

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 14 NOVEMBER 2019

Present: Councillor Ayub (Chair);

Councillors Debs Absolom (Vice-Chair), David Absolom, Barnett-Ward, Carnell, Duveen, Ennis, Page, R Singh, Stanford-Beale, Terry and Whitham

Apologies: Councillors Hacker

22. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of 11 September 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Further to Minute 18, the meeting requested confirmation of the recorded decision to remove of the proposed speed calming measures on Albert Road (Caversham Ward) from the list of schemes.

23. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

Questions on the following matters were submitted, and answered by the Lead Councillor for Strategic Environment Planning and Transport on behalf of the Chair:

Questioner	Subject
Adam Hewitt	Pedestrian Crossing in Pepper Lane
Councillor Jones	20mph Zone in Redlands
Councillor Jones	Parking Conditions in the Marlborough Avenue and Elmhurst Road Area
Councillor Jones	Residents only Parking in the Garages Area on Hexham Road
Councillor Whitham	Malvern Court Permit Parking
Councillor Whitham	Permit Parking Consultations

(The full text of the questions and replies was made available on the Reading Borough Council website).

24. PETITIONS

- (a) Petition Against the Introduction of Parking Permits on the Hexham Road Estate

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on the receipt of a petition asking the Council not to introduce parking permits on the Hexham Road Estate.

The petition read as follows:

'We, the residents on the Hexham Road Estate, do not support parking permits being introduced to this Estate'.

At the invitation of the Chair the petition organiser, Sylvia Hamilton, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the petitioners.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the petition be considered with the feedback for the informal consultation for resident permits in this area;
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

(b) Petition to Install a Zebra Crossing near St Joseph's College on Upper Redlands Road

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on the receipt of a petition from residents, asking the Council to introduce a zebra crossing, near St Josephs College, on Upper Redlands Road.

The petition read as follows:

'We, the undersigned, petition Reading Borough Council to install a zebra crossing near St Joseph's College on Upper Redlands Road.'

The report explained that the request for this measure had been captured on the Requests for Traffic Management Measure Report that was a regular item on the agenda and the report submitted to the previous meeting (Minute 18 refers) referred to this request as follows:

'A modest private contribution has been raised toward the development of the requested zebra crossing on Upper Redlands Road. Officers have arranged to meeting with the lead fundraisers to discuss expectations and can conduct some high-level design work as a result.'

The scheme was also included in the Traffic Management Measures - CIL Funded Schemes, see Minute 31 below. At this time the scheme remained unfunded.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the lead petitioner be provided with a copy of the report.

25. RESPONSE TO PETITION REQUESTING REINSTATEMENT OF PELICAN CROSSING ON WOKINGHAM ROAD

Further to Minute 14(b) of the previous meeting, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report in response to a petition that had requested the reinstatement of a pelican crossing on Wokingham Road near Palmer Park. Photographs of the Wokingham Road parallel crossing were attached to the report at Appendix A.

The report explained that the pelican crossing on Wokingham Road had been converted to a parallel pedestrian and cycle facility, between April and July 2019. The Council had received 15 complaints regarding the conversion from May 2019, which had led to a desktop review of similar facilities consisting of a two-lane approach. This also led to additional signage being installed on approach to the crossing warning drivers of the new layout. As required by the Highways Act, a further road safety audit (Stage 3) was carried out on the crossing by independent assessors in July 2019 and had been attended by Thames Valley Police and Council officers. The audit had been conducted over three separate dates and had consisted of daytime and night time observations, including two observations that had coincided with school pick up times. As part of the audit, the Council had highlighted concerns that had been raised by residents, including speed of vehicles approaching the crossing, visibility of users, both on the footways and in the carriageway, and vehicles not stopping to enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross. The road safety audit report had acknowledged that further improvements to the crossing could be made but, it did not recommend any alterations to the design of the crossing at that time.

The recommendations set out in the audit report had included the installation of tactile paving to the west of Palmer Park to alert visually impaired users of the shared path from the crossing facility to Palmer Park Avenue and the applications of anti-skid to highlight the approaching parallel crossing facility. The report had also suggested vegetation trimming outside the park and that ongoing observations should be carried out to record user behaviour on the approach to the crossing and for those to be reported back to the auditor. The audit report recommendations highlighted that the suggested improvements, which were outside the scope of the audit, had been implemented and, in addition, variable speed signs would be displayed on-site for two week periods to alert drivers of their speed on approach to the crossing, before they would be rotated to other sites, and redisplayed on Wokingham Road.

The report stated that as suggested by the independent road safety experts, ongoing monitoring of the crossing was taking place, including regular observations of users approaching the crossing. These were being reported to the auditor on a termly basis. Further changes to the crossing would be considered in response to observations recorded as part of ongoing monitoring of the crossing.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

26. PETITION TO RE-GRAVEL WARDLE AVENUE WITH CORRECT MATERIALS AS COMPENSATION TO ROAD CLOSURE ON ARMOUR HILL

Further to Minute 14(c), the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee on the findings of the petition requesting that the Council re-gravel Wardle Avenue with the correct materials as compensation for the road closure on Armour Hill.

The report explained that Wardle Avenue was a 'Private Prospectively Maintainable Road', which meant that it was a private road and responsibility for its maintenance lay with the land owner or, if unregistered, responsibility passed to the frontages of the adjacent property owners. Wardle Avenue was signed as a 'private road' and access rights were generally written into the Title Deeds of the properties that had access directly off a private road. It had been noted that due to the length of time the road had been in existence highway access rights might have been established but, this did not make Wardle Avenue a 'Highway Maintainable at Public Expense'.

In late December 2018 a collapse had occurred in Armour Hill near the junction with The Cedars. Thames Water had repaired a water-main that was damaged but, on further investigation the Council had established that there was a 'solution feature' within the public highway that resulted in Armour Hill being closed between The Cedars and Westwood Road for safety reasons. Following the successful completion of the ground stabilising works at the end of July 2019 a surface water sewer replacement scheme had been brought forward and these works had been completed on 4 November 2019, with Armour Hill then fully re-opened to through traffic.

The report explained that the Council had a statutory duty, under the Highways Act 1980, to maintain a safe highway. No diversion through Wardle Avenue had been proposed nor signed during the urgent ground stabilisation works in Armour Hill. Local residents might have chosen to use Wardle Avenue as an alternative route, but as the road was private, the Council had no control over the use of the road and the use of Wardle Avenue by local residents during the essential works in Armour Hill did not result in maintenance responsibility being passed to the Council. The Council therefore was not in a position to re-gravel Wardle Avenue in appropriate materials. The Council recognised that the Armour Hill ground stabilisation works had been disruptive to local residents, including residents of Wardle Avenue, and wanted to thank all residents who had been affected for their patience during the essential highway safety works.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;

- (2) That the findings of the investigation not to re-gravel Wardle Avenue be noted;
- (3) That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

27. RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - REVERSAL OF ONE-WAY SYSTEM ON SILCHESTER ROAD AND FAIRCROSS ROAD

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report informing the Sub-Committee of comments and objections that had been received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order, which proposed the reversal of the one-way system on Silchester Road and Faircross Road. The objections, supportive statements and comments that had been received during the consultation period were attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that to avoid peak-time traffic on a section of the A4 Bath Road, and the eastbound bus gate on Southcote Lane, a significant number of motorists were using Silchester Road and Faircross Road to access Southcote Lane. They were turning left onto the road and making a U-turn in the junction with Fawley Road, so that they could re-join the A4 Bath Road further to the east. It had therefore been proposed that to stop this 'rat-running' and turning movements was to reverse the one-way directions of Silchester Road and Faircross Road. The 'left-turn only' restriction from Faircross Road onto Southcote Lane and 'no-entry' from Southcote Lane onto Faircross Road would be revoked, with a 'no-entry' from Circuit Lane onto Silchester Road and from Silchester Road onto Faircross Road also being proposed.

Reversing the one-way direction of Silchester Road and Faircross Road would remove the ability for traffic to bypass the Southcote Lane bus gate and proceed towards the town centre. It had been acknowledged that changing the one-way directions would require those wishing to access Southcote Lane in the morning by private motor vehicle, to do so via its eastern end, at the roundabout with the A4 Bath Road. Residents of Silchester Road and Faircross Road wishing to travel eastbound would also be required to join the A4 Bath Road via Circuit Lane during the times at which the Southcote Lane bus gate was operational.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That having considered the comments and objections noted in Appendix 1, attached to the report, the Traffic Regulation Order proposing reversal of the one-way system on Silchester Road and Faircross Road be rejected;
- (3) That transport officers be asked to arrange a meeting with representatives of Southcote Primary School to consider alternative measures to deal with congestion around the school and inconsiderate parking during pick-up and drop-off times;

- (4) That the objectors be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee, following publication of the meeting minutes.

28. WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2019A - PORTWAY CLOSE

Further to Minute 16 of the previous meeting, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report asking the Sub-Committee to review the comments that had been received in respect of the Portway Close proposal, part of the 2019A programme, that had been deferred from the previous meeting. Objections, support and other comments received during statutory consultation for the Portway Close scheme were attached to the report at Appendix 1.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That having considered the objections noted in Appendix 1, attached to the report, the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, Portway Close, for the 2019A Waiting Restriction Review programme be rejected;
- (3) That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.

29. PALMER PARK - MANAGEMENT OF PARKING

Further to Minute 17 of the previous meeting, the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with the results of the statutory consultation that had been undertaken, which proposed management of the car park (including charges) by Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) at Palmer Park. A plan showing the area covered by the advertised TRO was attached to the report at Appendix 1 and the responses that had been received to the statutory consultation were attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report explained that the statutory consultation had finished on 5 September 2019 and that the area covered by the proposal was currently paved/hard-standing areas on the park. Officers were reviewing enforcement/management options for some grassed areas of the park, which were occasionally opened for overflow parking. These areas were Public Open Space and were likely to require additional legislative and consultation processes for the same restriction to be applied. Officers were developing a parking permit facility that could be applied to certain established activities that took place at the Palmer Park facilities. The results of discussions that had taken place with established clubs and users of the facilities, in addition to the consultation responses that had been received, had indicated a high level of demand for an increase to the 'free' period of parking and it had been proposed that the restrictions should be implemented with an adjusted tariff, which would allow three hours free parking as follows:

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 14 NOVEMBER 2019

- Free of charge - 3 hours
- 4 hours - 50p
- 5 hours - £1
- Each additional hour (or part, thereof) - +50p
- Night time - £2

It should be noted that parking during the 'free' period would still require a Pay and Display ticket to be obtained, although the charge would be £0.

At the previous meeting officers had been asked to investigate claims by the Park United Reformed Church that it leased the area of parking at the junction with Palmer Park Avenue and Wokingham Road and that this should be included in the TRO and, as a result, officers from the Leisure and Recreation Department had met with representatives of the Church. A draft lease and Heads of Terms had been drafted many years previously, but had not been completed. However, it was acknowledged that the Church had been using the car park in line with the principles that had been identified in the Heads of Terms and that the Council had agreed in principle to its use by the Church. The report therefore recommended that the car parking area should be excluded from the resultant TRO and that officers would work with the Church to formalise an agreement for its ongoing use and maintenance.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the objections set out in Appendix 2, attached to the report to either implement or reject the proposals be noted;
- (3) That, considering tariff-related objections received, the tariff be adjusted in the resultant order to extend the free parking period from 2 hours to 3 hours and the remainder of the tariff would have the timings adjusted, to resume from hour 4 onward, as set out above and in paragraph 4.9 of the report;
- (4) That the area of parking at the junction of Palmer Park Avenue and Wokingham Road be excluded from the resultant Traffic Regulation Order, as set out in paragraph 4.10 of the report;
- (5) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into the proposals;
- (6) That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting.

30. EAST READING AREA RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING - AREA 2 AND WOKINGHAM ROAD

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with an opportunity to consider the implementation of 'Area 2' of the East Reading area Resident Permit Parking Scheme. The objections that had been received to the statutory consultation on the Area 2 scheme were attached to the report at Appendix 1, drawings for the Area 2 scheme were attached at Appendix 2 and the proposals that had been recommended for Wokingham Road were attached to the report at Appendix 3.

East Reading Area Permit Parking - Area 2

Further to Minute 39 of the meeting held on 10 January 2019, the report explained that Area 1 had been implemented over the summer school holiday period 2019 and was 'live' (enforced) from 16 September 2019. The decision to implement Area 2 had been deferred by the Sub-Committee pending the implementation of Area 1.

Wokingham Road

Further to Minute 54 of the meeting held on 7 March 2019, the report stated that it was recommended that the original proposal for the unrestricted bays on Wokingham Road, as set out in Appendix 3, should be progressed to statutory consultation and the Pay and Display tariff be advertised as follows:

- Free of charge - 2 hours
- 3 hours - 50p
- 4 hours - £1
- Each additional hour (or part, thereof) - +50p

It should be noted that parking during the 'free' period would still require purchase of a Pay and Display ticket, although the charge would be £0.

The report explained that while it was uncommon for free periods of on-street charging to apply in the Borough, it was considered that the parking bays represented a reasonably unique situation of being in a residential area, not directly within a shopping area, and the free period of charging reflected the typical two hour period of shared use parking applied within Resident Permit Parking restrictions elsewhere.

At the invitation of the Chair, Ricky Chana, local resident, and Bernadette Cowling of Earley Christian Fellowship addressed the Sub-Committee.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;

- (2) That the objections and other feedback noted in Appendix 1, attached to the report, be noted and that the proposals for Area 2 of the East Reading Residents' Permit Parking scheme be agreed for implementation as advertised;
- (3) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into the proposals;
- (4) That respondents to the statutory consultation be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly, following publication of the agreed minutes of the meeting;
- (5) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake a statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions on Wokingham Road, as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the report;
- (6) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order;
- (7) That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisement be submitted to a future meeting;
- (8) That the Head of Transport (or appropriate Officer), in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals;
- (9) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.

31. TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES - COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDED SCHEMES

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report providing the Sub-Committee with concept designs for requested traffic management schemes that had received funding from local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions. The concept scheme designs were attached to the report at Appendix 1.

The report explained that the Council had allocated CIL funding to enable the delivery of a number of traffic management schemes, the majority of which had originated from the 'Requests for Traffic Management Measures' report that was submitted to the meeting bi-annually. Officers had conducted initial investigation works, had obtained indicative quotations and had provided Ward Councillors with recommended concept designs that they felt should be deliverable, within the allocated budgets and Ward Councillors had been provided with an opportunity to comment on the concept schemes. Officers intended to progress these schemes to a detailed feasibility and design stage which for

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 14 NOVEMBER 2019

most would necessitate external road safety audits, speed surveys and possible ground investigation works to be conducted. These processes would necessitate the use of the CIL contributions.

Many of the schemes would require statutory consultation or notification to be conducted and approvals were sought from the Sub-Committee to enable officer to progress with the necessary processes that could lead to the delivery of the schemes. This did not guarantee the implementation of the schemes and should any significant alterations be necessary, or objections to the consultation be received, officers would submit further reports to future meetings. If this was not the case then it was intended that officers would progress the schemes to delivery. A table setting out the decisions that officers were seeking was included in the report.

The report explained that officers had developed concept proposals for the privately funded request for a controlled pedestrian crossing in Pepper Lane and a concept had also been developed for a controlled pedestrian crossing on Upper Redlands Road, for which a modest private contribution had also been raised. Officers would be sharing these proposals with the funding contributors and would report the proposals to a future meeting with any necessary alterations.

In relation to the enforcement of 20mph areas scheme, the Sub-Committee only agreed to a single calibrated ANPR camera being installed. The device would enable the Police to use the data captured by the camera to contact owners of speeding vehicles to issue warnings in the first instance.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;**
- (2) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake the statutory advertisement processes for each scheme, as set out in paragraph 4.4 of the report, whilst noting that only one calibrated ANPR camera should be included in Scheme (i) 'enforcement of 20mph areas';**
- (3) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal any resultant Traffic Regulation Orders;**
- (4) That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisements be reported to a future meeting;**
- (5) That the Head of Transport (or appropriate Officer), in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals;**
- (6) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.**

32. THE ABBEY SCHOOL CHRISTCHURCH ROAD/VICARAGE ROAD

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES - 14 NOVEMBER 2019

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report on a review of the traffic management measures associated with proposed new accesses on Christchurch Road and Vicarage Road relating to the development works to The Abbey School. The Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road location and restriction plan was attached to the report at Appendix 1 and photographs of the existing access arrangements were attached to the report at Appendix 2.

The report explained that planning permission had been granted for the erection of single and two storey extension to the existing building and the creation of new access and alterations and adaptations to existing access points at The Abbey School. The access alterations included the provision of upgrading the existing dropped kerb access on Christchurch Road to a Bellmouth access in order to aid access for coaches and deliveries. The proposals also included the removal of the existing dropped kerb located on the corner of Christchurch Road and Vicarage Road and the creation of a new Bellmouth access onto Vicarage Road located 15.8 metres from the Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road junction. The existing access onto the Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road junction would be replaced with a pedestrian only entrance with a further pedestrian entrance which would be located south of the new vehicular access onto Vicarage Road. The design had been agreed at the planning application stage and work was currently underway to implement the building works associated with development.

The Christchurch Road school frontage was currently controlled through a 'No Waiting Mon - Sat 8.00am to 6.30pm' restriction, which extended across the existing dropped kerb. The proposal sought to alter the existing 'No Waiting Mon - Sat 8.00am to 6.30pm' restriction to the west of the proposed access. The restriction commenced at the Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road junction, which would continue, and would extend to the east for a distance of 36 metres following the kerb radii for the proposed junction and cease at the back of the footway. To the east of the proposed access the 'No Waiting Mon - Sat 8.00am to 6.30pm' restriction would commence at the back of the footway and follow the radii to the east of the proposed junction for eight metres.

The Vicarage Road school frontage was currently controlled through a 'No Waiting at Anytime' restriction, which extended from the Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road junction across the existing dropped kerb for a distance of 18 metres commencing at the end of the existing footway build out. The proposal sought to extend the existing 'No Waiting at Anytime' restriction to the south for a distance of five metres following the junction radii concluding at the back of the footway. To the south of the junction the proposal sought to introduce a 'No Waiting at Anytime' restriction, this was to commence at the back of the footway and extend for a distance of 12 metres until it met the existing School Keep Clear restriction.

All the above alterations were to ensure that parents did not drop off and/or pick up their children from Christchurch Road and/or Vicarage Road within close proximity to the proposed access, which would have detrimental implications for visibility and movement at either of the proposed accesses and for traffic movements close to the Christchurch Road/Vicarage Road junction.

Resolved -

- (1) That the report be noted;
- (2) That the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake a statutory consultation for the proposed restrictions on Christchurch Road and Vicarage Road, as set out in paragraphs 4.6, 4.7, 4.9 and 4.10 of the report;
- (3) That subject to no objections being received, the Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make the Traffic Regulation Order;
- (4) That any objection(s) received following the statutory advertisement be submitted to a future meeting;
- (5) That the Head of Transport (or appropriate Officer), in consultation with the appropriate Lead Councillor, be authorised to make minor changes to the proposals;
- (6) That no public enquiry be held into the proposals.

33. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved -

That, pursuant to Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) members of the press and public be excluded during consideration of item 34 below, as it was likely that there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

34. APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY PARKING PERMITS

The Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services submitted a report giving details of the background to her decisions to refuse applications for Discretionary Parking Permits from a total of 57 applicants, who had subsequently appealed against these decisions.

Resolved -

- (1) That, with regard to applications 11, 16, 17, 41 and 43 one book of discretionary visitor permits be issued, charged for, personal to the applicant;
- (2) That, with regard to applications 3, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 40 a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant, for one year only subject to adequate proofs provided;

- (3) That, with regard to application 13, a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant, subject to adequate proofs and one book of discretionary visitor permits be issued, charged for and personal to the applicant;
- (4) That, with regard to application 5, 51, 54 and 56 a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant and subject to adequate proofs provided;
- (5) That, with regard to applications 6, 27, 42, 48, 49 and 50 a third discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant;
- (6) That, with regard to applications 4 and 12 a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant and informed the permit scheme for the area had been approved;
- (7) That, with regard to application 47 a first discretionary resident permit be issued, personal to the applicant, subject to adequate proofs and one book of discretionary visitor permits be issued, charged for and personal to the applicant;
- (8) That, with regard to applications 55 and 57 two books of discretionary visitor permits be issued, charged for, personal to the applicant;
- (9) That the Executive Director for Economic Growth and Neighbourhood Services' decision to refuse applications 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 31, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 52 and 53 be upheld.

(Exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2).

(The meeting closed at 8.25 pm)