

# Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel Agenda

**Date:** Tuesday 12 July 2022

**Time:** 6.30 pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber, Harrow Civic Centre, Station  
Road, Harrow, HA1 2XY

## Membership (Quorum 3)

---

**Chair:** Councillor Ameet Jogia

**Conservative Councillors:** Nicola Blackman  
Thaya Idaikkadar  
Vipin Mithani

**Labour Councillors:** Shahania Choudhury  
Jerry Miles  
Mr Phillip O'Dell

**Conservative Reserve Members:**

1. Nitesh Hirani
2. Kanti Rabadia
3. June Baxter
4. Kuha Kumaran

**Labour Reserve Members:**

1. Peymana Assad
2. Stephen Hickman
3. Asif Hussain

**Contact:** Andrew Seaman, Senior Democratic & Electoral Services Officer  
E-mail: [andrew.seaman@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.seaman@harrow.gov.uk) Tel: 01135 188523

Scan this code for the electronic agenda:



# Useful Information

## Joining the Meeting virtually

The meeting is open to the public and can be viewed online at [www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting](http://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting)

## Attending the Meeting in person

Directions to the Civic Centre can be found at: [www.harrow.gov.uk/contact](http://www.harrow.gov.uk/contact). It is accessible to people with special needs, with accessible toilets and lifts to the meeting rooms. If you have specific requirements, please contact the officer listed on the front page of this agenda.

You will be admitted on a first-come-first basis and directed to seats.

Please:

- (1) Take a Covid 19 test before travelling and do not attend in person if you test positive.
- (2) Wear a face covering and use the provided hand sanitiser.
- (3) Stay seated.
- (4) Access the meeting agenda online at [Browse meetings - Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel](#)
- (5) Put mobile devices on silent.
- (6) Follow instructions of the Security Officers.
- (7) Advise Security on your arrival if you are a registered speaker.

## Filming / recording

This meeting may be recorded or filmed, and if you choose to attend, you will be deemed to have consented to this. Any recording may be published on the Council website.

**Agenda publication date: Monday 4 July 2022**

# Agenda - Part I

## 1. Attendance by Reserve Members

To note the attendance at this meeting of any duly appointed Reserve Members.

Reserve Members may attend meetings:-

- (i) to take the place of an ordinary Member for whom they are a reserve;
- (ii) where the ordinary Member will be absent for the **whole** of the meeting; and
- (iii) the meeting notes at the start of the meeting at the item 'Reserves' that the Reserve Member is or will be attending as a reserve;
- (iv) if a Reserve Member whose intention to attend has been noted arrives after the commencement of the meeting, then that Reserve Member can only act as a Member from the start of the next item of business on the agenda after his/her arrival.

## 2. Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non pecuniary interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:

- (a) all Members of the Panel;
- (b) all other Members present.

## 3. Appointment of Vice-Chair

To consider the appointment of a Vice-Chair to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2022/23.

## 4. Appointment of Advisers (Pages 7 - 10)

Report of the Corporate Director of Place.

## 5. Minutes (Pages 11 - 24)

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 a correct record.

## 6. Public Questions

To receive any public questions received in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 49 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

Questions will be asked in the order in which they were received. There will be a time limit of 15 minutes for the asking and answering of public questions.

**[The deadline for receipt of public questions is 3.00 pm, 7 July 2022. Questions should be sent to [publicquestions@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:publicquestions@harrow.gov.uk)**

**No person may submit more than one question].**

## 7. Petitions

To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 47 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

## 8. Deputations

To receive deputations (if any) under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

9. **Information Report - Petitions (To Follow)**  
Report of the Corporate Director of Place.
10. **Traffic Schemes 2022-23 Programme Update (To Follow)**  
Report of the Corporate Director of Place.
11. **Parking Programme 2022-23 (To Follow)**  
Report of the Corporate Director of Place.
12. **Any Other Urgent Business**  
Which cannot otherwise be dealt with.

## **Agenda - Part II - Nil**

### **Data Protection Act Notice**

The Council will record the meeting and will place the recording on the Council's website.

[**Note:** The questions and answers will not be reproduced in the minutes.]

This page is intentionally left blank



**Report for: Traffic and Road Safety  
Advisory Panel**

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	12 July 2022
<b>Subject:</b>	Appointment of (non-voting) Advisers to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 2022/23
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Dipti Patel, Corporate Director, Place
<b>Exempt:</b>	No

**Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations**

---

This report informs Members of nominations and requests Members to consider and agree the appointment of non-voting advisers to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the 2022/23 Municipal Year.

**Recommendations:**

That, in line with the Executive Procedure Rules (Part 4D of the Constitution - Rule 33.4), the Panel consider and appoint the nominated Non-voting Advisers to the Panel for 2022/23, as set out in the report.

**Reason: (For recommendation)**

To assist in the work of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel.

## Section 2 – Report

2.1 Rule 33.4 of the Executive Procedure Rules (Part 4D of the Council's Constitution) provides for the appointment of non-voting advisers to the Advisory Panel (to assist in the work of the Panel either generally or on specific matters).

2.2 The following have confirmed that they wish to act as advisers to the Panel for the 2022/23 Municipal Year:

- Anthony Wood (Harrow Public Transport Users Advisory Association).

Harrow Public Transport Users Association (HPTUA) was formed in 1963 to represent the needs and views of public transport users who live, work or travel in the borough of Harrow. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic it held 5 public meetings annually and will resume these in the Autumn of 2022.

(Mr) Anthony Wood has been resident in the borough for over 70 years. He has been Chair of HPTUA since 1977 and been an advisor to the Panel and its predecessors for nearly 40 years.

- (Miss) Louise Weldon (HAD – Harrow Association of Disabled People).

Harrow Association of Disabled People (HAD) is a registered charity that aims to promote and bring about inclusion and equality for all disabled people living in the London Borough of Harrow. HAD has been supporting and campaigning for the rights of disabled people for over 50 years. Originally founded in 1972, it now helps over 2000 disabled people each year.

HAD is an organisation that is “Run and Managed by Disabled People for Disabled People”.

Louise Weldon is the CEO of HAD and is a disabled person who uses a wheelchair. She is an active campaigner of disabled peoples' rights and works hard to make sure disabled people are included in society and that their voices and opinions matter.

- Veronica Chamberlain – Harrow Cyclist and Harrow Cycle Hub

Harrow Cyclists (HC) is the local branch of the London Cycling Campaign (LCC). LCC raises awareness, campaigns for, and represents the needs of cyclists, of all abilities across London. HC provides local focus and advises the council on implications for cyclists of its proposed schemes and seeks to improve conditions for cycling and identifies where cycling facilities can be improved.

Harrow Cycle Hub is a charity supported by Harrow Council whose volunteer qualified coaches teach people to ride, 95% of whom are women of BAME communities, which are very underrepresented



amongst cyclists. The charity is also developing Wheels for All for people with disabilities and health conditions needing adapted cycles with the support of Harrow Public Health. This project will take place at the Bannister Sports Centre.

Ms Chamberlain is long standing member of HC & LCC. Ms Chamberlain is chair of Harrow Cycle Hub, a qualified cycling coach and Ride Leader with extensive experience both of local conditions and of cyclists' needs, especially for women, people of BAME communities and those who are nervous about cycling.

- John Hinkley – Harrow resident motorist

Harrow Motorist resident seeks to represent residents who are primarily motorists, their needs, and views. It is important to recognise the needs of those who for practical or other reasons are mainly reliant on their own vehicle for their mobility, and balance these against other road users within the crowded Harrow environment.

John Hinkley is a longstanding Harrow resident and was a local councillor until May 2022. He was a member of this Panel for eight years, as well as a regular attendee of the Rail and Bus/Highway liaison meetings. John Hinkley is currently a member of Pinner Association speaking on road and parking issues and has extensive knowledge of the road infrastructure across the borough from a motorist point of view.

- 2.3 If appointed, the adviser will be required to comply with the Council's Protocol on Co-optees and Advisers (Part 5H of the Council's Constitution).

## **Legal Implications**

The appointment is in accordance with the Council's constitution.

## **Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

## **Equalities implications / Public Sector Equality Duty**

It is anticipated that appointing the proposed advisers will support the Council in meeting its Public Sector Equality Duty based on the advice they will be able to contribute.

## **Council Priorities**

Promotes 'Putting residents first' by enriching the work of the Panel.

## **Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Sharon Daniels**

Signed on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

**Date: 4 July 2022**

**Statutory Officer: Paresh Mehta**

Signed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

**Date: 4 July 2022**

## **Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

### **Contact:**

Stephen Freeman, Public Transport Officer

Email: [stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers:**

- [Council's Constitution](#)



# Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

## Minutes

### 19 October 2021

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Jerry Miles

**Councillors:** Dean Gilligan  
John Hinkley  
Honey Jamie  
Ameet Jogia  
James Lee  
Kairul Kareema Marikar  
Anjana Patel

**Advisers:** Veronica Chamberlain  
Mr A Wood

**In attendance  
(Councillors):** Honey Jamie

**138. Minute Silence**

The Panel observed a minute silence for the late Councillor Vina Mithani, a reserve member of TARSAP.

Members paid tribute to the late Councillor Vina Mithani.

**139. Attendance by Reserve Members**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance.

**140. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the declaration of interests, which had been published on the Council website, be taken as read and that in the course of the meeting.

- (1) the Declarations of Interests published in advance of the meeting on the Council's website were taken as read;
- (2) Members and Advisers who had declared interests remained in the virtual meeting whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

#### **141. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2021, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **142. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions had been received.

#### **143. Petitions**

A local resident submitted a petition which related to School Streets Scheme around Marlborough Primary School. The resident read out the terms of reference of the petition as follows:

"We the residents of Marlborough Ward, the undersigned, are opposed to School Streets Scheme and double yellow lines in adjacent roads near Marlborough Primary School. We call on Harrow Council to:

1. To get rid of the School Streets Scheme and double yellow lines from the relevant roads.
2. To fully consult with local residents on any future proposals regarding these two aspects."

The Chair responded accordingly and allowed the resident an opportunity to speak on the terms of the petition, details of which are set out in the recording published on the website.

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

#### **144. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations had been received.

### **Recommended Items**

#### **145. Appointment of Adviser**

The Chair introduced the report in brief and noted the nominee to be appointed as an advisor to Panel.

It was raised by a Panel Member that a motorist advisor would be welcomed to the Panel and requested for there to be an update on this matter.

## **Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder)**

That the following nominee be appointed as an Adviser to the Panel for the 2021/22 Municipal Year: Mr Adam Gabsi (Harrow Association of Disabled People).

## **Resolved Items**

### **146. Information Report - Petitions**

The Panel received a report which sets 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 three petitions since the last meeting which included:

- Whitefriars Avenue, which requested a review of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme in zone C1, Wealdstone. A petition was submitted at the informal consultation stage, which resulted in the scheme being amended to include shared use (resident and pay and display) parking bays in the roads near places of worship to provide more on street parking.
- Dennis Lane, which opposed an experimental traffic scheme. Results of this scheme had been shared with local Members and was terminated.
- Spencer Road, which requested to be included in the Wealdstone controlled parking zone, either Zone C1 or Zone J. This petition would need to be assessed, ranked and presented back to the Panel's next meeting.

The Chair thanked the officer for their presentation and opened the floor to questions from the Advisory Panel.

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

### **147. Information Report - Traffic and Parking Schemes 21/22 Programme Update**

The Panel received a report which provided members with an update on the on progress with the 2021/22 Traffic and Transportation programmes of works.

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

- The Parking Management programme had been progressing in accordance with the schedule, six of the schemes were at the statutory consultation stage and five schemes were at the public consultation stage.

- Funding for the Transportation programme had experienced some difficulties. An initial funding settlement was received in April/May of 2021, this had allowed for the development of projects. Transport for London (TfL) had received a settlement that was lower than expected which had a knock-on effect on London Boroughs, including the London Borough of Harrow (LBH). The implementation of LBH programmes had been paused because of this.
- Ideas from the Harrow Cyclist Group had been suggested that related to improvement of active travel in Harrow. There was an active project to review the North Harrow signals and comments from the Harrow Cyclist Group had been considered as well as the feedback from the recent public consultation on the High Street Fund proposals. Revised plans reflected the traffic and cyclist problems in this area, heightened by the recent tragedy where a cyclist had sadly lost their life at the North Harrow Signals.
- TfL required an active travel programme to be proposed for 2021/22 for consideration. This differed to the programme included in the report. The proposed active travel programme was presented and the schemes were explained to the Panel. It was noted that a proposal for a bus priority scheme for the A410 Uxbridge Road was included but was not a part of the LIP programme in Table 3, Appendix B but had been highlighted by TfL to be considered and would be a feasibility study.

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

- A Panel Member asked who had been consulted, regarding the North Harrow signals and what plans had been suggested. To which the Officer explained that there were two initiatives, one of which was a longstanding initiative which was the widening of Pinner Road that aimed to increase capacity and improve journeys for buses, however this was on hold due to lack of funding from the TfL. The second potential improvements to the junction for pedestrians connected to the High Street Fund where there was an extensive public consultation on proposals.

This was followed up by concern over the loss of cycle lanes with the widening of pavements, however, the Officer noted that the cycle lane would not be lost.

An Officer added that a petition was previously presented to the panel in February 2020 who asked for a control crossing point across the North Harrow Signals. This was to be reviewed by a transport consultant, however due to the Pandemic delays had resulted in developing the improvement of this junction.

- Had feedback been received from residents in surrounding roads to the proposed Copenhagen crossings? It was explained by an Officer that

four centres were part of the High Street Fund Consultation. It was noted that Copenhagen crossings were one of a number of different measures that were proposed, it was highlighted that these crossings were more suited to improve the walking experience, particularly within a High Street setting.

This was followed up by the Panel Member who had asked whether the Copenhagen crossings were decided by Ward Councillors or from feedback gathered. The Officer explained that the initiative was led by the Economic Development Team and there had been a full consultation and discussions had taken place with local Ward Members. All of which had been presented to the Programme Board.

- A Panel Member wanted to know what type of consultation had been planned in relation to cycle lanes. An Officer explained that full engagement was not required as it was subject to funding. Once funding had been confirmed then a full consultation would take place before these cycling projects could proceed. It would then be determined with the Portfolio Holder and the Communications Team what the appropriate type of consultation would be.
- Clarification was sought by a Panel Member as to whether the list of schemes was guaranteed. The Officer responded by noting that the list of schemes was a list of priorities that strategically matched the London Borough of Harrow's (LBH) objectives, which had been requested by the Active Travel Oversight Group (ATOG). It was noted that a decision on LBH's funding application for these schemes had not been indicated.

Should the funding application be unsuccessful, it was expected that schemes that had been consulted on would still be delivered, however no specific date was given.

- Raised if the Howebery Road scheme covered the crossing as well as the double yellow lines, to which an Officer confirmed that these were to be included in that particular scheme.
- The Corporate Director of Communities noted that the schemes proposed were to support funding that LBH did not currently have for these schemes to be delivered, many of which were feasibility studies.

It was highlighted that no other funding was available for these schemes which was why LBH and other Boroughs had been impacted by the full allocation of funding not received from TFL. There was a timeframe for funds from TFL to be allocated to these schemes and therefore would be important for the feasibility and consultations to be undertaken.

- It was highlighted that the traffic calming scheme for Royston Park Road, Hatch End was not included in the list of schemes to be presented to ATOG, the Panel Member noted that several accidents

had occurred on this road and encouraged officers to make this scheme a priority.

- An Adviser raised the southwest arm of the North Harrow junction was being widened for bus priority but asked if it was possible for cycle priority to also be included. In addition, it was suggested Noah Hill should include similar safety measures applied to pedestrians. The Officer mentioned that the inclusion of cyclists into the Noah Hill Junction scheme would be looked into.

The Adviser raised that cycle safety improvements should be included for the Northolt junction and could include early release signals for cyclists. This was because of the junction being uphill.

The Officer explained that the safety of cyclists and all road users would be considered in all feasibility assessments that had been planned.

Asked by the Adviser why cycling safety provisions were not included in the Goodwill to All junction, to which the Officer responded by saying that though this was a challenging junction due to its limited capacity, they noted that pedestrians were the main focus of this particular scheme due to local shops, bus stops and amenities. The Officer also highlighted that that this junction had a 'green link' that allowed cyclists to bypass the junction.

- The Adviser highlighted that the electric car charging point scheme for Uxbridge Road could be a danger to cyclists. It also risked the Northern Cycle Route to become substandard and so therefore advised against this scheme. An Officer noted that car park spaces to be used for charging points on this road already existed and that he had not been made aware that these existing spaces had created any problems for cyclists that already had a dedicated cycle lane.
- An Adviser asked how many people were to be targeted for the cycle training scheme and if it had been planned to target less advantaged groups. An Officer explained that further details could be provided and that a choice of provider had not been decided but noted the comments made.
- The Adviser then commented that the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) that cycling was a prominent mode of transport and asked that it be omitted the consideration of cycling for people with disabilities and for inclusive cycling to be included in all schemes.
- A Member raised concern over the junction on Northolt Road, meeting Roxeth Hill for pedestrians and cyclists and that there whilst bus priority was important it was highlighted that public safety should be taken as a priority. An Officer stated that a meeting was planned with a consultant working on the signal design for this junction to consider the possibility of incorporating a pedestrian crossing facility into the design.



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

**The audio recording of this meeting can be found at the following link:**

<https://www.harrow.gov.uk/council/virtual-meetings/2>

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.41 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Jerry Miles  
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank

# Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (Special)

## Minutes

### 7 December 2021

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Jerry Miles

**Councillors:** Dean Gilligan James Lee  
John Hinkley Kairul Kareema Marikar  
Ameet Jogia

**Advisers:** Ms V Chamberlain Mr A Wood

**Apologies received:** Councillor Anjana Patel

**148. Attendance by Reserve Members**

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Anjana Patel

Councillor Paul Osborn

**149. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that

- (1) the Declarations of Interests published in advance of the meeting on the Council's website were taken as read. The following further declarations were made at the meeting for agenda item 3 – Report – School Street Schemes:

- Councillor Kairul Marikar declared a non-pecuniary interest in that their niece's sons attend Grimsdyke School.
- (2) Members of the Committee and Co-opted Members who had declared interests remained in the virtual meeting whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

## **Recommended Items**

### **150. Report - School Street Schemes**

The Panel received a report which provided Members with details about the six-month extension of the four school streets schemes trials in the London Streetspace Programme following their special meeting on 22 April 2021 and the results of a recent public consultation to consider the future of the schemes.

An officer gave a brief presentation highlighting:

- The school street scheme was part of the wider packages from 2020, there was a 18-month experimental term for the schemes and the trials were agreed to be extended for a further 6 months, during that time feedback was received from the local community. The report set out the response from the community, circa 150 comments, which had shown a negative sentiment towards the schemes. Those that had responded negatively ended to live further from the schemes.
- The negative themes from the feedback received revolved around access for deliveries, convenience, traffic and parking on surrounding roads.
- A final consultation had involved the local community and there had been a separate consultation with the school community. It was found that the school community was much more positive. It was noted that there was strong support for Grimsdyke and Park High schools street scheme, 50/50 support from Newton Farm School and Marlborough School had shown more opposition towards the scheme.
- All Head Teachers had shown support and could see the benefits to the school community, the school pupils had shown support, with 90% in most cases supporting the scheme.
- During the consultation, a petition had been received in regard to the Marlborough School street scheme, where residents were opposed to the school street scheme.
- The report's recommendations sought the Panel's views as to whether the individual schemes should be removed or retained. It was highlighted that all schemes had an experimental status and the maximum length of time an experimental scheme could continue was

18 months. There was an end date of 31 March 2022 for these experimental schemes.

The Chair thanked the officer for their presentation and invited questions from the Panel.

- A Panel Member referred to appendix A and noted that the most recent traffic counts had taken place in July 2021 and questioned whether these could be relied upon why there had not been a more recent traffic count. An officer explained that all of the available funding had been used and therefore no further surveys could be undertaken but that he was of the view that the July surveys provided a reasonable understanding of the traffic conditions around the schools.

The Chair introduced the Headteacher and staff from Newton Farm School. Two videos were shown that explained the school street scheme in relation to Grimsdyke and Newton Farm Schools.

The Head Teacher from Newton Farm School explained that, from a school's perspective, the scheme had supported the physical and mental health of students. They noted that active travel rates had increased, those that lived further away parked and walked part of the way. The scheme had lowered their concern of traffic being a potential risk to pupils' safety. A staff member from Newton Farm School added that it had benefited the school's active travel rates.

The Head Teacher had noted that staff dropping off their children to school and then travelling onward to work had been a challenge brought by the school streets scheme. It was suggested that a possible exemption status be given to staff similar to that issued to local businesses.

The Chair thanked the Newton Farm School Staff for their presentation and invited the Panel to ask questions which were answered as followed:

- A Panel Member ask what had the school done to engage with local residents. The Head Teacher explained that residents that had children attending their school had been engaged with, however no engagement had taken place over parking restrictions and that local residents had not engaged with the school.
- In response to point raised that for some staff and pupils that lived further away from their school, this scheme could be problematic. The Head Teacher explained that staff and pupils had been travelling part way and walking the rest in order to improve their active travel.
- A Member raised the issue of displacement parking as they residents outside the exclusion zone had been negatively affected by parked cars and users of the scheme. The Head Teacher noted that car usage had decreased which had been due to some parents choosing to walk instead of drive.

- A Member sought clarification in relation to the objectors to the scheme and whether this could be mitigated. An officer explained that in general terms, there had been improvement in support for the schemes, which the most recent consultation had identified. The schemes that had the strongest support also had the fixed enforcement cameras, which gave the maximum impact and best delivered the schemes.

The officer added that Newton Farm School and Marlborough School only had temporary enforcement in place and believed that support would increase if permanent enforcement had been delivered by the use of ANPR cameras.

The officer highlighted that the number of negative responses was small and that there was not a strong opposition towards the schemes.

A Member questioned whether there was an update available on the ticketing/enforcement regarding the Marlborough School scheme. An officer explained that Marlborough School only had a mobile enforcement unit, however the officer suggested Members consider schemes that had permanent enforcement because these had shown that residents had adapted and accepted these restrictions. If the schemes were made permanent, then permanent enforcement measures would need to be put into place.

The Chair proposed additional recommendations which were duly seconded and agreed by the Panel following. The following was noted during the discussion:

- A Member indicated that though he largely agreed with the recommendations the School Street Scheme in relation to Marlborough School further discussion was needed due to the complexity of roads potentially affected by this scheme.
- A member of the Panel requested further clarification over what it meant to mitigate objections and how would this be achieved. The Member expressed the view that the Marlborough School Street Scheme should not be removed but should be looked into further and brought back to the Panel. The Chair explained that the mitigation would be to work with residents to overcome any objections made.
- It was highlighted that if the Marlborough School Street Scheme were to be deferred, one Panel Member stated that he would be interested in what mitigating solutions were available to appease objectors.
- An Adviser commented that there was a need to tackle obesity and that a scheme that supported a community's health and wellbeing should be supported. The advisor also highlighted that there was demand for wanting to cycle in Harrow. The Adviser expressed support for all the school street schemes to be made permanent.

A Member moved an amendment to the recommendation which requested that the decision in relation to the school street scheme by Marlborough School be removed or made permanent be deferred until the next Panel meeting. This was duly seconded, put to the vote and was carried.

[Voting for the amendment was as follows: Councillor Dean Gilligan, Councillor James Lee, John Hinkley, Councillor Ameet Jogia, Councillor Paul Osborn. Against the amendment: Councillor Jerry Miles, Councillor Kairul Marikar].

**RESOLVED:** That the decision in relation to the school street scheme by Marlborough School be deferred until the next Panel meeting.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to Cabinet) That**

- (1) The school street scheme by Grimsdyke School be made permanent;
- (2) the school street scheme by Newton Farm School be made permanent;
- (3) the school street scheme by Park High School be made permanent;
- (4) although there was over-whelming support from the school communities for both the Marlborough School and Newton Farm School schemes, in order for the Council and Highways team to better understand the reasons for the small majority of resident objectors, a formal action plan be collated to mitigate these concerns ensuring the long-term success of the schemes.

**Reason for Recommendations:** The maximum 18-month experimental period allowed for the school streets traffic management orders under current legislation ended on 27 March 2022 and a decision was required on whether to remove the schemes or make them permanent.

**The audio recording of this meeting can be found at the following link:**

<https://moderngov.harrow.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=260&MId=65278>

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.41 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Jerry Miles  
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank