

**MINUTES of MEETING of HELENSBURGH & LOMOND AREA COMMITTEE held by MICROSOFT
TEAMS
on THURSDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2021**

Present:

Councillor Barbara Morgan (Chair)

Councillor Lorna Douglas
Councillor George Freeman
Councillor Graham Hardie
Cou

indicated that there had been an impact on the TRO process, standing orders could be suspended to allow Members to re-consider the matter. Councillor Freeman also sought confirmation that the TRO would be subject to a bi-annual or annual review.

The Head of Roads and Infrastructure Services confirmed that the TRO would be subject to ongoing review as part of the standard process, and it was likely that any TRO would require to be in place for a 12 month period before any changes were made to allow it an opportunity to bed in. He noted that many of the measures in the draft TRO had been a part of the TTRO and had therefore been previously tested in the area. He advised that it was unclear at this point what would happen in the future with regard to staycation activity and travel behaviour, and where there was a requirement to respond quickly they would do so, as had been previously demonstrated by

tradesmen require constant access to their vehicles for tools and materials. Their only alternative is to park close to the coffee shop and risk a parking ticket while they carry out their work. For example is our gardener expected to unload his mower and then leave it unattended while he goes to the car park to park? Maybe then go back for his strimmer? What if he has forgotten something? What about our maintenance man who needs constant access to his vehicle for tools and materials?

The TRO suggests applying for permits in advance but that is not much use when we need an emergency plumber or engineer. This TRO is totally unsuitable for a working business. Why is Argyll and Bute Council making it so difficult for a legitimate business to

The Head of Roads and Infrastructure Services agreed to note these comments.

David Pretswell, Luss and Arden Community Council, asked the Committee to disregard previous comments relating to the Community Council as it had been inappropriate for these to be raised at the meeting. He noted that he would invite a reduction in costs for permits and asked Councillors to consider the responses of residents who had overwhelmingly reported their desire for a sustainable, long-term traffic management solution in Luss.

David Pretswell also asked the Committee to take cognisance of the below statement from Luss and Arden Community Council which had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting in relation to the draft TRO proposals:

TROs, currently being considered, are based upon the plan drawn up by the Community Council, local Residents and Luss Estates, which were subsequently and are now, overwhelmingly supported by our Community.

We view the proposed TRO as the very minimum 'first step' that Argyll and Bute Council can do to mitigate the simply appalling traffic issues facing Luss on any sunny day, winter or summer.

We make the following observations:

1. Permit cost :

- a. We note the reduction to £45 per residential permit, as proposed in the papers submitted to the Area Committee; that the whole Parish is included, with each home getting two permits and that the £45 proposed charge is not a temporary measure.
- b. Whilst this reduction is welcome there remains very significant resistance to the principle of chargeable permits for village residents, many of whom are elderly and on low incomes.
- c. Having been given some six days only, between our first sight of the TRO charge proposals and the date of the Area Committee at which the TRO's are to be considered, it is not possible to give a view at this time on whether the £45 per permit charge may prove to be acceptable to our Community.

2. Prohibition of Driving :

- a. As has been emphasised by us on many occasions, the crisis facing Luss is NOT a simplistic parking issue, but is a TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT problem, caused in turn by the enormous volume of circulating visitor cars entering

the heart of the village and circulating there for no good reason. It poses real hazard to resident Quality of Life together with a severely elevated risk of pedestrian/vehicle accidents - there are NO pavements in this area.

- b. We find it to be totally unacceptable that the PDO (Prohibition of Driving Order) has been removed from the proposal. Without a PDO in place, the traffic crisis in Luss will never be resolved.
- c. y these
circumstances to reduce passing and circulating traffic from sensitive locations.
- d. We regret very much the apparent exclusion of this element of the proposal

Decision

The Helensburgh and Lomond Area Committee considered and noted the contents of the report.

(Reference: Report by Executive Director with responsibility for Roads and Infrastructure Services dated July 2021, submitted)

7.

landfill diversion performance along with national policy, targets and regulations which are likely to impact on future performance.

Decision

The Helensburgh and Lomond Area Committee considered and noted the information outlined within the report, including the national policy drivers that would likely impact over the next few years.

(Reference: Report by Executive Director with responsibility for Roads and Infrastructure Services dated 16 September 2021, submitted)

8.

The Committee considered a report providing information around two proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) relating to Luss Village and the U228 Old A82.

Decision

The Helensburgh and Lomond Area Committee agreed:

Speed Limit TRO

1. that the Order should be made as drafted;
2. that physical traffic management measures should be installed to support the proposed speed limits in-Framework;
3. that officers should carry out pre and post implementation speed surveys and

Traffic Management TRO

4. to reduce the proposed permit cost from £98 to £45 per annum;
5. to retain the restriction on the proposed number of permits with a view to amending this in the future depending on post-implementation use with respect to available road space (capacity);
6. to note that there is sufficient provision of off-street parking, that the inclusion of visitor parking within the permit scheme

The Committee considered the Area Scorecard report for Financial Quarter 1 of 2021-2022 (April-June 2021), which illustrated the agreed performance measures.

The Committee Manager provided a further update in relation to street lighting targets on behalf of the Network and Standards Manager, noting that the electrician for the area would shortly be undertaking training to allow him to work on street lights and this should result in improved statistics in due course.

Decision

The Helensburgh and Lomond Area Committee:

1. agreed the proposed presentation of dog fouling data commentary as detailed at section 1.3. of the report;
- 2.

-standing commitment to the provision of a dedicated, high quality walking and cycle route linking Helensburgh, Cardross and Dumbarton.

The Committee resolved in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 to exclude the press and public for discussion of appendix (b) in relation to the report on the grounds that it was likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 7A to the Local Government (Scotland) Act