



North West Chilterns Community Board minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the North West Chilterns Community Board held on Thursday 7 September 2023 in Via MS Teams, commencing at 6.00 pm and concluding at 7.30 pm.

BC Councillors present

M Walsh (Chairman), C Etholen (Vice-Chairman), S Adoh, S Broadbent, D Carroll and G Hall

Town/Parish Councils and other organisations present

C Davies (Lacey Green Parish Council), S Breese (Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council), V McPherson (Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council), S Reading (Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council and lead petitioner), T MacGillivray (Lacey Green Parish Council)

Others in attendance

J Binning (Buckinghamshire Council), J Stevens (Lead of the Transport and Road Issues Action Group), N O'Leary (Network Safety Team Leader, Buckinghamshire Council), S Sidley (lead petition, Speed Calming in Lacey Green) and M Biswas, A Followell, M Mirza, H Breed (residents)

Agenda Item

1 Chairman's Welcome/Purpose of the meeting

Matthew Walsh [MW] (Chairman of the North West Chilterns Community Board – NWC CB) welcomed everyone to the meeting to discuss the three petitions that had been received by the Community Board.

MW asked Jackie Binning (JB) to outline the structure of the meeting. JB advised that the following petitions would be presented by Neil O'Leary (NOL):

- Bledlow Ridge Traffic Calming
- Speed Calming in Lacey Green
- Radnage School Safety

JB confirmed that after each presentation there would be an opportunity to ask questions and then the NWC CB would agree the recommendations/next steps. MW informed the CB that the meeting would be recorded for the purposes of JB writing the notes. Once the notes had been approved the recording would be destroyed.

2 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Buckinghamshire Council Councillors Darren Hayday, Orsolya Hayday, Robert Carington, Alan Turner; Councillor Simon Digby, Piddington and Wheeler End Parish Council, Councillor Robin Thomas, Stokenchurch Parish Council, Councillor Surinder Marshall, Princes Risborough Town Council, Councillor Wendy Monroe-West, Downley Parish Council, Sophie Payne, Service Director, Wendy Morgan-Brown, Head of Community Boards, Makyla Devlin, Senior Community Board Manager and Nicola Surman, Funding and Support Team Leader.

3 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4 Petition - Bledlow Ridge Traffic Calming

NOL queried how the reports should be presented. JB stated that if meeting attendees had read the petition reports then an overview would be suffice. It was therefore agreed that NOL would read the Executive Summary and the Recommendations and then hand over to the CB for questions.

NOL read the Executive Summary and Recommendations for this petition – see petition report in the agenda pack.

Questions:

Stephen Reading (SR – Lead Petitioner) referred to Recommendation 2 in terms of analysing the speed data in accordance with Bledlow cum Saunderton's Neighbourhood Plan 2017. SR stated that as per the presentation (PowerPoint slides) he forwarded as part of the supporting information, a speed survey which the Parish Council had commissioned from Transport for Bucks in November and December 2022. SR said that this information had also been presented to the NWC CB Transport and Road Issues Action Group (TRIAG) some months ago. The speed data showed that 25% or more of vehicles throughout the survey were travelling at 35mph or more. SR did not think that Recommendation 2 was accurate.

SR added that the Parish Council were looking for something more than what Recommendation 1 described. SR confirmed that the Parish Council would like more than a redesigned sign as the Parish had these already and a Vehicle Activated Signed.

NOL responded and said that he was aware that speed data had been collected, but was not aware of the level it had been analysed. SR advised that very comprehensive data was produced by Buckinghamshire Council which was also detailed in his presentation. Furthermore, some drivers had historically driven at speeds of 60 to 70mph to the end of village, so that's why the Parish Council felt that further traffic measures were required. SR said that he would be happy to have a conversation on what might be possible.

NOL stressed that it was not that he wasn't aware that the data existed, it was more

that the data had not been analysed by designers who would determine what might be the best options in terms of traffic calming.

Jim Stevens (JS) then introduced himself as the Chair of the NWC CB's Transport and Road Issues Action Group. JS confirmed that TRIAG had a met SR a few months ago and discussed at length the traffic conditions in Bledlow Ridge. JS stated that TRIAG supported the petition and the need for physical traffic calming in the village. JS said that it was a linear village, a long straight road with houses either side, and there was not much encouragement for drivers to slow down.

JS confirmed that the Parish Council had over the years implemented softer measures. There were two Vehicle Activated Signs in the village and red friction surfacing and road markings where the speed limit changed, but drivers still drove at speed. TRIAG believed that physical measures were now required which was the basis of the petition and referenced in item 3.7 of the petition report.

JS advised that the NOL's report stated that a chicane/build out could potentially block visibility for people driving to the Cricket Club. JS said that a chicane/build out would really slow traffic down to give way to traffic coming in the other direction. He said chicanes and build outs were used within Buckinghamshire and across the country. JS said that in his opinion a chicane/build would be an effective solution and would slow traffic and create a much safer entrance into the Cricket Club which now had a café and recreation ground as well.

JS asked that the NWC CB ask for an amendment to Recommendation 1 to include an assessment of a chicane/build out.

MW asked NOL what his thoughts were on this. NOL stated that it came down to whether this aligned with the CB's priorities.

In terms of costing, MW confirmed that the report from Bledlow cum Saunderton estimated that chicanes cost approximately £40,000. MW advised that he had not had the opportunity to read the new Highways Toolkit (submitted today) so asked if this was the ballpark figure. NOL stated that he couldn't confirm with any confidence but didn't believe that there was a schedule of costs in the new guidance.

SR reported that Chinnor Town Council had provided that ballpark figure, so although the cost has not been researched, it was based on experience.

JS advised that in terms of the priorities for the NWC CB which had been mentioned by NOL, TRIAG had a series of priorities for the CB. One was around ensuring speed limits were appropriate and enforced and the other was that road safety issues were addressed (there were other priorities too). The chicanes/build out's would fit well within the CB's priorities.

Steven Broadbent (SB) advised that he was talking as a member of the CB at this meeting and not as a Cabinet Member. SB believed that the reference to priorities

related to money and funding, and whether formal consideration of the report was carried out at full Board where it would decide on next steps – this may be to go through the new toolkit process. SB confirmed that there were trigger points in that it brought it back to the CB along with the lead person. SB accepted there were CB priorities, but there were three petitions to discuss and that there may be relative priorities in those as well.

With his Cabinet hat on, SB informed the meeting that there were certain design elements in the toolkit which the CB should be aware of. There would be resources for all CB's where a design would be agreed against a schedule of rates, but the cost was driven by the context. When the work was considered it would factor in how much traffic management was required etc. so it was difficult to give a figure until we had the correct information. SB thought it was better to obtain an accurate figure rather than speculating.

SR requested that we progress the chicane/build out solution. If it was found to be too expensive then at least it had been explored. It was in the petition and SR did not want to let it go as he had a Parish Council meeting on Monday (11/9) and he did not want to report that at the very first hurdle the chicane/build out idea had been rejected.

MW asked if local Bucks Council Members had anything to add – none had anything further to say.

MW asked NOL if the chicane/build out could be included in the petition report. MW stated that it was a key part of the petition and met our CB priorities and said there were funding partnerships with Parish Council's in the area that may assist. NOL advised that it was essentially included in Recommendation 2. NOL added that we needed to make sure the Cricket Club was accessible and the visibility wasn't impaired for residents opposite and for people entering and exiting.

SR asked if timescales to meet, discuss and commission the work could be agreed with NOL (**Action BR/01**). SB stated that he wasn't sure if NOL commissioned a chicane/build out assessment and that it would have to be presented to the CB to do it.

JB felt that the NWC CB needed to consider the new procedures as the chicane/build out proposal may have to follow a different procedure. SB believed that for this one, the soft measures had already been considered by TRIAG, so the technical measures could be reviewed quite quickly.

Summary of the actions discussed:

Action BR/01: SR and NOL to arrange a meeting to discuss the chicane/build out proposal and any another other traffic calming solutions.

In addition - Action BR/02: SR to consider Recommendations 2, 3 and 4

MW thanked SR for attending the meeting.

5 Petition - Speed Calming in Lacey Green

NOL read the Executive Summary and Recommendations for this petition – see petition report in the agenda pack.

Questions

Sue Sidley (SS – Lead Petitioner) confirmed that she had organised for a few members of her Road Safety Group and local residents to join this meeting.

SS confirmed that she had sent the speed data which were collected by Community Speed Watch. Trello strips were put down and information from an MVAS unit were collected, as well as photographs showing drivers parking in dangerous situations.

SS asked if the footway in Recommendation 2 was referring to the one on New Road or Main Road. NOL confirmed that it was New Road. SS advised that there were problems on Main Road as well with speed and parked cars which she didn't feel was reflected in the petition report. Community Speed Watch have identified that parking of school cars was creating a huge issue as well as speeding – one driver was caught doing 63mph at 9am outside the school which was considered very dangerous.

SS added that from Main Road there were children coming into school facing the other way from Lacey Green. The speed signs go from 60mph to 30mph and the 30mph sign was not clearly visible. SS confirmed that you couldn't see a school coming up and was on a bend with a bus stop which was a notorious bottleneck and very dangerous. There were also parents parking in the 60mph area on New Road which created a problem on the blind bend coming around the corner from the other direction. SS believed this was an accident waiting to happen and this was why the petition was raised.

SS stated that there had been a few accidents. One car was written off and her son could have been in the vehicle five minutes later. The accident happened quite near the school.

SS referred to the petition report which stated that Thames Valley Police had said there had been no accidents in the area. SS confirmed that she knew of serious accidents in 2022 and had photographs to evidence these.

NOL responded and said that in terms of the Community Speed Watch data, he could not dispute the figures presented but it was for a three month period and no other speed checks had been carried out since December 2022. NOL said that generally, Community Speed Watch data was reviewed over a longer period of time, and this provided a bigger dataset and allowed the Council to get rid of those anomalies. NOL recognised that Community Speed Watch data was an effective tool and had seen great results in other areas. However, it was a slow build and data was

required over a longer period of time (**Action LG/01**).

SS stated that the Parish Council had invested in MVAS units and that data from these units (pre-covid and March this year) provided similar figures, so this delivered quite a long history of speeding vehicles. NOL said that he didn't dispute the figures, but this wasn't Community Speed Watch, which he stated was an effective way of reducing speeds but took time to take effect.

NOL then responded to the other point raised around the number of serious incidents or accidents. NOL confirmed that if no injury was reported then Buckinghamshire Council wouldn't have the figures. When the data was reviewed over the last years, NOL advised that there were five accidents across the Parish but none where speeds were sighted as a contributory factor. NOL stressed that he was not disputing there was a problem, but the policies followed looked to resolve accidents where there were injuries, and then they assessed where there was a risk rather a recorded incident.

SS thought this was a problem because she did not want there to be an accident where a child died.

JS commented that the road through Lacey Green was very similar in many respects to the road through Bledlow Ridge. It was on a ridge, so a linear village and straight road. There was not much encouragement for drivers to slow down and JS said that when the A4010 was blocked with either road works or incidents, the traffic diverted through Lacey Green and Naphill. JS stated that there were peaks in traffic and new vehicles going through which he believed contributed to the speeding problems.

JS advised that TRIAG considered SS's submission prior to the petition was raised and thought that well thought out arguments had been raised. TRIAG was aware that speed data had been collected and reviewed it, specifically in relation to whether there might be a case to reduce the speed limit between RAF Naphill and the school. That stretch of road is currently a 60mph speed limit so the Action Group came up with two reasonable ideas. JS confirmed that the first idea was to reduce the 60mph speed limit to 40mph all the way from RAF Naphill through to where the 30mph speed limit started near the school. The other option was to reduce the 60mph speed limit to 50mph from RAF Naphill, but implement a 40mph buffer limit on the immediate approach to the existing 30mph speed limit school. JS said that NOL was aware of these two suggestions from TRIAG and thanked him for referencing this in paragraph 4.1 in his report.

JS stated there were two other aspects relation to a zebra crossing and a School Crossing Patroller. In relation to the zebra crossing, JS confirmed that the Action Group were not too sure about this because the group had no data to assess. If the request for a zebra crossing continued, TRAIG would recommend that data was necessary to understand the number of people that crossed the road at this location. A feasibility study would be required to look at the return of an any investment to put in a formal crossing. JS felt this was an aspect that was missing

from NOL's report. JS therefore requested that this should be one of the recommendations to enable the possibility of a zebra crossing to be ruled in or ruled out **(Action LG/02)**.

With regards to the second point concerning a School Crossing Patroller, JS stated that the School Sustainable Travel team had confirmed that they were unable to deliver a Patroller as they were unable to afford it, but recommended a third party sponsorship which JS thought was a sensible suggestion. JS suggested this be pursued and if a School Crossing Patroller could be sponsored by a third party, it might reduce the need for the more expensive zebra crossing. He also requested this feature in the Recommendations as well. **(Action LG/03)**

On the point of the zebra crossing, MW thought that to manage expectations, that like the chicane, zebra crossings were notoriously expensive. JS agreed and said they could cost a six figure sum due to the complexity and amount of work that was necessary. It was not just a case of painting black and white stripes on the road surface.

Alison Mueller (AM) referred back to the conversation around the speed data. AM asked if it would be possible to include in the submission or was there a period time that the data was collected from. NOL stated that it depended on how far back the data went. If the data was three to four years old it probably wouldn't be taken as being representative of what's happening now. NOL reiterated that Community Speed Watch data was a really powerful tool when applied and regularly kept up.

NOL reported that for speeds and limit changes, the data collected from the loops was over 24 hours, for a seven day period and would collect every vehicle that passed. Community Speed Watch data was taken over periods during a day.

AM referred to JS's discussion concerning the cost of funding a Patroller and asked how much it would be. JS recommended that she make contact with the School Crossing Patrollers lead officer at Buckinghamshire Council to find out the potential cost, but said it would include the uniform, the stop signs and wages. JB to confirm the officer contact details **(Action LG/04)**.

Tim MacGillivray (TM) reported that the Parish Council had issues with MVAS's where the batteries were stolen in a space of three days. All three new units were down and had taken time to get the repairs completed. TM stated that one of the units was opposite Slad Lane, which was catching all the traffic coming in from New Road, Walters Ash. TM thought that the data he sent SS was quite late but was collected in April 2023. He however thought that the data reflected the information already given and believed that in the region of 22% of drivers were going over 35mph to 40mph, and 22% plus were driving at 35mph to 45mph. TM added that as SS had stated, you have a sweeping bend that's 60mph, and then as you came round the bend it's 30mph, and then within 150 yards you are at the school. You have to slam on your brakes which was unsafe. During very congested times, TM confirmed that people parked on the left hand side.

TM stated that if more data was required he could supply this. The data sent by SS yesterday reflected the same speeds.

Gary Hall (GH) confirmed that he had much sympathy on this matter. He believed there was a big problem and was made even worse when there were parked cars along Main Road by the school because people had freehand to come into the village and just carry on speeding. GH felt there was nothing to break that speed and had encouraged AM to set up the Community Speed Watch after the accident a year or so ago. Although GH didn't like what they had done in Chinnor, he felt that kind of barrier as you come into the village that stopped the traffic and gave priority to oncoming traffic was exactly what was needed in Lacey Green at the end of the village. GH stated that there was no budget in Buckinghamshire Council but maybe the Parish Council and other external funders could fund something like this. GH added that a physical barrier to stop the traffic as it came into the village was the only answer.

Cathryn Davies (CD) confirmed that the Parish Council had looked at chicanes and other possible solutions over the years, but the fact they were on a main bus stop route of the 300 bus that went through the village, north and south every 20 minutes, and a working farm in the middle of the village that transported muck hay straw up to 10 times per day, was putting the Parish Council off. CD wasn't sure what the Council would think of chicanes with heavy vehicles going and up and down all the time.

NOL responded and said that any measures would be developed to support the movements in the area, and particularly in rural areas the Design team would make an allowance to ensure that heavy vehicles could get through. The trade off however was that it would be easy for normal vehicles to get through, so not as effective as you would like.

CD acknowledged this, but on another point, which she hadn't raised with NOL, was that she had tried to contact an officer in Buckinghamshire Council about six to nine months ago, concerning three trevello strips which had been put down. The RAF, Buckinghamshire Council, Bradenham Parish Council had all denied any knowledge of these strips and Lacey Green didn't implement this work. CD thought a lot of information on how fast the traffic was going past the RAF base, and how long it took them to get to 60mph plus into the national speed limit zone had been collected, but by who?

CD stated that the data SS had presented from the village, was as TM said, four years of valuable information, including a trevello strip which was put down. She advised that just opposite or just outside Slad Lane, the information collected would give a fair indication that cars coming to the village that hit that 30mph zone were over the speed limit because they didn't have a chance to slow down. CD mentioned that when SS submitted the petition she couldn't find anywhere to download any data to back up what she was doing. CD reported that the Parish Council didn't know

she could and nobody from the Council advised that there should be more information to back up her petition.

CD reported that the Parish Council with Buckinghamshire Council had put down all the yellow lines two or three years ago, but because they were not enforced, people now ignored them and they just parked where they liked. The Parish Council spent tens of thousands of pounds so this was not helpful. Thames Valley Police won't enforce because it's a parking problem and Buckinghamshire Council haven't got the resources.

CD advised that she was not keen on putting in chicanes or anything else if the solution was not enforceable and stressed that the Parish Council had been trying for 20 years to get something done about the speeding through the village.

SS stated that in her petition she had referenced having a zebra crossing to mainly help people cross the road and to slow the traffic down. However, SS said that she was not an expert, but if someone had a better solution she would be open to it, as long as it resolved the speeding issue.

In terms of farm traffic, SS confirmed that she had met with the local farmer – the West family. SS said they would completely be in support of any kind of road safety measures because they had problems with access to their field on Slad Lane as it was constantly blocked with school traffic. She added that the school was getting bigger and there wasn't enough parking. The school had advised that around 70% of children now came from outside the area. SS agreed with CD that a long term solution needed to be agreed.

SS added that she hoped that the speed on New Road was reduced to 40mph as it would encourage people to walk. She reported that Naphill and Walters Ash School had in their new travel plan an initiative for families to walk and cycle to school and park further up the road. At the moment no one would do that because it's 60mph.

SS confirmed she'd had contacted Buckinghamshire Council to try and use the Speen Bus as part of the Spare Seat Scheme. The bus picked up children free of charge from Speen, went past the Pink and Lily and then returned. One of the ideas was to stop by the Whip Pubic House to collect the children from Loosley Row or that end of Princes Risborough, and then continue down to the school to try and move the parking to different areas of the village. SS stated that Countrywide Coaches said they would do this free of charge but then Buckinghamshire Council said they wanted to charge. She thought that no one would want to pay when they could park two minutes down the road.

MW acknowledged this and thanked SS for her impressive piece of work.

With regards to the chicane idea, TM asked where this would be located because the main issue was the sweeping bend. TM believed that the traffic should be slowed before the chicane because of the speed of the traffic.

Carl Etholen (CE) confirmed that he, Shade Adoh and Robert Carington had a meeting scheduled with Mark Davies, the Parking Operations Manager, to discuss enforcement in Lacey Green. They also had a meeting with Mr Newton and Mr Bundock regarding the school bus from Speen. The proposal was to go to Princes Risborough (outside the George and Dragon) then pick up a number of students, visit other locations, and then drop off at the school. This would reduce the number of vehicles coming to the school. The number of collections would need to be agreed. CE understood that a sizeable bus was used with only 15 pupils transported.

CE also thought that with regards to the speed limit reduction, 50 mph was the answer from Walters Ash, right through to the 30mph zone.

CE stated that this obviously came at a cost, but as discussed by the TRIAG, it's the legal fees for changing the traffic regulation order which was expensive. CE said he had tried to contact the RAF to find out if they could contribute. However, RAF officer's continually moved on so it was difficult to keep a track on who to contact. CE said they had families that would probably like the idea of having speed reduction as many of their children would be attending the school.

Anne Followell (AF) informed the meeting that she had lived on the bend for 19 years and her children attended the school. She agreed that reducing the speed limit coming into the village would be a sensible option, but reported that a new nursery in Grimsditch had opened. The entrance to the nursery was on the bend on a single track driveway, so not only were cars pulling out, cars were coming in and had to check there was no oncoming vehicles to ensure there wasn't a head on collision. There were small children in pushchairs walking effectively on the road and crossing the bend to take their older children to school – this was increasing the risk. AF also advised that although additional data was required, it was a high risk area, particularly as planning permission for 11 properties had been granted in the entrance with no footpath. She stated that everyone was concerned in terms of people using the road and pedestrians accessing the village amenities.

AF stated she was also concerned on the idea of a zebra crossing, only because of children having to cross the road with no footpath on the end. SS thought that the crossing would be located near the church, so a footpath would have to be added.

David Carroll (DC) advised that he knew the area very well and that a number of residents had contacted him and raised their concerns. He also agreed with what JS and CE had said. DC asked what the procedure would be to reduce the speed from 60mph to 40mph.

SS tabled a further comment on the road where AF lived. She confirmed that they couldn't do Community Speed Watch in this location because it was too close to where the speed limited changed so they placed trevello strips there instead. SS thought that a 60mph to 50mph would not be suitable and felt it seemed sensible to continue with 40mph along that road.

NOL recommended that data be collected at the points where they would like the speed limit changed and then somewhere mid point to monitor driver habits. The data would then be analysed in terms of percentage above and maybe enforcement level. NOL said that they would also ask the Traffic Management Team at Thames Valley Police for their opinion, as well as other teams within Buckinghamshire Council.

NOL added that FT (Future of Transport) guidance was previously used which was quite binary. Buckinghamshire Highways would bring sustainable transport and planning teams into the equation to provide a better balance. NOL stated that it was not all about the vehicles and that other strategies were searched for which the Network Safety Team would not necessarily know about. For example, if there were plans to place a new bridal way or new cycleway, the team may not know that information so a more holistic approach on the speed would be sought. NOL informed the group that the process was on Buckinghamshire Council's website.

Mel Biswas (MB) referred to the point CD had made around enforcement and the yellow lines, which she felt had helped a great deal. MB stated that she regularly walked passed this spot and noted the near misses. MB also noted that it was the same few vehicles parking on or near the bend which were causing the issues. MB said that she had taken a number photo's and had quite a lot of data. She also commented on those vehicles parking on yellow lines and said they should be stopped, and that a speed reduction would reduce the risk of collision.

In response to MB's view, SS stated that some schools in Buckinghamshire had ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition) cameras to catch people parking on zig zags. She wondered if this would be an option. MB thought this was a costly solution and would not stop those individuals. She also wondered who funded these camera's. MW asked what school's SS was referring to. SS confirmed they were outside Hamilton School in High Wycombe and that new locations were being investigated. She also thought camera's were used at Great Marlow School and Wycombe High School as well. MW asked SS to share any information she had with JB (**Action LG/05**).

In terms of enforcement, SB stated that if MB had photo's which showed times and dates and those that evidenced patterns, this would help the enforcement team on the best way to target their activities. SB also thought it would helpful if this information was passed to CE due to the specific work he was doing, so if there was a pattern, the enforcement team could enforce in places that were less visible locally (**Action LG/06**).

With regards to the camera's, SB confirmed that there was a legal process which assess any infringements. SB stated that camera's tended to be on zig zags and outside schools and that requests for local suggestions had been made. Even though Bucks was one of the first counties outside London to install these camera's, a traffic regulation change was required for each. SB said that a public consultation would

also be necessary to get the camera installed. Therefore, if there was a problem with parking on zig zags, SB stated that CE and his Ward Members could suggest a camera in the area. SB stated that people should understand that there is a warning first to offending drivers and a fine thereafter. MB confirmed that she had dates, times and road positions in relation to the yellow lines etc.

MD reported that she did not remember the model and number plates of cars for the regular offenders but believed it was the same people. SB advised that the camera could not deliberately focus on an individual or car.

SS advised that the data sent before the meeting had dates and times of vehicles parking on zig zags etc., as well as weekends when those attending the Sports and Social Club blocked up the road. SB suggested that this information be passed to CE who could review during his meeting with Mark Davies.

CD asked if NOL could have a meeting with the Parish Council and SS so that it could agreed exactly where the traffic data should be collected from. NOL said he would be happy to **(Action LG/07)**.

MW asked JB what the next steps would be. JB stated that primarily further speed data should be collected and any photo's and other supporting evidence should be submitted by **any individual** attending the meeting to NOL and JB **(Action LG/01)**.

Summary of the actions discussed:

Action LG/01: As above.

Action LG/02: To rule in or rule out the feasibility and cost of a zebra crossing. **NOL** to add to the Recommendations in the report.

Action LG/03: If a School Crossing Patroller could be sponsored by a third party, it might reduce the need for the more expensive zebra crossing. **NOL** to feature this in the Recommendations in the report.

Action LG/04: **JB** to provide the lead officer details to SS and AM who manages the School Crossing Patrollers at Buckinghamshire Council.

Action LG/05: **SS** to share any information she has with JB on schools that maintain an ANPR.

Action LG/06: **MB** to provide CE with the photo's of vehicles parking on the zig zag etc.

Action LG/07: **NOL, CD and SS** to arrange a meeting to agree suitable locations to place trevello strips.

In addition - Action LG/08: **SS** to consider Recommendations 2, 3 and 4.

MW thanked everyone from Lacey Green for attending. MW said it was very useful and thanked everyone for the valuable work that had been undertaken. MW stated that the Community Board would assist in the journey to make this location safer for everyone to use.

6 Petition - Radnage School Safety

As the Lead Petitioner did not attend this meeting, MW asked the Community Board

if they had any questions.

JS stated that the Parish Council attended a TRIAG meeting a few months back to present their concerns with the traffic around the school. Their petition was largely the product of that discussion.

JS advised that one of things TRIAG suggested was the use of yellow amber flashing lights that could be placed either side of the school during pick up and drop off times. JS said this would draw motorists attention to the fact that they were approaching a school. JS thought this was a good idea but did not see any reference to this in the petition report.

JS confirmed that TRIAG also suggested removing the road centre line and putting edge lines down. JS added that NOL was aware of these, so any future work should look at these to take a view on whether they were feasible and appropriate. NOL stated these were included in Recommendation 1.

MW asked if the Community Board had anything further to add. As no one did, MW advised that the Community Board was happy to agree the recommendations **(Action RS/01)**.

Summary of the actions discussed:

Action RS/01: Cris Everett (Lead Petitioner) to consider Recommendations 1, 2, 3 and 4.

MW then thanked NOL for all his hard work and said he found it useful.

7 Meeting Close

MW thanked the Board members for attending and then closed the meeting at 7.30pm.