

**MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, 20<sup>th</sup> October 2005 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Jones (Chair) and Councillors Fox and R S Patel.

Apologies of absence were received from Councillors Beswick and Kagan.

Councillors R Blackman, Kansagra, J Moher, R Moher, H B Patel, Sayers and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

**1. Declarations of Interest**

None

**2. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 13<sup>th</sup> July 2005**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of meeting of the Highways Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> July 2005 be received and approved as an accurate record.

**3. Matters Arising**

Councillor Sayers enquired why no consultation was planned concerning the possibility of introducing a Controlled Parking Zone scheme for Gardiner Avenue and Anson Avenue. The Chair enquired what section of Doyle Gardens would be subject to consultation following a petition that had been considered at a previous meeting requesting that it be included in a CPZ scheme. Councillor R S Patel enquired if there was any update with regard to the possible reduction of operating hours for Barham Car Park.

In reply to the queries raised, Satnam Sahota (Parking Team Leader, Transportation Unit) advised Members that neither Gardiner Avenue nor Anson Avenue had requested a CPZ, although the streets would be looked at as part of the CPZ programme. He confirmed that the section of Doyle Gardens to be consulted would be the part between All Souls Avenue and College Road. With regard to Barham Car Park, Mr Sahota advised Members that the zone ST had been reviewed and it was proposed to reduce the operational times of the car park to 10.00am to 3.00pm.

**4. Deputations**

None

**5. Petitions**

Members noted that the following petitions had been received containing in excess of 50 signatures.

(a) **Request for One-Way System and Traffic Calming Measures to be introduced to Sedgcombe Avenue**

This petition stated that:

"We, the residents of Sedgcombe Avenue, Harrow, HA3, request that Sedgcombe Avenue is made one-way with traffic calming measures. This residential street is used as a cut through. With cars parked on one side – moving cars cannot pass each other. There are many 'stand-offs' where no one will give way – which the police sometimes have to resolve. Also, both ends of Sedgcombe Avenue become hazardous when cars are entering and exiting at the same time."

Mrs Golden, representing the petitioners, welcomed the recent improvements undertaken along Sedgcombe Avenue. However, she asserted that the narrowness of the road continued to cause traffic flow problems, especially as the road was being used as a 'cut through', adding to the volume of traffic. Of particular concern was damage to the environment caused by lorries and Mrs Golden explained that the speed of vehicles was excessive when traffic volumes were lower, causing danger to residents and to children who attended St Gregory's School at the end of the road. When the volume of traffic was high, Mrs Golden highlighted other problems such as traffic build up behind buses, or vehicles blocking each other when coming from different directions which had sometimes led to the Police needing to be called. Members heard that the petitioners suggestions included introducing a one-way system to reduce both the volume and speed of the traffic, a no right turn from Kenton Road and extending the double yellow lines.

In response to the issues raised by Mrs Golden, Mr Sahota stated that use of the Sedgcombe Avenue as a 'cut through' had been observed during a recent site visit. However, he advised Members that as there were no reported road accidents in Sedgcombe Avenue in the last 3 years that it was not presently listed as a priority road to undergo traffic calming and safety measures, particularly as funding from Transport for London (TfL) was limited. Members heard that a road safety scheme was currently under progress along Kenton Road which could reduce traffic flow in Sedgcombe Avenue. He therefore advised Members that the outcome of the Kenton Road scheme be monitored before any decision was made in implementing a one-way system in Sedgcombe Avenue. In the meantime, Mr Sahota confirmed that the possibility of introducing a no right turn from Kenton Road and extending yellow lines as suggested by the petitioners would be investigated by officers as part of the Kenton Road safety scheme and that the Police would be requested to carry out speed surveys in Sedgcombe Avenue.

Decisions relating to this petition were agreed under the Request for one-way system in Sedgcombe Avenue report.

(b) **Request for a One-Way System for Sherrick Green Road, NW10**

This petition requested that a one-way system be implemented for Sherrick Green Road, NW10 in order to relieve traffic congestion.

Ms Geraldine Wilcox, representing the petitioners, stated that Sherrick Green Road was experiencing increasing congestion, pollution and noise and was becoming less safe due to vehicles using the road as 'cut through' route. In addition, Ms Wilcox felt that particular attention should be afforded to this road considering Gladstone Primary School was located there and she requested that a one-way system be introduced as a solution to the problems highlighted.

In reply to queries from Members, Ms Wilcox confirmed that petitioners were requesting that traffic be restricted in the direction coming from the Burnley Road end of the road and she asserted that heavy traffic was being experienced along the road through most times of the day. Ms Wilcox also suggested that traffic flow problems were likely to worsen once CPZ schemes had been introduced to surrounding roads, and although she acknowledged that a one-way system would not prevent the daily 'school run', she maintained that it would make the road safer to cross for school pupils.

Responding to the issues raised, Mr Sahota advised Members that a number of accidents had been reported along this road and that therefore further investigation was necessary.

Decisions relating to this petition were agreed as set out in the Briefing Note for Traffic Congestion: Sherrick Green Road.

(c) **Request for Yellow Box at junction of Ealing Road and Chaplin Road, Wembley**

This petition requests that:

"We, the undersigned, call on Brent Council to provide a yellow box traffic treatment at the junction of Ealing Road and Chaplin Road to ensure the turning is safer for vehicles and pedestrians."

Members noted that a yellow box traffic treatment had recently been introduced at the junction of Ealing Road and Chaplin Road.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted

(d) **Preston Road: Traders and Residents' Petition (15<sup>th</sup> July 2005)**

This petition requested the following:-

- (a) Free Parking Bays in Preston Road
- (b) The reinstatement of car parking in front of shops 237 to 251 Preston Road
- (c) Reduce the zig zags in front of and opposite 199-207 Preston Road
- (d) Move the zebra crossing to the 'circle' junction of Carlton Avenue East and Preston Road and reduce to a minimum length

Mr Robert Dunwell, representing the petitioners, felt that the requests outlined in the petition provided a satisfactory solution to the parking situation for this section of Preston Road and he stated that a similar scheme operated successfully at the top section of the road. He stressed the importance of protecting local businesses and suggested that free parking for up to 1 hour would encourage more customers to the area and prevent commuter parking. He also asked that the zig zag road markings in front of and opposite 199-207 Preston Road be reduced to the minimum length as it would not compromise safety. He confirmed that shopkeepers were satisfied with the reintroduction of parking opposite 231 to 251 Preston Road.

Mr Robin Marklow, speaking in support of the petitioners, stated that the free parking bay system that operated at the top end of Preston Road where his business was located had worked well and had benefited both shopkeepers and customers. He estimated that each parking space was occupied by 3 to 4 different vehicles an hour and felt the same system would benefit the section of road identified in the petition.

Councillor R Blackman stated that the measures suggested in the petition would remove confusion over parking arrangements in Preston Road, as currently different schemes were in place along various sections of the road. He agreed with the previous speakers that the free parking bay system worked well at the top section of Preston Road and stated that businesses were affected by all day commuter parking in the section of the road addressed by the petition. He felt that the zig zag road markings should be reduced to the minimum length in order to maximise parking spaces and would not compromise safety as traffic was relatively slow moving along this road. He suggested that a free parking bay scheme would also benefit the Circle Area of Preston Road.

Councillor H B Patel supported Councillor R Blackman's comments, stressing the need to help local businesses and shoppers. He suggested that parking arrangements needed to be looked at in more detail before deciding on the appropriate course of action.

Councillor Van Colle enquired on the length of time required before a decision regarding the parking arrangements would be taken.

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the briefing note on this item that was circulated at the meeting. He suggested that an investigation into free parking bays being introduced, including cost and staffing implications, would be undertaken and reported to a future Committee meeting. In answer to some of the issues raised, Mr Sahota advised Members that there was frequent disregard of a 1 hour restrictions on parking bays and an earlier assessment had indicated that a reduction to the zig zag road markings would compromise safety. With regard to re-locating the zebra crossing, Mr Sahota advised Members that its current location provided the optimum level of safety and that any re-positioning would have safety implications and require re-locating the bus stop. Members heard that each parking scheme along Preston Road was clearly signed.

The Chair indicated her approval that a report be considered at a future meeting of this Committee reviewing the current parking arrangements for this section of the road which would also include monitoring of how short term parking bays were used. Members agreed to the Chair's request that an investigation into reducing the length of the zig zag markings to the minimum length be undertaken and the findings reported to the Chair and ward councillors.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the contents of the petition and the officers' response to it as set out in the briefing note be noted;
- (ii) that a report on parking arrangements for this section of Preston Road be considered at a future Committee meeting;  
and
- (iii) that an investigation into reducing the length of the zig-zag marks at the zebra crossing be undertaken and reported back to the Chair and ward councillors

(e) **Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking: Brent Residents including Toley Avenue area (22<sup>nd</sup> September 2005)**

This petition rejected the Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking proposals for the Toley Avenue area and requested that no extra street markings, including parking bays and extensive additional yellow lining be introduced.

Mr Dunwell, representing the petitioners, stated that residents in the Toley Avenue area had been against road markings for the Wembley Event Day Parking Scheme since the beginning of the consultation and that this view had also been expressed in previous petitions. He stated that this petition reaffirmed support for no road markings and he asked that this be agreed without a re-consultation as the Event Day Scheme needed to be in place in time for the Wembley Stadium opening.

Mr Mel Hacker, speaking in support of the petition, informed Members that he had taken part in circulating the petition and asserted that no one he had spoken to wanted road markings. He felt that no road markings would be appropriate as although it was not in a conservation area, it was part of Barnhill and shared similar characteristics and he added that other small non-conservation areas would not be having road markings.

Mr Jerome Cohen commented that a similar no road marking scheme had been successful in the area around the City of Manchester Stadium according to a report from the Department of Transport.

Councillor Van Colle indicated his support for the petition, stating that the Toley Avenue area was no different to the rest of Barnhill. He suggested that implementing a no road marks scheme would be quicker and easier and would avoid unnecessary expenditure. He also enquired whether parking arrangements in the area could be changed after a review.

Councillor Kansagra felt that the benefits of no road markings, such as reducing costs and increasing parking spaces, should be given serious consideration, adding that it would be preferable to include road markings only if the results of a review had concluded this. He enquired about the dates of the officers' visit to the City of Manchester Stadium and the publication of the Department of Transport report.

Councillor H B Patel remarked that if the results of the review had concluded that a signs only scheme was preferable, costs would be incurred in removing the road markings.

Councillor R Blackman stated that the current proposals for the Toley Avenue area could lead to unnecessary spending if the review concluded that road marking were not required. He expressed concern that road markings would reduce the number of parking spaces and felt that clear signage would be sufficient to deter parking from visitors. He referred to the success of the no road markings for the City of Manchester Stadium Area Event Day parking scheme and suggested that the addition of a car park near to Wembley Stadium would be desirable.

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the briefing note in response to the petition that was circulated at the meeting. Replying to some of the issues raised, Mr Sahota confirmed that the Department of Transport report was drafted after the officers' visit to Manchester. However he advised Members that due to the number of existing CPZ schemes in Brent, it was felt that the Event Day Scheme needed to be easily recognisable and this would be aided by road markings. In addition, Members noted that there were more parking facilities at the City of Manchester Stadium. He advised Members that if a re-consultation was undertaken for the Toley Avenue area, that an Event Day Parking Scheme would not be place for the area in time for the opening of Wembley Stadium.

Phil Rankmore (Director of Transportation) advised Members that the City of Manchester Stadium Area Event Day Parking Scheme included a much smaller area than that of Wembley Stadium and because of the smaller volume of parking in Manchester, visitors were dissuaded from travelling to the Stadium by car. Members noted that the capacity of the City of Manchester Stadium was smaller than Wembley Stadium.

Councillor Fox stressed the need for the scheme in the area to be in place in time for the Wembley Stadium opening. He also highlighted the possibility of residents in no road marking areas requesting road markings to be introduced during the review.

The Chair stated that the results of the consultation were of high importance in considering parking arrangements for the Toley Avenue area. She confirmed that removing road markings could be considered if the review indicated that there was no need for them. She emphasised the need for the scheme to be operating before Wembley Stadium opened and agreed that there was insufficient time to re-consult. She felt that the extensive consideration of the possible options for the area had led to a balanced set of proposals.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of this petition and the officers' response to it as set out in the briefing note be noted but that officers be instructed to proceed with the scheme as previously agreed by this Committee

**6. Petition – Request for One Way System in Sedgecombe Avenue**

The Committee had before them a report informing Members of a petition received by the Council from local residents about concerns regarding traffic conditions in Sedgecombe Avenue, Kenton, and their request for the introduction of a one-way system in this road.

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the report produced in response to the petitioners' request.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petition be noted;
- (ii) that the outcome of officers' investigation of the petition as detailed in paragraph 3.4 of the report be noted; and
- (iii) that it be agreed officers await the delivery of the Kenton Road Safety Scheme (as detailed in paragraph 3.5 of the report) and monitor the outcome before any further consideration is given to the petition.

**7. Briefing Note – Traffic Congestion Sherrick Green Road**

The Committee received a briefing note informing them of the Transportation Unit's response to a petition received from residents of Sherrick Green Road and requesting that a one-way system be introduced.

In introducing the briefing note, Mr Sahota recommended that a detailed traffic survey be undertaken and the results reported back to this Committee for consideration, as set out in the briefing note.

The Chair asked that an investigation into the possibility of extending the double yellow lines by Gladstone Primary School Hall be undertaken during the traffic survey.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition and the officers' response to it as set out in the briefing note be noted



## 8. **Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Controls**

The Committee received a report informing Members of the outcome of re-consultations on options for the Wembley Stadium Event Day Protective Parking Scheme in the Tokyngton, Oakington and Clarendon Garden areas of Wembley. Mr Sahota introduced the report, advising Members that the re-consultation was carried out following a request received from representatives of residents' associations in these areas for a permit and 'signs only' parking control scheme for their respective areas. Members noted that the responses received indicated that there was majority support from the areas consulted for the 'signs only' scheme.

Mr Jerome Cohen, the Chairman of the Wembley Residents' Advisory Committee, welcomed the re-consultation that had been undertaken in environmental areas but expressed concern that there was no enforcement provision to prevent parking of vehicles across driveways. He felt that parking bays could result in residents parking some distance from their homes which would be of particular concern to families with children. Mr Cohen suggested that traffic barriers would be effective in preventing roads being used as rat runs. He also felt that recommendation (ii) should be changed so that the review of the scheme should include consultation with residents and residents associations and reported to Committee for consideration.

Councillor R Blackman welcomed the re-consultation, however he felt that a number of roads required further investigation and that there should be greater clarity of what was proposed for each road. In particular, he felt that roads such as Wembley Hill Road, Wembley Park Drive, Gabriel Close and Victoria Court lacked parking spaces and suggested that there should be consideration into whether parking bays should continue to remain for these roads. He sought clarification of what roads would have road markings in the areas that had been re-consulted. He also stressed the need for clear signage and effective enforcement once the Wembley Event Day Parking scheme was implemented.

Councillor Van Colle sought clarification on what the remaining Section 106 funds would be used for after the expenditure as detailed in the report had been used.

In reply to the issues raised, Mr Rankmore advised Members that because the residents had chosen 1 inclusive zone for the Event Day Parking Scheme, that there was a risk that the inner zone areas nearer the Stadium would experience permit holders from other areas parking there, which would put pressure on parking spaces and could lead to parking across driveways and footways. He explained that it would therefore be prudent to introduce parking bays to the inner areas to prevent this from occurring. Members heard that vehicles parking across driveways could only be removed if there was proof of obstruction. With regard to the query concerning Section 106 funding, Mr Rankmore advised Members that after

the Stadium opened, the consultation area would be extended and that therefore the remaining funds could be used should other areas want parking controls introduced. Mr Rankmore suggested that a review of the scheme be undertaken after completion of a season of events at Wembley Stadium and would investigate issues such as enforcement and complaints received.

The Chair requested that officers provide Councillor R Blackman with details of the roads that had been re-consulted that would have parking bays by the time the Wembley Event Day Parking Scheme was in place. Members agreed that recommendation (ii) be revised so that the review of the Scheme be reported back to this Committee.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the results of the consultation at appendix C, summarised in paragraph 3.8 of the report, be noted and in light of the consultation officers be instructed to proceed with a 'signs only' scheme in the Tokyngton, Oakington and Clarendon areas, as detailed in paragraph 3.9 of the report and in certain areas of area 10 as determined by the Director of Transportation in consultation with the Chair; and
- (ii) that officers review the scheme for Tokyngton, Oakington and Clarendon Garden areas after the initial major events (for 6 months) at Wembley Stadium and the results be reported to a future meeting of this Committee

**9. Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme**

The Committee considered a report which detailed progress with the programme of implementing CPZs in Brent since the report to the last meeting of the Committee in July 2005. In introducing the report, Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the progress of various CPZ schemes and the results of the various consultations that had been undertaken.

Mr Frost, representing residents of Chambers Lane, informed Members that he had recently submitted a petition that had shown clear support against a CPZ scheme being introduced for the road. He acknowledged that an earlier consultation had indicated support for a CPZ scheme, but asserted that many residents had not received the results of the consultation. He requested that any decision on implementing a CPZ scheme for Chambers Lane and Harlesden Road be deferred for a year.

Councillor Sayers enquired when Olive Road would be included in CPZ scheme Zone GM and double yellow lines introduced to Auckland Passage and also whether parking spaces would be made available for visitors to the library in Oman Avenue. He expressed concern about the lack of enforcement in Hassop Road and reported fly-tipping and parking across

the footways along this road. He suggested that Closed Circuit Television Cameras (CCTV) be installed on the road as a deterrent. He also stated that vehicles, particularly lorries, were having difficulty in negotiating the junction of Hassop Road and Ashford Road and enquired about the possibility of providing kerb build-outs to deter parking.

In reply to Mr Frost's comments, the Chair stated that many residents in the area had expressed concern about the current lack of parking spaces and were in support of a CPZ scheme. She stressed the importance in observing the results of the consultation but advised Mr Frost that the CPZ scheme would be reviewed after implementation. She stated that his concerns would be noted and included in the review.

In reply to Councillor Sayers' comments, Mr Sahota advised Members that the possibility of installing CCTV in Hassop Road would be looked at and he explained that it had been determined that there was no longer a need for yellow lines in Ashford Road. The Chair confirmed that yellow lines would be introduced to Olive Road and Oman Avenue and that parking spaces would be made available for visitors to the library in Oman Avenue through pay and display bays for visitors to the road. The Chair added that she would enquire with the Head of Libraries about the possibility of parking being made available on the library forecourt. She confirmed that she would liaise with offices to ensure that the Parking Enforcement Team visited Hassop Road more regularly.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the progress reported by officers on the Controlled Parking Zones programme be noted;
- (ii) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Dicey Road on CPZ measures for their street be noted and it be agreed that Dicey Road be included in zone GA CPZ;
- (iii) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Oman Avenue on CPZ measures for their street be noted and it be agreed that Oman Avenue shall not be included in Zone GA CPZ;
- (iv) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Olive Road (section excluded from GM zone) on CPZ measures for their street be noted and it be agreed that Olive Road should be included in zone GM CPZ;
- (v) that the concerns from residents of KS CPZ be noted and it be agreed officers consult with residents on options for Bank Holiday operation of the CPZ; and

- (vi) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Woodgrange Avenue be noted and it be agreed that footway parking arrangements be made permanent.

10. **Private Street Works Service Road to rear of 5-31 Burnt Oak Broadway**

Mr Rankmore introduced the report that sought the authorisation of Members to serve notice of Brent Council's intention, as the highway authority, to carry out private street works within the existing service road to the rear of 5-31 Burnt Oak Broadway under the Private Street Works Code set out in the Highways Act 1980 and thereafter to seek the adoption of this length of service road under Section 228 of the Highways Act 1980. Members heard that the work was required to enable the redevelopment of the Theoco site to provide a new car showroom and flats and would result in improvements to the condition of the existing poorly maintained rear service road which was vulnerable to regular fly-tipping. It was noted that costs were to be borne by the developer. Mr Rankmore drew Members' attention to amendments to the recommendations as set out in the supplementary report that was circulated at the meeting.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that it be agreed as the service road to the rear of numbers 5-31 (odd numbers) Burnt Oak Broadway, being a private street, was not to the satisfaction of the street works authority, sewered, levelled, paved, metalled, flagged, channelled, made good and lighted with respect to the street and that such street works be executed;
- (ii) that it be agreed the expenses incurred by the Authority in executing the street works shall be apportioned between the premises fronting the street such those expenses shall be borne by the developer the developer of 5 Burnt Oak Broadway, whilst other frontagers shall receive a nil apportionment;
- (iii) that:-
  - (a) the specification of streetworks, with the plans and sections
  - (b) the estimate of the probable expense of the works; and
  - (c) the provisional apportionment, apportioning the estimated expenses to be charged to the developer as in (ii) above as set out in the appendix to the report be approved; and
- (iv) that, subject to the approval of the items listed in (iii) above and subject to the developer agreeing to meet the Council's legal, professional and other costs in pursuing the procedure to adopt the street under the Private Street Works Code, the Director of Transportation shall proceed with the works such that the street may

be adopted under the provisions of Section 228 of the Highways Act 1980 – Private Street Works Code.

#### 11. **London Bus Priority Network (LBPN) Progress Report**

Hossein Amir-Hosseini (Transportation Officer) introduced the report which updated Members on progress on the LBI/LBPN programme since the last Committee meeting. Members also noted the schemes identified on various bus routes for design and consultation during 2005/06 to be implemented during 2006/2007 and 2007/2008.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the LBPN schemes identified in the report be noted and it be agreed to proceed with the public consultations on the proposed schemes; and
- (ii) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with public consultation and design during the 2005/2006 financial year with a view to implement these schemes, subject to satisfactory statutory consultation and funding availability (and provided that there are no objections or the Director of Transportation considers the objections received are groundless or insignificant) during 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 financial years.

#### 12. **Petition – Hay Lane Residents**

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to a briefing note that was circulated at the meeting which summarised officers' response to a petition received from Hay Lane residents that requested that waiting restrictions be introduced by implementing a single yellow line on both sides of Hay Lane and double yellow lines opposite Evelyn Avenue and at the junction of Hayland Close. Members heard that officers had met with residents and he advised Committee that waiting restrictions were already part of the LBPN scheme for this section of Hay Lane and it was proposed that these measures be consulted upon with local residents which, if agreed, would be accelerated in the programme schedule.

Councillor J Moher stated that the current situation along Hay Lane had caused concern amongst local residents and he asked that the single yellow lines be implemented as soon as possible as a solution to the problem and to prevent vehicles being parked across residents' driveways. He added that the junction of Hay Lane with Evelyn Avenue also posed safety concerns.

During Members' discussion, Councillor R S Patel expressed surprise that only residents at even number addresses along Hay Lane had been consulted and felt that any further consultation should include a larger area and Queensbury ward councillors and be reported back to Committee.

In reply to the issues raised, Mr Rankmore confirmed that residents on both sides of Hay Lane and also Evelyn Avenue would now be consulted following the earlier meeting with residents. Members heard that residents would be asked if the yellow lines should be in operation from Monday to Friday or Monday to Saturday. Mr Rankmore added that side roads were not normally consulted until the formal consultation stage when waiting restrictions were proposed for main thoroughfares.

The Chair agreed that the introduction of waiting restrictions along Hay Lane were a priority and she confirmed that officers would consult with Queensbury councillors concerning any developments. She also confirmed that notices would be placed in Hay Lane and Evelyn Avenue at the formal consultation stage of the LBPV proposals.

**RESOLVED:-**

that the contents of the petition and the officers' response to it as set out in the briefing report be noted

**13. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Highways Committee would take place on Tuesday, 6<sup>th</sup> December at 7.00 pm.

**14. Any Other Urgent Business**

None

The meeting ended at 9.35 pm.

L JONES  
Chair