

Minutes of Hampton Prep – Hampton Prep Neighbours' Association Liaison Meeting

Held at Hampton Prep School, Gloucester Road, 28/11/18

Attendees from Hampton Prep: Andrew Munday, Tim Smith, Rachael Tinkler

Attendees from HPNA: Trevor Alldridge, Nigel Kingsley, Kay Oliver, Pauline Alldridge

Suzette Nicholson was unable to attend for personal reasons. Rachael Tinkler was introduced and welcomed to her first meeting.

1. **Ratification of Minutes from previous Liaison Meeting on 18/5/18** These minutes were agreed.
2. **Matters Arising.** No Newsletter to Neighbours had been produced as promised, because of staff shortage.

Action: Next Newsletter will be produced in the New Year (TS)

3. PPP&Parking Marshalls.

The School have initiated a 'Golden Lock' scheme to encourage better parking.

The School announced that their insurance policy would not cover Staff if they marshalled beyond site entrance areas. They were considering informing the Council that they would no longer be Marshalling beyond the entrance areas. Meanwhile such marshalling had been suspended. HPNA expressed concern about this. NK mentioned a recent HPNA survey in which 85% of responders had seen Marshalls less than once a month or never. The School reiterated that they attended at entrances. HPNA pointed out that the intent (and wording) of the council statement was for marshalling of the entire affected area.

Action: School agreed to consider employing Marshalls, or varying the insurance policy, and if cost was agreed, to present proposal to the Board of Governors.

HPNA reported that a recently conducted short survey showed that 85% of respondents thought that the traffic and parking situation had improved during the recent survey week, compared to normal. If this was sustained it would be a good outcome.

The School said that they were trialling the use of small minibuses to bring pupils to the school. A trial with a route from Chiswick was under trial (about 10 pupils participated), another from the Thames Ditton area was under consideration. HPNA welcomed this initiative.

There was a discussion about signage requesting parents to refrain from parking/park considerably near entrances to the school grounds. A neighbour had suggested that a sign near the entrance from Carlisle Park should be duplicated on the Gloucester Road.

Action: HPNA & TS to investigate further

4. Exchanges with neighbours.

TS cited 4 exchanges. 2 where parking issues were resolved in a friendly manner. One where the School was called in by a neighbour, a School employee (TS?) attended and solved the

problem because the person alleged to have parked inconsiderately had nothing to do with the school. One where neighbours allegedly reacted unpleasantly in Scotts Drive when questioning TS.

TA said that it was hard to help in cases such as this when the full evidence was not available. NK said there were behaviour issues both from parents and neighbours.

5. Travel Plan

The School were unsure about progress on the application. NK reported that Anita Vedi had said that consideration at a Planning Meeting in New Year was likely.

HPNA raised School's failure to inform neighbours in advance about forthcoming Applications, as promised at previous Liaison Meetings.

Action: School agreed to inform HPNA in advance of such events (and indeed other things which might 'surprise' neighbours) (TS).

TS expressed concern that in some cases more than one member of a family had lodged objections to the plan. HPNA objected strongly to TS' concern as it implied a degree of unfair manipulation of the objection process. The main issue arose where neighbours owned two houses and submitted one objection from each dwelling although they lived in one and the other was tenanted, which TA felt was perfectly acceptable. TA confirmed, when asked, that no objection had also been made by the occupiers of the property.

The School reminded the meeting about about the Travel Plan process. They were seeking new Consultants to prepare the next Plan.

During discussion TS said that he had sight of communications about the Travel Plan sent to HPNA Members. He was concerned that HPNA encouraged neighbours to object. NK explained that HPNA listened to neighbours, did their best to evaluate the Plan, and suggested that Members review the plan in the light of HPNA comments and their own experiences, and choose to comment on the Council website as they thought fit.

The School expressed concerns about the content of some objections to the Application. In particular, suggestions that the School warned parents when surveys were undertaken. AM said that some comments could be regarded as defamatory because they suggested that the school had been guilty of deliberately manipulating the data gathering exercises. He added ~~There~~ there is no evidence to support such an allegation because it is wholly untrue. AM has brought the matter to the attention of the Planning Officers. He also wished to reiterate his warning to HPNA members about making allegations the School regards as defamatory, especially when they are repeated, as in the case of one objection connected with the current planning application.. TS and AM said that neither parents nor neighbours are informed that a travel survey is about to take place because it might alter travel/parking behaviour and therefore skew the results. TS said that even he had not been made aware of the survey start date. PA suggested that it was possible that parents might change their behaviour once they notice that a survey was taking place. That assertion was challenged by

AM and TS. HPNA reiterated that neighbours reported that they had seen a significant reduction in parking during the survey period.

6. HPNA Website.

TS expressed strong concerns about some of the statements and the nature of some language on the HPNA website and showed those online. He took issue with the tone and content including paragraph 2 and the section headed, "Traffic Survey" which repeated the allegation by innuendo that the school had manipulated the traffic data. TS stated yet again that this is a false allegation. HPNA explained, as elsewhere in the meeting, that their role was to listen to and represent what neighbours felt. Sometimes these feelings were perceptions, based on the School's behaviour over time. Nonetheless they were strongly held and often backed by personal experience. HPNA stated that they had no wish to present factually incorrect information. They would review the relevant areas of the site and update them if appropriate.

Action: HPNA to review the statements to which TS referred (NK,TS)

7. AOB

- Winter Service Plan

Action: The School will contact the Council about the Winter Service Plan

- Carlisle Park. TA reported rumours that the School intended to buy or take over management of Carlisle Park. AM stated that, based on his 20 years' experience on the Board of Governors, the School had never had any such plans, nor did they now.
- Wensleydale Gardens. NK reported that a neighbour had informed him that neighbours in four properties were in full time care. There was concern that congestion in the Gardens could impede carers or emergency vehicles.

Action: TS agreed to take this into consideration when communicating with parents

- Staff Parking. HPNA had had comments about staff parking. NK asked TS whether the policy regarding parents' parking was applied to School employee parking. NK was aware of a member who parked in WG and was almost certainly an employee.

Action: NK agreed to send TS photographic evidence.

- Wensleydale Gardens. A neighbour had alleged that the emergency route into the School Grounds was not usable because of the proximity to the entrance to a fence. The School said that there was a viable route.
- Date for next Liaison Meeting.

Action: HPNA to suggest dates to the School

NK/TA

04/01/19