

**From Cllr Burbage to A Cormie on 24 June 2015**

Subject: RE: PROTEST AGAINST LEGOLAND PROPOSALS TO SEND THEIR TRAFFIC THROUGH BRAY PARISH

Andrew

We are also concerned about the impact of any mass diversion of Legoland traffic!

However, we can't argue for a blanket ban unless we have evidence to the contrary - and as you point out, the trials last year were inconclusive.

I think the intention is to run another short trial - not permanent - at some point over the summer so we can get proper before/after statistics to ensure we can protect Bray without trying to create avoidable traffic jams elsewhere.

I'll get Cllr Rayner (now in charge of Highways and Transport) to drop you a line.

David

**From A Cormie to Cllr Burbage on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

David,

All that is necessary is a firm stand from Ward Councillors and Bray Parish Councillors that they will never accept the placement of any road signs or wording placed on Motorway signs routing Legoland traffic through Bray Parish, and will not ever agree that there are any official Legoland routes from or to Legoland via Oakley Green Road, Forest Green Road, Drift Road or the A330.

You should not allow yourself to be gulled into any negotiations with Legoland. No traffic trials should take place.

If you take the firm stance I suggest then that will be an end to it.

I imagine that we cannot stop Legoland from putting whatever directions they wish to on their website, or on leaflets or notices, but there is no reason why RBWM should assist by officially agreeing any route or placing road signs.

Councillors in other areas are apparently keen to send Legoland traffic to us.

Bray Ward and Bray Parish Councillors should act for Bray Residents in refusing to countenance it.

Andrew

**From Cllr Rayner on 25th June 2015**

Andrew

Thanks for your email. Do you want to meet to go through proposed trial of very little Legoland traffic in your parish for a short period?

I have been informed by officers that Legoland don't have to consult us on this project. We are trying to work with them to minimise disruption to residents.

Regards

Cllr. Colin Rayner

**From A Cormie to Cllr Burbage on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

David,

In my email to you on 24th June, where I responded to your email that is shown below, I said as follows;

"All that is necessary is a firm stand from Ward Councillors and Bray Parish Councillors that they will never accept the placement of any road signs or wording placed on Motorway signs routing Legoland traffic through Bray Parish, and will not ever agree that there are any official Legoland routes from or to Legoland via Oakley Green Road, Forest Green Road, Drift Road or the A330.

You should not allow yourself to be gulled into any negotiations with Legoland. No traffic trials should take place.

If you take the firm stance I suggest then that will be an end to it.

I imagine that we cannot stop Legoland from putting whatever directions they wish to on their website, or on leaflets or notices, but there is no reason why RBWM should assist by officially agreeing any route or placing road signs.

Councillors in other areas are apparently keen to send Legoland traffic to us.

Bray Ward and Bray Parish Councillors should act for Bray Residents in refusing to countenance it."

From that, you and Cllr Rayner will recognise that - as I consider that the solution is to disengage from Legoland, telling them that RBWM will never agree to placing signs to divert traffic onto Bray Parish roads - there is no point in me being involved in considering any aspect of a related traffic trial.

By copy of this to Bray Ward Councillors and Bray Parish Council, I repeat my concern that all Bray Councillors should act for Bray Parish residents in stopping the proposed trials and refusing to have any signs placed to divert Legoland traffic onto Bray Parish roads.

This page <http://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/councillors> from the RBWM website states;

"The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is a democratic organisation.

It comprises 57 elected Councillors who are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Councillors are elected every four years and there are 23 wards with up to three councillors in each ward. The number of Councillors per ward is representative of the number of people living in that area.

Councillors are responsible for agreeing policies about provision of services and how the council's money is spent. The council employs officers who are responsible for its day to day management.

The overriding duty of Councillors is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them. They have regular contact with the general public through council meetings, email, telephone calls or surgeries. Surgeries provide an opportunity for any ward resident to talk to their councillor face to face."

For Bray Ward and Bray Parish Councillors, I emphasise "ELECTED COUNCILLORS WHO ARE DEMOCRATICALLY ACCOUNTABLE TO RESIDENTS OF THEIR WARD" and "THEY HAVE A SPECIAL DUTY TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS"

I note that one of the RBWM Councillors involved with the Legoland routes "Task and Finish" group that is pushing for the Bray Parish Route is Cabinet member (Youth Services and Safeguarding) - Cllr Natasha Airey (Park Ward). Also there is Cllr Jesse Grey for Datchet and Cllr Eileen Quick for Clewer East. These Councillors are rightly performing their SPECIAL DUTY TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS, and I call upon all Bray Ward and Parish Councillors to do likewise for their Bray Parish constituents.

Further, it seems irrefutable that Bray Parish Council, being theoretically closest to the local population of Bray Parish, must act in the best interest of Bray Parish Residents. I note that Bray Parish Council now has as Parish Councillors, the following RBWM Councillors - Burbage, Walters, Dudley, Wilson - three of them being also RBWM Cabinet members.

Bray Parish residents elected these councillors to act in the best interests of Bray Parish. I expect that Bray Parish and RBWM Councillor, Cllr Dudley, having been key to the creation of the Holyport College on the A330 will not wish to have more traffic going past its door.

You will no doubt be aware that there have been negotiations between some Bray Parish Residents and RBWM about the lamentable traffic problem on the A330 as it transits Holyport. I understand that some action is being taken by RBWM. Such action should not be compromised by routing further traffic on the A330.

I have copied this to the West Windsor Residents Association and the Oakley Green and Fifield Residents Association, who I understand would like to be kept advised of RBWM actions in this matter.

By copy to the Clerk of Bray Parish Council I ask that she ensure that all Bray Parish Councillors receive a copy this email.

Sincerely,

Andrew Cormie

**From Councillor Rayner on 30th June 2015**

Subject: RE: Legoland Traffic  
Thanks for your email. As lead member of transport, it will be my ultimate decision re. this project. I have noted that you don't want to meet.

Regards

Cllr. Colin Rayner

**From A Cormie on 30th June 2105**

**For attention of Bray Ward Councillors, Cllr Burbage, Cllr Coppinger, Cllr Walters, and all Bray Parish Councillors.**

By copy of this to the Proper Officer of Bray Parish Council I ask that she obtain the views of Bray Parish Councillors and convey them to Bray Ward Councillors.

Dear Councillors,

I am forwarding this chain of email correspondence to you as it has now reached an unacceptable stage with the statement from RBWM Cllr Rayner that he considers that he is the person who will decide upon whether or not Legoland Traffic will be sent through Bray Parish.

Cllr Rayner says he has noted that I don't want to meet with him.

It is not that I don't want to meet him; I consider that democratically the duty of resisting extra traffic on behalf of Bray Ward residents belongs with the RBWM Bray Ward Councillors. For me to meet him would confuse the issue, and I will not take the place of democratically elected Councillors, both Bray Parish and RBWM Bray Ward who must act on behalf of their constituents.

I repeat from my email below my view that all Bray Councillors must act for Bray Parish residents in stopping the proposed Legoland traffic trials and refusing to have any signs placed to divert Legoland traffic onto Bray Parish roads.

This page <http://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/councillors> from the RBWM website states;

"The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is a democratic organisation.

It comprises 57 elected Councillors who are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Councillors are elected every four years and there are 23 wards with up to three councillors in each ward. The number of Councillors per ward is representative of the number of people living in that area.

Councillors are responsible for agreeing policies about provision of services and how the council's money is spent. The council employs officers who are responsible for its day to day management.

The overriding duty of Councillors is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them. They have regular contact with the general public through council meetings, email, telephone calls or surgeries. Surgeries provide an opportunity for any ward resident to talk to their councillor face to face."

For Bray Ward and Bray Parish Councillors, I emphasise "ELECTED COUNCILLORS WHO ARE DEMOCRATICALLY ACCOUNTABLE TO RESIDENTS OF THEIR WARD" and "THEY HAVE A SPECIAL DUTY TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS"

Other RBWM Councillors are actively seeking to have Legoland traffic sent onto Bray Parish roads, and Bray Ward and Parish Councillors must fight on behalf of Bray Ward and Parish constituents to stop such traffic being imposed upon us.

I have seen no evidence of either Bray Parish Councillors or RBWM Bray Ward Councillors attempting in any way to find out their constituents views on whether Legoland Traffic should be diverted onto Bray Ward roads.

However, I have drawn attention of some residents to this problem, encouraging them to advise Councillors of their views. To date, in addition to my emails, forty-five residents have sent emails to RBWM Bray Ward Councillors and Bray Parish Council. Many of these are on behalf of two people, and all have been in support of my email.

Bray Parish Council, being theoretically closest to the local population of Bray Parish, must act in the best interest of Bray Parish Residents. I note that Bray Parish Council now has as Parish Councillors, the following RBWM Councillors - Burbage, Walters, Dudley, Wilson.

Bray Parish residents elected these councillors to act in the best interests of Bray Parish. Bray Parish Councillors who are also RBWM Councillors must have as their foremost duty that of acting on behalf of Bray Parish Residents. Secondly, as RBWM Councillors to act on behalf of their Bray Ward constituents.

Cllr Burbage may believe that as leader of the Council he cannot act for Bray Residents, but must have a duty to the whole community. I

must say though that we did not elect Cllr Burbage to be leader of the council. He was elected to Bray Parish Council to represent Bray Parish and to RBWM to represent Bray Ward.

Residents of Bray Parish can expect the councillors whom WE HAVE VOTED INTO THEIR POSITIONS to act in the best interests of Bray Ward and Bray Parish.

I have said I consider that such trials should not take place and that RBWM should not agree to have any signs put in place that would divert Legoland Traffic onto Bray Ward roads.

Cllr Rayner has said in effect that if I, a resident of Bray Parish, wish to have any say in whether or not he will impose traffic upon us, I must personally put my case to him, and must consider RBWM's proposals in cooperation with Legoland to apply traffic trials.

I do not agree, and I expect ALL Bray Ward Councillors and Bray Parish Councillors to take account of the views of their constituents and refuse to have any signs placed that would divert Legoland Traffic via Bray Parish Roads.

I expect the RBWM Monitoring Officer to support my position.

Sincerely,

Andrew Cormie,

**From David Coppinger on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015**

**Andrew**

We have received many emails from residents following your call to arms. Some of these were addressed to us individually and some to us as a group. I would appreciate you circulating this email, as for me to respond individually to so many would take a long time.

**Residents**

On behalf of David Burbage and Leo Walters can I thank everyone for writing to us to express their concerns. I will try in this mail to answer the core questions that arise and what is going to happen.

1. Legoland like Windsor Castle, Ascot Racecourse and Windsor Racecourse are major attractions within the Borough attracting visitors from both UK and in the case of the Castle across the world. They bring much money into businesses within the Borough which benefits all of us.

2. We do not have a cosy relationship with any of them and they all have to meet our requirements from licensing to planning. With some 83% of the Borough being Green Belt , which of course this Conservative administration is committed to protect, we will inevitably disagree with many projects. One such was the Haunted House planning application which was turned down by both officers and members although Legoland have gone to appeal which of course is their right.

3. When any business or developer asks us to attend meetings to discuss future plans we will of course attend because it is far better to understand what they are trying to achieve and suggest improvements than wait for their plans to be finalised. Such discussion is welcomed within the Localism Act as long as we do not predetermine our views and should we be called upon to make a decision we keep an open mind.

4. Traffic for all of these attractions is a major concern and we work with all to mitigate the effect upon our residents. Vehicle traffic comes from all directions with the majority coming on the Westbound M4. Eastbound is one of the lighter routes.

5. RBWM attempted a trial last year to ease congestion created by Legoland last year to spread the load but this was not effective for the Eastbound M4 because signage was poor and we used an indirect route to avoid the A330 to avoid gas works.

6. The proposal now is to run a limited trial to see whether the concerns over traffic are real and whether there is any impact on the traffic congestion. What we do know is that most drivers these days ignore such routes as they are following their sat nav's.

7. All three of us are very concerned about the level of traffic within the Parish especially on the A330 and for this we are finalising a scheme which will limit lorry movements. However it is no good saying that the traffic effect would be disastrous if we have no evidence. All three of us have debated the options with other Members and the officers responsible and whilst we are unhappy we cannot disagree with the logic that until you know the impact you cannot object.

8. There appears to be some misapprehension about what powers your elected officials have and this applies at Parish Borough and Parliamentary level. The Parish can make unilateral decisions about those areas that they control e.g. Holyport and Bray Green but even when decisions are unanimous they cannot tell, for example, public utilities not to dig up a road. Similarly your Borough Councillors have a lot of power within the Ward but where a decision involves other parties our power is limited. Believe it or not, your MP has even less actual power. What we all can do and we do it very well is to influence, persuade and cajole. We can get many things changed or stopped but in this case we would need to persuade a majority of RBWM Councillors to support us. In many cases we could achieve this but in this case the view is that a trial is needed.

Rest assured we will monitor the results carefully and if there is a quantifiable issue for residents we will fight any permanent change to the road directions. I together with David and Leo are very happy to answer any further questions by phone or email.

**Cllr David Coppinger**

**From A Cormie on 4th July 2015**

Dear Bray Ward Councillors,

I am replying to the 30th June email from Cllr Coppinger, which I understand was sent on behalf of all three of you.

By copy of this to Janice Eden-Bagley the Proper Officer of Bray Parish Council I formally ask her to ensure that all Bray Parish Councillors receive a copy of this, and to ensure that this is debated by Bray Parish Councillors with a view to Bray Parish Council refusing to accept that Legoland Traffic be diverted through Bray Parish.

I further copy this to Ken Elvin, the Leader of Bray Parish Council, as he has responded recently to another resident and copied his email to me, from which I understand that Bray Parish Council will discuss the Legoland Traffic topic on Monday 6th July. I suggest that Cllr Elvin could ensure that during the weekend, whilst the Clerk is unavailable, this is copied to all Bray Parish Councillors.

I have postponed this response pending receipt of a Councillor reply to my email of 30th June to Bray Ward Councillors, copied to others, but as no reply has been forthcoming I comment now on your email appended below. I also attach my email of 30th June 2015 to which I refer in the previous sentence.

As requested by David C I did send his email to the HRA Members etc.

One responded to me; "Re: Legoland - I saw the response from David Coppinger. To be honest, I agree with him that a trial as to the traffic implications seems to be the best way forward as long as it is run correctly. The previous one was a mess! I feel you do need hard evidence in these matters."

Another said to me; "Whilst we appreciate your efforts to ensure that Holyport remains a delightful place for its residents, Cllr Coppinger makes a very reasonable case below. The Bray Parish Council, as well as the RBWM Council, also have a duty to consider the wider picture, and how the parish and our village relate to the economic and social development (and conservation) of the area."

Neither of these residents were from those who have already written to you supporting my view. So far there have been no more resident responses.

---

Re your Point 2 - it was not as you stated - Officers recommended for approval the Haunted House Application. Councillors rejected it.

---

Re your Point 3 - Regarding the need to avoid predetermining Councillors views - clearly the action of meeting and discussing could influence one's views, so it is necessary not only to consider the requirements of the business or developer, but also to consider residents requirements. The latter must be the most important, as it is surely a part of the job description of the position of Councillor, that the Councillors view should reflect the view of the constituents he represents?

In this regard, I have heard from the Chair of the West Windsor Residents Association that one of her Ward Councillors has refused to meet with her to discuss the Legoland applications as he feels it could be seen as predetermining his view.

But according to this; <http://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/councillors>

"The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead is a democratic organisation.

It comprises 57 elected Councillors who are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Councillors are elected every four years and there are 23 wards with up to three councillors in each ward. The number of Councillors per ward is representative of the number of people living in that area.

Councillors are responsible for agreeing policies about provision of services and how the council's money is spent. The council employs officers who are responsible for its day to day management.

The overriding duty of Councillors is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them. They have regular contact with the general public through council meetings, email, telephone calls or surgeries.

Surgeries provide an opportunity for any ward resident to talk to their councillor face to face."

So how can Cllr Bicknell refuse to meet with one of his constituents?

Re your Point 6 - My request is simply that Bray Ward Councillors be seen to oppose the placement of signs that encourage traffic to use Bray Ward roads.

This is a simple request, and it is easy to justify. Traffic is bad in our area, so why do anything to make it worse?

If Ward Councillors will agree that such signs will not be placed, then there would be no point in performing any trial to assess whether or not extra traffic would be onerous. It is already clear that any extra traffic would be undesirable.

I believe that if trials go ahead it will be inevitable that you Councillors will have to agree to allow the Legoland traffic on Bray Ward roads. My reasons for thinking this are as follows;

1. If a trial takes place and the result is that there is a lot of extra traffic, then some may think you will have a justification for refusing to place the signs, because the extra traffic is not wanted by your constituents. However, in this same case, Legoland and Councillors in Windsor would argue that a lot of traffic has been diverted from Windsor so you must agree to the signs. Faced with that I expect that you Ward Councillors would agree to place the signs.

2. In the last failed trial (and no doubt you remember the persistence of the Councillor in charge of these in claiming against me that the tests were successful) it was argued that as there had been little extra traffic the route could be agreed. If the trials had not been a failure you would have agreed.

So it seems to me that if you agree to trials, whatever the outcome, the result will be that you RBWM Ward Councillors will capitulate and agree the route.

By agreeing to the trial you are allowing yourselves to be manipulated by Legoland. The result will be as I say above and having assisted Legoland to shift some of their Windsor traffic to Bray Ward roads, this will make more capacity available in Windsor roads, for Legoland to fill with more traffic.

Here is one way that this will happen - see <http://www.legoland.co.uk/Plan/annualpass/Passholder-Perks/Bring-A-Friend-for-5-in-July/> This will increase visitors during the peak months. A pass holder can invite a friend/relative to visit Legoland and the friend/relative will only be charged £5. The responses on the facebook site show that already families are inviting other families to attend with them. So - more visitors and hence more cars - all at peak times.

Legoland will persist in increasing their visitors no matter what you do.

---

Re your Point 7 - I welcome what you say in the first phrase and look forward to your acceptance of my response to your Point 6.

Regarding the RBWM intended limitation of Lorries on the A330 I quote from the email to you on 30th June from the resident most involved in negotiations with you;

"I have received several emails from Andrew Cormie on behalf of the Holyport Residents Association as well as receiving a call from a concerned Councillor with regard to a proposal sent to RBWM from the owners of Legoland to allow signage on primary routes including M4 directing traffic through Holyport via the A330 as a preferred access to Legoland.

I know other Ward Councillors are privately against this proposal but please could you all collectively reassure Andrew Cormie representing Holyport Residents Association members as well as other residents of Holyport that you will all vehemently voice against any such proposal.

You have all individually supported the issue of safety concerns regarding weight, speed and volume of traffic on the A330 at various times over many years, albeit with absolutely no effect whatsoever. You now have the opportunity to voice your concerns once again.

At the beginning of March and only with intervention from residents, we finally managed to get an agreement with funding from RBWM to implement a 7.5 tonne weight limit (unless for access) through Holyport. Six months on and nothing has happened to honour that agreement! Nor has the promised traffic survey to give a realistic view to speeds, weight and volume of existing traffic as well as giving an insight to predicted future modelling. You are all well aware of the conditions of the previous farcical survey.

With future plans to physically increase the development size at Legoland both with scale of hotel and theme park, if signs were placed to encourage a route via A330, surely this would defeat our objective in making the roads in Holyport safer. The enforceable 7.5 tonne weight limit would cause unnecessary confusion and fines for the drivers of any Legoland construction HGVs using it for access. It wouldn't take long for users to realise that the more direct route would be to turn left by The Lodge and travel via Moneyrow Green and Forest Green Road.

To actively encourage Legoland traffic through Holyport would be in complete contradiction to everything we've been trying to achieve."

Agreeing entirely with what your correspondent said, I also would add that another route that drivers of Legoland construction vehicles would use would be via the A308 and Holyport Road and on via Moneyrow Green.

Regarding the rest of your Point 7 - I do not agree that "it is no good saying that the traffic effect would be disastrous if we have no evidence" I do not ask you to say the effect would be disastrous, you just have to say that because your constituents do not want extra traffic, you cannot agree to any signs sending Legoland traffic onto Bray Ward roads.

Also I do not accept that "we cannot disagree with the logic that until you know the impact you cannot object"

My logic is simple - it is illogical to send more Legoland traffic via Bray Wards busy roads so that space can be made on Windsor roads that Legoland will fill with more traffic.

---

Re your Point 8 - My understanding about the powers of RBWM Councillors may well be incorrect, but I do not think it is beyond the bounds of reason that residents can expect Ward Councillors to assist them by telling all RBWM Councillors that they do not agree with the placement of signs that would divert Legoland traffic onto Bray Ward roads. If you are out-voted because the majority of RBWM councillors do not support you then so be it, but at least you could take pride in the fact that you stood against the other Councillors in an attempt to help your own constituents.

---

Your penultimate sentence "Rest assured we will monitor the results carefully and if there is a quantifiable issue for residents we will fight any permanent change to the road directions." is welcome, but raises the question as to how the traffic can be measured in comparison with what traffic would otherwise have been present. For instance it is often the case that traffic reduces during summer whilst drivers who normally transit the route are on holiday. If traffic is measured whilst such a reduction is happening, then any actual increase due to Legoland traffic will be incorrectly measured.

---

The find the following of interest;  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/332862/TA9304.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/332862/TA9304.pdf)

From the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

QUOTE  
PART 3 TA 93/04 TRAFFIC SIGNS TO TOURIST ATTRACTIONS AND FACILITIES IN ENGLAND GUIDANCE FOR TOURIST SIGNING - GENERAL INTRODUCTION SUMMARY

This Advice Note provides a general introduction and background to the new guidance on the provision of traffic signs to tourist destinations in England.

3.3 Directional traffic signs on local roads also have to provide the information needed by business and leisure travellers to reach their chosen destinations. Local traffic authorities have a statutory duty to exercise their functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 [12], including the provision of traffic signs, so as to secure the convenient, expeditious and safe movement of traffic, while having regard to the amenity of the area through which it passes. The usefulness of the information on a sign has to be balanced against its impact on the environment.

3.5 In conjunction with the consideration of the safety and traffic management aspects of signing, the environmental impacts must also be

fully considered. This is particularly necessary in rural areas, so that "the things people value about the countryside, are properly taken into account in planning and similar decisions" (DETR Rural White Paper, 2000) [13]. It is important to minimise the cumulative impacts of signing on the environment and the character of the countryside not only within designated areas but also more generally.  
UNQUOTE

The operative words being "having regard to the amenity of the area through which it passes. The usefulness of the information on a sign has to be balanced against its impact on the environment." and "In conjunction with the consideration of the safety and traffic management aspects of signing, the environmental impacts must also be fully considered. This is particularly necessary in rural areas, so that "the things people value about the countryside, are properly taken into account in planning and similar decisions" (DETR Rural White Paper, 2000) [13]. It is important to minimise the cumulative impacts of signing on the environment and the character of the countryside not only within designated areas but also more generally."

Clearly the imposition of extra traffic would adversely affect the amenity of Holyport and other areas through which the extra traffic would pass, and the usefulness of the direction indication is (as you have said) of little value in the days of satellite navigation. Further the environmental impact needs to be considered especially in our rural area.

One more point - Cllr Coppinger has advised that you would all fight to prevent the new exit that Legoland has suggested. If you agree that Legoland traffic can be sent onto Bray Ward roads, these are the same roads that would be further impacted by the new exit, and if when planning permission is requested, you have already agreed that Legoland traffic is formally encouraged onto these roads, this will be a further point that Legoland will use against you to get approval for the new exit, which of course would mean even more traffic.

Is it perhaps a form of Anti-Social Behaviour to purposefully impose extra traffic on residents living in a particular area?

Sincerely

Andrew Cormie