area following the properties being completed as the residents will be passing the rear of the shops on a daily basis.</p> <p>We again ask that all incidents of Anti-Social Behaviour are reported to the Police on the 101 telephone number as we believe the amount of Anti-Social Behaviour is underreported. Whilst we wait for the properties to become occupied we have introduced a litter picking service so as to see how much alcohol litter is dropped which will take place once a week and will be reviewed on a regular basis.</p>
15-07 - Milan Centre Closure	156	<p>1st Sep 2015 I am writing to formally respond to the above paper petition submitted on Wednesday 5th August, 2015.</p> <p>Thank you for submitting the petition about the proposed closure of the Milan Community Centre.</p> <p>The Thomas Gray and Milan Centres, which are interlinked, do not provide services unique to the location; instead they provide services for people across the Borough. The Council is looking to release the site for better use in the local community.</p>

		<p>Over the last three months research has been undertaken on use of the Milan Centre, including numbers using the Centre on an hourly and daily basis, where users travel from, how they travel to the Centre and how they use the Centre. Focus groups with users have taken place to understand what is important for users about the Centre. Alongside this staff have mapped a range of activities that users could access and identified alternative sites that could be hired. Some users have already started to attend a weekly yoga session at Chalvey Community Centre.</p> <p>Options were presented to the users on 25th August. We will be working with the users to find which of these best suits their needs and supports their health and wellbeing and look at how we can support individuals to make these options accessible.</p> <p>The Council will continue to support one off events such as EID, Diwali celebrations at its community buildings.</p>
<p>15-08 - Stop the Sale of Land in Cherry Avenue & Hold Network Rail to Account</p>	<p>106</p>	<p>11th Sep 2015 I am writing in response to your above paper petition submitted to the Council on Wednesday 2nd September, 2015.</p> <p>Although we have received complaints about noise from work relating to the access point at the garages at Cherry Avenue in the past, the Council has not carried out a full noise investigation. As such we are not in the position to take any formal abatement action in relation to noise or any other issue of nuisance. I have therefore responded to your points accordingly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We do not have the power to close an area of private land. In areas where we have substantial evidence over a given period of time, e.g. 6 months, we may consider gating an area. However, I understand that this has been looked into by Community project officer, Esther Masters and there was not evidence for this. Even if the area was to be gated, Network Rail have advised us that they would still require access. 2. Cherry Avenue is public land and the Council therefore are not legally able to prevent access. 3. I understand that the sale of the land has already been completed and that Network Rail have purchased the land. However, the Council itself would not have been able to nominate an asset of community value. It is the Council's role to access the nomination against the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the asset will enhance social wellbeing through alleviating poverty, creating employment, improving health or increase educational attainment and;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the asset will enhance social interests, which includes cultural, recreational and sporting, • They have the skills, plans, management structure, resources and finance in place to manage the asset. Only an eligible 'Community Group' can make a nomination and full details of the nomination/assessment and the nomination form can be found on the Council's website (http://www.slough.gov.uk/business/land-and-property/asset-of-community-value.aspx). <p>4. We will monitor the area in receipt of any noise complaints made in relation to any new issues of noise. The complainant(s) will be asked to complete noise diary sheets which upon receipt, the investigating officer will assess the diary sheets decide whether further monitoring is necessary. Any complaints received will also be discussed with Network Rail to arrive at an early solution if there is a current noise issue.</p> <p>5. The assessment of the completed noise diary sheets, any monitoring (including any monitoring carried out by a noise recorder if necessary), will determines whether a statutory nuisance exists. If a statutory nuisance does exist, we will consider the most appropriate course of action to abate the nuisance.</p> <p>I have been liaising with Network Rail and will continue to do so regarding the concerns that the residents have raised. Please be assured that it is our intention to arrive at a solution by working with Network Rail and the residents to ensure that any use of the land does not cause a nuisance.</p>
<p>15-09 - Against Station Road Closure through Burnham Station Bridge</p>	<p>4,965</p>	<p>23rd Sept 2015</p> <p>I would like to respond to the petition submitted on 3rd September, 2015 with regard to the proposed Station Road closure. As it may be known by now, the scheme has been through a scrutiny panel and has been subject to a report to the councils Cabinet. The outturn from the Cabinet meeting was to direct council officers to proceed with the closure for Station Road.</p> <p>To help understand the process the council has followed, I will explain how officers have recommended the closure. Firstly, a modelling report was completed in 2014 but was not conclusive as to which option was the best, all options had an impact. Officers discussed the implications at a working group and also with members and it was agreed that some of the options be trialled, this was captured in a significant decision report. The scheme proposal for Station Road is to close the road under the bridge so that officers can evaluate the actual impact on the road network rather than rely on modelling reports. The reason for the scheme is to address the congestion issues on Burnham Lane and around the station as well as improve access to the station. The</p>

closure will also help the council understand whether future development opportunities are viable so before the council commits to the final scheme, it needs to be sure which option works well, once this has been determined the design will be completed and included in a tender.

There has been some misinformation about what the council is actually proposing so for clarity, I can confirm that the entire scheme will include the following changes:

- Closure of Station Road except for pedestrian and cycle access
- Changing Burnham Lane to southbound but still maintaining access from the A4 to residents
- Alterations to the traffic signals along the A4 between Dover Road and Huntercombe Lane North
- Moving of the bus stops from Burnham Lane to outside the station
- Parking restrictions on Burnham Lane and Littlebrook Avenue

The permanent scheme will look at also the following:

- A new parking area for commuters
- Upgrades to the station car park
- New ticket hall
- Access to all the platforms at Burnham Station
- New zebra crossings on Burnham Lane
- Upgrades to the 5 points junction
- Improvements to drainage to reduce any existing flooding

The petition referred to alternate options being considered first; such as width restrictions, better signage, improved signalling and improvements to bus stops. Some of these options suggested are already incorporated into the experiment or will feature in the final scheme. We are not proposing to implement this scheme to stop bridge strikes though this does reduce incidents there is no business case to make this change on our network.

In terms of the consultation process it is clear that residents feel we have not consulted them. Experimental traffic orders do not require pre-implementation consultation but the consultation process will start as soon as the experimental scheme is implemented. The total period for the experimental process is 18 months, the first 6 months is used for consultation/feedback and the remaining 12 months affords the council time to make a decision. The consultation and the decision period do not have to extend to the full timescales and so the council can make a decision sooner if possible. However, we are keen to engage with all those who live, work or pass through this area, to understand what the issues are once the scheme is in place and therefore we will be undertaking a leaflet drop to affected residents when a firm date for the closure has been agreed.

		<p>I hope this information is of some help to enable a better understanding of the process officers have followed, for any further questions please let me know.</p>
<p>15-10 - Extension of Zone D - Parking Permits for Residents of 1A Stoke Road</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>28th Oct 2015 Thank you for the submission of the above petition.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Council cannot consider your request to include Stoke Road into the Zone D residents parking zone. Slough Borough Council has a planning policy to restrain parking for new developments in the town centre and West Central is classed as a town centre development. This policy is applied on the basis that, firstly, it is appropriate to limit traffic growth from new development to avoid further town centre traffic congestion and secondly, that public transport options, shops and other facilities are nearby such that many people are willing and able to live in town centres without a car.</p> <p>Furthermore, the developer for West Central agreed that residents of the development will be ineligible to apply for a parking permit in existing and future residents parking schemes as part of the planning approval.</p> <p>We are sorry we were unable to assist on this occasion.</p>
<p>15-11 - Restoration of St Ethelbert's Church, Wellington Street</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>11th Nov 2015 Many thanks for the submission of the above petition.</p> <p>It is stated in the petition that it is "not an appeal for monetary funding", but a request to the Council for assistance in the restoration of the building by making an order in terms of the listed building act. It is assumed this request is referring to the issuing of a Repairs Notice under Section 48 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is worth noting that in terms of this section, a Local Planning Authority can serve a notice setting out the repairs needed for the proper preservation of a listed building. If the building is not repaired within two months, the Local Planning Authority may then serve a compulsory purchase order under Section 47 and, if the order is confirmed by the Secretary of State, proceed to acquire the building in accordance with the Acquisition of Land Act 1981.</p> <p>The petition is clear that it is not requesting financial support, however there might be some uncertainty about the process outlined above. Before the Council can serve this notice, the Local Planning Authority will have to instruct a consultant to undertake a survey in order to determine if there is any merit in serving the notice, prepare a repairs schedule and likely costs to undertake the repairs. It is recommended that direct contact is made with the Planning and Building Control Service to clarify and confirm if this is indeed what is requested for the Council to undertake.</p>

<p>15-12 - Objection of Grant for St Ethelbert's Church Hall</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>31st Dec 2015 Thank you for your Petition.</p> <p>Your Petition is an objection to an alleged Council grant of £250,000 towards the "construction of a new hall" on the basis of a range of allegations which you set out in your Petition.</p> <p>I am afraid the Council is not making a grant award to the St Ethelbert's RC Church.</p> <p>The Council is however, entering into a legal agreement with the land owner of the Church, the Northampton Roman Catholic Diocese Trustee (charity number 234091). The consideration being paid is in relation to acquisition of land under the Curve Compulsory Purchase Order and other related matters. The Council is legally required to make this payment. I would reiterate that this payment is not a grant award by the Council.</p>
<p>15-13 - Parking - Chalvey Gardens</p>	<p>19</p>	<p>13th Jan 2016 Thank you for the paper petition submitted on Wednesday 16th December, 2015 requesting a review of the residents permit parking on Chalvey Gardens.</p> <p>We are pleased to advise that we will be extending the zone so that Zone O permit holders will also be able to park in Zones G and AG which are located on Chalvey Park.</p> <p>We will be writing to all residents with permits in the affected zones in the next few weeks, and hope to have the new arrangements in place from April 2016.</p>