

7 Huntly Gardens
Glasgow, G12 9ASA

7 February 1990

Dear Owner,

I hope that like me you will vote against adoption, and I therefore urge you to consider the following points:

- (i) At present we have full legal rights to restrict parking to residents and their guests, we would lose that right on adoption. The real point is, of course, to what extent we can exercise that right in practice, and we all know that we are not wholly successful. However, bear in mind that we do not know how many outsiders are deterred by our notices and occasional pieces of sticky paper. An educated guess might be obtained by comparing Huntly Gardens in daytime with 24 hour locked-solid double parking on Observatory Road. Once adopted, we cannot expect our opportunities for parking to be any different from those which prevail in Observatory Road.
- (ii) At present, thanks to its poor state and the sharp turn at the top, Huntly Gardens is predominantly a quiet access road, whereas Observatory Road is effectively a single lane road with through traffic fighting to go in both directions. Even if we upgraded the road we could, so long as it is a private road, retain this status by constructing 'sleeping policemen' and erecting 'Access only' signs. (These measures may need planning permission, but Strathclyde Region do not object to sleeping policemen on private roads - as witness those on the private roads in the University, the Hospitals and the Museum.) However, Strathclyde are legally unable to construct sleeping policemen on public roads. So once upgraded and adopted, we risk becoming a thoroughfare. Even worse, we could finish up with a one-way system with traffic going up Observatory Road and down Huntly Gardens and Grosvenor Crescent! Of course, I acknowledge that Strathclyde have legal powers to force such a traffic management scheme upon us, even if the road remains private. But I do not think that as a matter of practical politics they would be tempted to do so in the case of a private road against the determined opposition of its owners.
- (iii) Property in Huntly Gardens commands a premium price over property in Observatory Road. What can this be due to, other than our quiet private road as against their public thoroughfare? Should you add the loss of this premium to the real cost of adoption?
- (iv) We have been offered a grant of about £2000 towards the cost of repairing the pavement, but only if the grant is accepted by April and work started by June. But the Council may be unable to agree to adopt in this timescale, and we lose the grant. The Council may find it has protracted legal process with some owners who resist adoption, and even find that in some cases the relevant owner is not the voting householder but a feu superior.
- (v) Cost. If we decide not to adopt, we can choose to upgrade the pavement and apply only first aid to the road, at approximately half the cost of upgrading pavement and road to the standard required for adoption.

Finally, let me remark on two aspects of the case for adoption, which are less substantial than they appear at first sight. "Once the Council have adopted they are responsible for the cost of future repairs." True, but once repaired there should not be substantial repair costs for many years to come. So it is a very long-term benefit to set against immediate disadvantages. "The Council will fund the operation, bill owners and take them to Court if necessary." True, but the owners, in association, have the same legal rights and powers of recovery through the Courts (with costs) as a last resort. Hopefully that will not be necessary, particularly if we vote for a less expensive option than adoption.

Really finally, whatever you decide, may I urge you to return your votes so that your opinion counts.

Yours sincerely,

Jim Edwards