

# Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

## Minutes

# 12 July 2022

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Ameet Jogia MBE

**Councillors:** Nicola Blackman Thaya Idaikkadar  
Shahania Choudhury Jerry Miles

**In attendance  
(Councillors):** Nitin Parekh  
Krishna Suresh

**Apologies  
received:** Councillor Vipin Mithani Councillor Phillip O'Dell

### 1. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

Ordinary Member

Councillor Vipin Mithani  
Councillor Phillip O'Dell

Reserve Member

Councillor Nitesh Hirani  
Councillor Asif Hussain

### 2. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that, during the course of the meeting, Councillor Ameet Jogia MBE declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he lived behind Culverlands Close. He would remain in the room whilst the reports were considered.

### 3. Appointment of Vice-Chair

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Nicola Blackman as Vice-Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) for the 2022/2023 Municipal Year.

### 4. Appointment of Advisers

**RESOLVED:** That the following nominees be appointed as Advisers to the Panel for the 2022/23 Municipal Year:

- Anthony Wood (Harrow Public Transport Users Advisory Association)
- Veronica Chamberlain (Harrow Cyclists)
- Louise Weldon (Harrow Association of Disabled People)
- John Hinkley (Harrow Resident Motorist)

### 5. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2021 and the Special meeting held on 7 December 2021, be taken as read and signed as correct records.

### 6. Public Questions

**RESOLVED:** To note that five public questions had been received and that a written response would be provided.

### 7. Petitions

Three petitions were submitted by local residents. The residents each read out the terms of reference of their petition as follows:

#### Petition 1.

A petition was received from the residents of Spencer Road stating “We the undersigned request the council change the parking restrictions from part time (CA) to full time (J) or (C1) from 7.00am to midnight for 7 days a week”.

#### Petition 2.

“A petition from the residents on Lucas Avenue, signed to have speed humps installed due to many cars speeding up and down, day and night.”

#### Petition 3.

The Chair had also submitted a petition on behalf of a resident which was for the installation of traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing outside Sandringham estate on Common Road.

**RESOLVED:** That the petitions be received and referred to the Corporate Director of Place for consideration.

## 8. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 48 the following deputation be received in respect of agenda item 9:

9 - Information Report - Petitions.

<b>Title of Deputation</b>	Petition on parking restrictions in Spencer Road, Harrow, HA3 7AN/P
<b>Reason for Deputation [11 Signatories]</b>	To comment on the report made to TARSAP in January 2022 and subsequent discussion and represent the petition.

Full details in relation to the deputations, including questions asked and answers given, are referenced, in brief, at Minute 9 of these minutes.

## Resolved Items

### 9. Information Report - Petitions

Prior to the consideration of the report of the Corporate Director of Place, the Panel received one Deputation (Minute 8 also refers).

<b>Title of Deputation</b>	Petition on parking restrictions in Spencer Road, Harrow, HA3 7AN/P
<b>Reason for Deputation</b>	To comment on the report made to TARSAP in January 2022 and subsequent discussion and represent the petition.

In summary, the two representatives outlined how the current CPZ (CA) between the High Street (clock tower) and 40 Spencer Road should be included in CPZ (C1). The Deputee described how this road was the only road near High Street, Wealdstone which had zone (CA) (Monday-Friday 10-11am and 2-3pm) restrictions whilst all other roads nearby had zone (C1) (Monday to Sunday 8am - Midnight) restrictions. This meant that Spencer Road was used by many to park their cars to access the high street's amenities and attracted displaced parking from other nearby roads, which created congestion and had made it difficult for residents to park their cars.

The Deputee noted that driveways had been blocked by those parking their cars on Spencer Road. It was emphasised that zone (CA) parking restrictions had made life challenging for residents. Between Friday 5pm to Monday morning residents are unable to park on Spencer Road. They feel trapped and unable to do everyday tasks using their cars for the fear of losing their parking spaces. In addition, it was explained that Spencer Road was like an overspill carpark. The available parking spaces would be taken by commuters after the zone (CA) ended at 3pm. The Panel thanked the Deputies for their presentation. The Panel asked the Deputies for clarification of the parking restrictions, to which it was explained by the

Deputee the controlled parking zone currently restricted parking on Monday to Friday between 10:00 – 11:00 and between 14:00 – 15:00.

Asked why residents of Spencer did not originally apply to be part of zone (C1) scheme, the Deputee explained that they had applied a few years ago to be included in a CPZ but the introduction of zone (CA) was only supported by the southern section of Spencer Road between High Street and 40 Spencer Road.

An Adviser also added that improvement to the nearby Peel Road car park needed to be made to make it more user friendly and to support the local area.

The Panel received a report which set out details of the petitions that have been received since the last TARSAP meeting and provided details of the Council's investigations and findings where these had been undertaken.

An officer reported that there had been twenty-one petitions since the last meeting and introduced each item:

1. Lucas Avenue, which requested traffic calming measures. It was explained that due to funding issues with Transport for London (TfL), any traffic calming scheme assessed as a priority could not be funded. In addition, it was clarified that enforcement of speeding was a duty carried out by the police.

The Chair of the Panel requested officers notify the Police and Members be put in touch with relevant Safer Neighbourhoods teams to enable speeds to be assessed so as to provide an evidence base for priority.

A back-benching Member commented that the Community Roadwatch had very limited resources.

2. Rayners Lane, which requested the removal of a speed table.

A back-benching Member sought to support the request and stated despite the speed table being approved in public and statutory consultation, the resulting speed table was causing great difficulties for residents nearby due to vibrations caused, disturbance and complaints over a number of years and lack of funding should not be a reason for inaction.

A Member of the Panel asked if any new technologies could be used or different materials for the speed tables so that unwanted vibrations and noises could be reduced.

An officer explained that the council could not itself use cameras to enforce speed restriction but there were options regarding the road hump. Different materials can reduce vibrations but they cause other problems. The gradients of ramps can be reduced (as described in the report). Another approach taken by some councils was not to

introduce speed humps/tables but to have alternative traffic calming measures. Officers agreed to carry out speed surveys.

3. Ranmoor Gardens, which objected to the Marlborough School Street Scheme. The officer explained a later item would include discussions on this scheme and it was agreed for this to be discussed then.
4. Camrose Avenue, which highlighted safety issues including pedestrian crossing facilities at the junction with Burnt Oak Broadway (A5). The officer explained that the A5 formed the boundary with London Borough of Barnet and (all arms of) this junction was the responsibility of Barnet as the leading authority. Harrow were in contact with Barnet to chase where they are on the scheme as they will be the lead authority. The operation of all traffic signals in London are managed by TfL.

An invited Member explained he and previous Head of Service had observed the junction and great crossing difficulties. He requested officers follow up with Barnet council regarding developing a scheme along with TfL. The other issue is that of speeding and lack of crossings along Camrose Avenue and requested a speed survey.

A Panel Member also raised that traffic light timings had caused drivers to jump the lights in this area. The officer noted that TfL controlled traffic light timing but could raise this issue with TfL.

5. Pinner Road /Station Road which wanted a junction made safer. An officer explained that this scheme was in its development phase and was expected to be completed at the end of the next financial year.
6. Cherry Tree Way, which has objected to double yellow lines. An officer explained that this petition had been discussed with the Portfolio Holder and Ward Members and would be implemented subject to it being signed off this financial year 2022-23.
7. St Brides Avenue, which had raised safety issues. A Member of the Panel raised that the (flat white painted mini) roundabout had proven to be ineffective and had resulted in drivers not adhering to the road layout and that there was concern for public safety especially with proximity to Camrose Primary school. There was an original traffic triangle which appeared to offer crossing options. Residents would probably welcome the original layout being restored.

In response, an officer wanted to establish the history and reasoning for the current layout and investigate the best way of moving forward. We would then need to look at what TfL LIP funding might be required in relation to the current LIP programme.

8. Culverlands Close had objected to double yellow lines. The Officer explained that following consultation an amended scheme is planned for implementation by the end of August 2022. The officer also confirmed they had liaised with Ward Councillors on this matter.

9. Pangbourne Drive and Dalkeith Grove, which requested a formal crossing. The officer that the request would be investigated and TfL funding for any proposals sought as part of the LIP programme. Implementation of any scheme works would be subject to funding being granted by TfL.
10. Veldene Way, which requested double yellow lines. The officer explained that this would be implemented in August 2022, subject to any objections from the statutory TMO consultation.
11. Porlock Avenue, which requested for improved road safety measures. The officer explained that defective signage had been fixed, however consideration of any new measures would require resolution of the outstanding funding issue from TfL. Officers explained that this is highly unlikely to be this financial year due to the financial position of TfL.
12. Leeway Close, which requested for a new CPZ. An officer explained that due to delays this will be taken forward into next financial year 2023-24.
13. Merlin Crescent, which had addressed parking issues. An officer explained that this scheme was on the programme for the current financial year to be completed.

When an invited Member asked if this would be completed this financial year, an officer explained that all requests received are assessed and placed on a priority list of existing and new requests. Only the top scoring schemes subject to funding are recommended to taken forward and subsequently included in the parking programme for the coming financial year.

14. Kings Road/Drake Road junction, which requested the removal of a speed table and Kings Road/Ravenswood Crescent, which requested the removal of a speed table.

A back-benched Member spoke (regarding both petitions 14 and 15) strongly in favour of the immediate removal of the junction speed tables at both these junctions insisting traffic including buses and other large vehicles from early morning to late at night are causing great vibrations, also vehicles braking / accelerating and many complaints from residents needing priority action by the Panel.

An officer explained the council will look at the practicality of modifying the ramps of the speed tables probably reducing the gradient so that noise/ vibration effects can be mitigated. If this proves not sufficiently successful other options, even the complete removal of the speed humps would be considered. However, we would need to seek funding if removal was chosen as it is much more expensive.

The Chair of the Panel was interested at how the scheme with the road humps in Kings Road was instigated, as it surely would come from community demand and/or to address safety and have followed consultation. Whilst not ruling out removal in the future, he was concerned with the limited funding and demand for safety and traffic calming improvements across the borough, that schemes were put in only to be removed at significant waste of funding.

An Adviser commented that driver behaviour was an issue with people driving too fast over these traffic calming measures and with accelerating and decelerating. It was suggested that better signage and education including bus drivers would be beneficial for residents and road users.

15. Methuen Road, which requested the timing and duration of existing zone (O) be reviewed. An officer explained that this scheme has moved to the prioritisation stage and would be implemented subject to consultation in 2023-24.

A Member of the Panel asked of the origin of the parking restriction times of 08:30 to 20:30, Monday to Saturday, to which an officer explained that the parking controls that had been introduced were the result of earlier consultations undertaken in the area which were supported by the local residents.

The Member asked if the hours could be revisited, to which an officer explained that the cost and time involved in a review of a scheme previously supported by residents would be at cost of a potential new scheme. The Officer continued to explain that TARSAP had previously agreed that parking scheme reviews would no longer be undertaken after implementation due to the impact this would have on the parking programme and the number of new schemes that could be taken forward each year.

An officer raised that a review of the consultation process and how parking and traffic schemes were prioritised should be presented to the Panel.

In a discussion that followed, an invited Member raised concern over how many residents may have not known about the initial consultation of this scheme and a Member of the Panel also noted that phraseology of consultations should be clear and easy to understand. In addition, a Member of the Panel also raised that a minimum number of responses to particular consultations should be considered.

16. The Heights, which requested for improved road safety measures in order for speeding concerns to be addressed. An officer explained that speed enforcement was a responsibility of the Police, however, they had suggested a speed survey be undertaken.

A Member of the Panel noted that though a speed survey had taken place in the past, it was felt that speeding had recently become worse

over time and that a speed survey would be welcomed. A later time for the new speed surveys was requested.

17. Merlin Crescent, which requested for road safety measures and a pedestrian crossing. An officer explained that investigation of the petition requests take place this financial year.

Member requested joint consideration with petition 7 of the report due to similar issues involved.

A Member of the Panel also suggested that petition 13 could also be combined with the consultation. An officer noted that the consultations would be assessing differing (road safety and parking) needs and the combination of consultations could risk fewer needs of residents being met.

18. Borrowdale Avenue and Grasmere Gardens, which requested that speeding concerns be addressed. An officer explained that investigation of the petition request would take place this financial year.
19. West Towers, Pinner, which requested that parking concerns be addressed. An officer explained that this was to be part of this year's programme to be investigated.
20. Brookshill, which requested for road safety measures (Hujjat Primary School). An officer explained that the scheme proposals particularly to install guard-railing had raised some concerns about cyclists being trapped between traffic and the guard railing so a road safety assessment needed to be completed and will be reported back.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

## **10. Traffic Schemes 2022-23 Programme Update**

The Panel received a report which was presented to members to provide an update on progress with the 2022/23 Traffic and Transportation programme of works, including ongoing schemes from 2021/22.

An officer outlined that this report explains current progress on traffic schemes and proposed schemes programme within the context of limited Transport for London (TfL) funding so far awarded for the 2022/23 financial year which was detailed in the Appendix.

The officer explained the context and outlined the main recommendations of the report which was regarding Marlborough School Street scheme.

### **Marlborough School Streets scheme**

The report recommended the normal suspension of the school street over the summer holiday period (starting on 21 July) be extended to allow a new



consultation to take place and until the results of that consultation are brought to the Panel's next meeting in October 2022.

The consultation will start in July and run for ten weeks to take account of the summer holiday period.

A Member of the Panel commented that the feedback from residents would be listened to but was disappointed that another consultation would be undertaken as (only agreed by Cabinet in January 2022) extensive consultation had been carried out previously and that officers had assessed and actioned changes to address concerns raised as detailed in the report. It would mean that the scheme would be suspended until the Autumn half term and believed it would be difficult to gain responses over the summer holidays. School streets brought benefits including better air quality for children, fewer cars and improved safety and encouraged walking and cycling to school. Both the school and its pupils were very enthusiastic of the scheme and hoped that residents appreciated the benefits of the scheme being continued.

In response to a question from the Member on the extent of the consultation area, an officer confirmed a wider consultation area than before had been agreed, bounded by Station Road, Greenhill Way, Harrow View and Headstone Drive (and the railway line).

The Member commented that views would be sought from people living quite some way from the school.

**RESOLVED:** That the report and proposals be noted and that it be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that:

- (1) a new consultation with residents within the area of Marlborough Hill and Marlborough School be undertaken in order to gauge their views, including suggested improvements or whether there is still support for this scheme. This would include writing to all residents in the defined catchment area of the scheme to seek their views on the impact of the scheme so far to see if improvements could be made and whether there is support for the continuation of the scheme; and
- (2) the suspension of the Marlborough Hill School Streets scheme, which would have occurred during the school summer holidays, be extended until a decision has been made on the future of this scheme.

### **Other Issues raised regarding the report**

Questions from the Advisory Panel to which officers answered as followed:

An adviser noting Local Implementation Plan (LIP) objectives of encouraging more sustainable travel including those with mobility difficulties.

With reference to Howberry Road area and Royston Park Road traffic schemes (2.8 – 2.10), that speed cushions discriminate against disabled cyclists and would therefore not meet an equality impact assessment.

Sinusoidal humps should be used for traffic calming so that disabled cyclists including those using adapted cycles/ trikes can be accommodated whereas speed cushions are dangerous to adapted cycles.

An Officer noted that sinusoidal humps had been proven to reduce vibrations, support cyclists and HGV movements. The type of road hump would be considered especially in regard to equality impact assessment and cost implications. We are also undertaking a wider review of all highway materials regarding accessibility and climate change.

The adviser raised, regarding the North Harrow Junction (between Station Road and Pinner Road 2.12 – 2.15), that a pedal cyclist was killed in 2021. Motor traffic volumes reflect the lack of safe cycle facilities. Will there be a green phase for cycling through this junction and can the junction proposals be shared with Harrow Cyclists, to allow input before decisions are taken?

An Officer confirmed Harrow cyclists would be fully consulted.

In relation to electric vehicle charging points (2.19 & 2.20) the Adviser raised concern for cyclist safety caused by the proposed (rapid) electric charging facility on Uxbridge Road (near Hatch End station). Electric vehicles were not a panacea for climate change and did not address the health issues of car dependency and the borough wanted to encourage the use of active travel.

The Uxbridge Road facility had been promoted by officers at the Panel meeting in October 2021 despite the safety concerns raised. The Adviser requested the Panel agree that charging points would be installed at locations so that people using active travel, including children, were not put at risk and so planned or actual cycle routes would not be impeded.

The officer explained residential charging points would be in the form of overnight lamp column charging at the front of the footway, not the back, to avoid trip hazard for pedestrians or people with disabilities. In future, where we were considering daytime and rapid charging, we would avoid putting them in certain areas or on cycle lanes/routes.

A Member of the Panel requested whether of the locations of charging points could be highlighted in the form of signage so that they could be easily found.

## **11. Parking Programme 2022-23**

The Panel received a report which provided information about the identification, prioritisation, development and implementation of parking management schemes in Harrow. It informed Members about requests for parking schemes received by the Council. The report also recommended the programme of work for 2022/23 based on the Council's agreed assessment criteria.

An officer gave a presentation in brief with the following being highlighted:

- There was a £300,000 revenue budget per annum for parking schemes across the borough, which was internal Council funding and not funding from TFL.

The Chair thanked the officer for their presentation and opened the floor to questions from the Advisory Panel to which officers answered as followed:

An Adviser raised that parking restrictions impacted the older demographic within Harrow and felt the 08:30 to 20:30 restrictions to be draconian and raised the mental health impacts that this could have on residents due to the complexity of parking restrictions. The Adviser challenged the usefulness of parking restrictions if residents were hindered. In addition, the Adviser welcomed hour parking as it would deter commuters but aided residents.

- An Adviser noted that parking restrictions were often taken advantage of by people whereby people periodically moved their cars according to the parking restrictions.
- An Adviser raised the issue of sustainability and that there should be efforts directed towards encouraging active travel and the reduction of car ownership and noted the report had not mentioned other types of parking such as parking for cycles. They noted that 6-8 traditional bicycles could be parked in a single car park space and would be particularly useful for those who lived in HMOs or Flats.
- In addition, the Adviser also raised the potential for car club initiatives and cargo bike rental points all of which would reduce congestion and promote sustainable and active travel. The adviser also noted that there were other modes of transport that could be utilised by the older generation to get around and raised that this had been the case in other countries.
- In regard to non-standard cycles, it was noted that there were no parking facilities in Harrow that supported non-standard cycles and that disabled cyclists had not been mentioned in the Equality Impact Assessment for this report. The adviser suggested that section 106 monies be used for new developments, such as cycle storage so that cycling to be encouraged.
- It was mentioned by an Adviser that footway parking had been proven to generate difficulties to those with prams as well as disabled people.

Another Adviser that represented HAD also emphasised that cars parked on pavements could result in the pavement being damaged, which could cause obstruction for wheelchair users.

The Chair thanked the advisers for their comments and sought clarification over the legality of cars being parked on pavements. An officer explained that within London, footway parking was not permitted unless signage allowed. A minimum of 1.5m of footway had to be accessible and a review of footway parking within Harrow could be considered.

- Enforcement was raised by an Adviser by which it was emphasised that appropriate enforcement needed to be exercised in order for schemes to be truly effective.

An officer agreed that enforcement was an important factor that needed to be considered and that new technology such as digital permits could support Harrow Council with enforcement.

- A Member of the Panel proposed to add Gainsborough Gardens and Stag Lane to the list of schemes.

**RESOLVED:** The Panel agreed:

That any substantive new requests received to undertake a controlled parking scheme or review that were not included within the agreed programme or priority list in Appendices B and C to the Parking Management Schemes Programme 2022/23 be referred to the Panel for consideration.

That it be recommended to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety that:

- (1) the list of proposed parking management schemes for 2022/23 as shown in Appendix B be approved;
- (2) scheme design and public consultation on the parking management schemes listed in Appendix B and the plans detailed in Appendix E be undertaken;
- (3) the proposed parking management schemes listed in Appendix B be implemented subject to further reports being provided on the outcomes of public and statutory consultations and receiving approval from the Portfolio Holder to proceed;
- (4) Gainsborough Gardens, Stag Lane and Methuen Road, Edgware schemes be added to the parking list in Appendix B in replacement of schemes that are no longer being progressed, and Spencer Road, Wealdstone (north) be added to the Byron Road, Wealdstone (south) area parking review listed in Appendix B.

## **12. Any Other Urgent Business**

A Member raised that there had been a recent death on Mollison Way and wanted to know where fatalities could be added to the agenda.

The Chair expressed condolences to the family concerned and an officer suggested that a standard item be presented to the Panel in regard to a review of schemes where fatalities and serious injuries had occurred as well as a post 12-month safety review of schemes.

**RESOLVED:** That the panel received a standard report which reviewed schemes where fatalities and serious injuries had occurred as well as a post 12-month safety review of schemes.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.27 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Ameet Jogia MBE  
Chair