
**REPORT FOR: TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY
 ADVISORY PANEL**

Date of Meeting: 25 June 2019

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**
 Petitions

1. Summit Close , Edgware - Request for Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)
2. Byron and Warham Road, Wealdstone - Request for parking review
3. Churchill, Gresham and Montgomery Roads - Objection to proposed changes to waiting restrictions.
4. Weston Drive / Wetheral Drive - Vibration – Vibration and speed limits
5. Bluebell Court, Tranquil Lane - Request to remove speed hump
6. Whitchurch Gardens - objection to double yellow lines
7. Wildcroft Gardens - Request for CPZ
8. Harrow on the Hill - Change in proposed hours of CPZ
9. Elmore Drive – Request for double yellow lines
10. 704 / 738 Kenton Road– Request for parking controls
11. 1- 17 Courtenay Avenue – Request for access road
12. Dudley Gardens – Request for one way and parking controls
13. The Ridgeway, Stanmore – Request

for a CPZ
14. Oxford Road and Byron Road –
Request to remove parking
restrictions

Key Decision: No

Responsible Officer : Paul Walker – Corporate Director,
Community

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Varsha Parmar – Portfolio
Holder for Environment

Exempt: No

**Decision subject to
Call-in:** No, report is for information

Wards affected: Edgware, Marlborough, Roxbourne,
Canons, Greenhill, Harrow Weald,
Wealdstone, Belmont, Harrow on the Hill

Enclosures: None

Section 1 – Summary

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last TARSAP meeting and provides details of the Council's investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

Recommendations:

None, the report is for information only.

Reason:

None, the report is for information only.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting of TARSAP and the current status of any investigations and findings undertaken.
- 2.2 No updates on the progress made with previous petitions will be reported because officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any further updates.

Options considered

- 2.3 This report is provided only to update members on the status of petitions received by the Council that are within the terms of reference of TARSAP.

Background

Petition 1 – Summit Close, Edgware – Request for controlled parking zone

- 2.4 A petition containing 37 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“Summit Close is a small cul-de-sac with 36 maisonettes and no off street parking. Because it’s a narrow road there is parking on only one side and we have a problem parking when non-residents park and go off to work. This was exacerbated when Methuen Road and Methuen Close were made CPZ`s. We as residents therefore request a CPZ and enclose our petition”

- 2.5 The request was added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report in February. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 2 – Byron and Warham Roads, Wealdstone - Request for parking review

- 2.6 A petition containing 49 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned call upon Harrow Council to urgently carry out a review of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in our area as it is increasing difficult to park in the evenings.”

- 2.7 In line with the agreed action at the last TARSAP meeting in February officers met with the PH and the chair of this Panel to discuss the resident`s petition requesting a parking review in Byron and Warham Road.
- 2.8 Prior to the meeting the request was assessed in line with the agreed TARSAP criteria and attained a score below the top eight sites put forward in the annual parking review programme presented at the February meeting of TARSAP. The site therefore would not have been recommended for inclusion in the 2019/ 20 programme which TARSAP debated and agreed at that meeting.
- 2.9 As councillors maybe aware schemes that are not approved but still justify further review will remain on the priority list for assessment in the following financial year. This request is currently ranked within the top ten sites on the current list and therefore has a high probability of being recommended for inclusion in next year`s programme (2020/21).

Petition 3 – Churchill, Gresham and Montgomery Roads – Objection to at any time restrictions.

- 2.10 A petition containing 52 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned deplore the fact that Churchill, Gresham and Montgomery Roads have effectively become a public car park for visitors to the Madonna Hayley Hotel and Trilogy Restaurant in Whitchurch Lane”.

This makes it sometimes impossible for residents to park anywhere in these streets on Friday, Saturday and Sunday evenings and renders our parking permits virtually useless. Those with limited mobility or young children are particularly disadvantaged when unable to park anywhere near to their homes.

We consider the council`s proposals to introduce `at any time `waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) at junctions and bends to be an inadequate response to our problems and call on the council to come up with alternative means of dealing with the present unsatisfactory situation caused by the over expansion of Madonna Haley Hotel and to consult us again”

- 2.11 The zone TB area was included in the parking management programme for 2018/19. Churchill Road, Gresham Road and Montgomery Road are already located within zone TB, which operates Mon – Fri, 10am -11am, and were consulted in July 2018 on proposals to extend these hours of control.

- 2.12 Two options of extended hours were proposed:
- Monday – Saturday 8:30 am -12pm and 2:00pm - 6:00 pm
 - 8:30am – 8:30pm Monday – Saturday.
- 2.13 Both Churchill Road (64%) and Gresham Road (80%) were against any changes to the current CPZ hours whilst Montgomery Road (60%) was in favour of longer hours of control.
- 2.14 Given that the geographical nature of these three roads I that they form a large cul-de-sac the results were considered holistically. The decision taken by the Portfolio Holder was to keep the existing hours of control and not to proceed to statutory consultation regarding any changes.
- 2.15 No further reviews are planned for this area in line with the council's current policy.
- 2.16 Where parking reviews are carried out it is standard procedure to review parking at junctions and bends and propose double yellow lines to improve access and visibility. The double yellow lines proposals in this area are therefore designed to comply with parking guidance as stipulated in the Highway Code.

Petition 4 – Wetheral Drive / Weston Drive – vibration and traffic speeds

- 2.17 A petition / letter containing 14 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“Last year my husband contacted Harrow Council for the subject matter but as happens always, they are less worried about local resident's problems and more concern about expenses that will incur to the council to resurface the road, so it's time for all residents to get together and sort out this ongoing nightmare for once and all and to do that we have decided to start a signing campaign to make sure, not only Harrow council take vibration problem seriously but resolve it immediately too and fix a 20 MPH speed limit for Weston Road without further delay, which is in their power. Subject campaign will also force Transport for London and Metropolitan Police to fix two speed cameras on Weston Drive (around Wetheral Drive junction) so it force motorists and heavy vehicle to follow road speed or face speed fine which will also lower down ongoing vibration problem too.

I will appreciate if you can kindly sign underneath so I can forward this petition to local MP and councillor accordingly”

- 2.18 The council notes the concerns raised regarding alleged vibration to some properties in the vicinity of the Weston Road / Wetheral Drive junction. It should be noted that it is possible for airborne vibration to be generated by traffic which can cause windows to rattle. This could lead to a subjective impression of structural damage although airborne vibration

is not a cause of actual damage or cracking to buildings as a consequence of vehicle type or speed.

- 2.19 All footways and carriageways are inspected on a periodic routine cyclic maintenance regime, between three and four times a year. As a result of these inspections localised repairs are implemented where a defect exceeds the Council's intervention levels and is considered to be a potential hazard to pedestrians or vehicle users. It should be noted that the Highways Team have carried out a structural survey of the road conditions at this location and found no faults in the road.
- 2.20 In order to as far as is practicable, produce a fair and unbiased programme of footway reconstruction and carriageway resurfacing works, these are based upon a robust scoring system which combines the results from structural surveys carried out by consultants on behalf of the Council with scores based on usage, the risk factor, corporate objectives and impact. The extent of the programme is limited by the available budget and is prioritised on the scores given to each road.
- 2.21 Generally the advice given to residents where they feel that that damage has been done to a property because of traffic noise / vibration is to discuss this with their insurance company, provide evidence to support their claim and submit a claim to the council's insurance team.
- 2.22 For information Weston Drive is classed as a local distributor road and therefore provides access to the main highway network including buses and as a result it is council policy not to introduce 20 mph zone or speed humps on these routes. Introducing speed humps or platforms would affect buses and emergency services operational and response times and may divert traffic to other residential roads.
- 2.23 The council has installed a number of speed activated signs to inform drivers of the speed limit with a message to advise drivers to slow down in Weston Drive and consideration will be given to placing additional "Slow" markings at this location.
- 2.24 The council are not directly involved with the introduction of speed cameras. All speed cameras are installed by the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP) and have to meet strict criteria for their installation. Fixed camera sites are located where three or more fatal or serious speed related personal injury collisions have occurred over a previous three year period.
- 2.25 Our most up to date personal injury accident data for Weston Drive shows there have been no killed or seriously speed related personal accident injuries recorded over the most recent 36 months of data available. Therefore the provision of a speed camera in this location cannot be considered because it does not meet the criteria.

Petition 5 – Bluebell Court, Tranquil Lane – Request to remove speed platform

2.26 A petition containing 31 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned are residents of Bluebell Court, Tranquil Lane, Harrow, HA2 0GS and are very concerned about the state of Rayners Lane Road situated adjacent to our block of flats.

The speed bump located on Rayners Lane opposite Tithe Farm Social Club is working against its designed purpose and causing vehicles to speed more than the set limit of 20 mph. The speed bump is not acting as a deterrent for the traffic and instead encourages vehicles to rush even more thereby resulting in more noise and air pollution. Several complaints have also been lodged with TFL about speeding drivers but this, of course, doesn't address the core issue.

This is having a daily impact on our lives and we have listed detailed reasons for its proposed removal below:

- 1. Massive shake to our block of flats when heavy vehicles such as H12 bus passes through. Vibrations are very strong and can be felt even on the 3rd floor of the building.*
- 2. Long term damage to the foundation of the building due to continuous shake (every 10-15 minutes by H12 bus)*
- 3. The speed bump is also proving to be unsafe and dangerous because vehicles are speeding up while getting and off the speed bump. In the absence of any pedestrian crossing, the specific section of this road is used by the residents to cross and reach the Clitheroe Avenue (J) bus stop located on the opposite side of the road.*
- 4. The blind turn, an intersection of roads (Tranquil Lane and Rayners Lane) and main entry door to block of flats along with an absence of any pedestrian crossing are making it a perfect case for potential accident anytime with an over speeding vehicle.*
- 5. This section of the road including the speed bump has deteriorated to a point where potholes have been reported regally by us over the last year and the potholes come back in no time. This is a complete waste of time and money.*

Council would also appreciate the landscape of this area has changed significantly during last year with young families moving to new block of flats and houses around this road. Thus, the traffic calming measures in this area require an immediate review.

Considering all above, we request your support and ask Harrow Council to please remove the speed bump at the earliest and if needed replace it with better traffic calming measures such as a pedestrian crossing and vehicle activated speed limit warning signs.”

2.27 For information the speed platform in Rayners Lane was installed in 2013 and was funded by a developer through a section 106 planning

agreement to mitigate the effects of the new development in the area. The platform forms part of a series of speed humps designed to make the road safer by reducing vehicle speeds. The rationale for the introduction of the speed platform was to create a safer environment in order to encourage more walking and cycling particularly because of its close proximity to the development and bus stops.

- 2.28 The speed limit along this stretch of road is 30 mph and not 20 mph as suggested in the petition. Since their introduction the council's perception is that traffic speeds have decreased.
- 2.29 Officers have checked the Council's personal injury accident database which has shown that there have been no incidents of personal injury in this area within the last three years.
- 2.30 The council notes the concerns highlighted in the petition regarding vibration to properties. It should be noted that on some occasions airborne vibration may be generated by traffic which can cause windows to rattle. This could lead to a subjective impression of structural damage, although airborne vibration is not a cause of actual damage or cracking to buildings as a result of the vehicle type or speed.
- 2.31 Unfortunately the opportunities to review existing traffic calming is limited because there are no funds allocated to undertake traffic calming reviews or carry out any statutory consultations or changes as a result. For information The Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel in November 2008 agreed a protocol for considering requests for changes to traffic calming features as follows:
- 2.32 Where consideration is to be given to removing or modifying existing traffic calming measures, then the implications and consequences must be considered very carefully, including:
- the potential legal/liability implications of removing measures that were put in as accident reduction measures (as in the case of the Kingsfield Avenue area have been demonstrably successful)
 - the need to re-consult residents and emergency services, including the cost and the timescales involved.
 - the effect on the highway maintenance budget and programme. (N.B. removal of traffic calming in only part of a street would result in not complying with current legislation)
 - the cost of modifying existing measures, or replacing them with some other form of traffic calming.
 - the view of Transport for London or developers in relation to schemes funded by them.
- 2.33 These are not necessarily in any priority order, nor exhaustive. It was suggested, however, that the accident reduction implications are the most

significant issue and great caution needs to be exercised to avoid the potential for road casualties to increase. Apart from the human and economic costs associated with personal injuries, it is necessary to be conscious of Harrow's very successful and consistent record in reducing casualties. It is important to be careful to not adversely affect accident reduction targets set by the Mayor for London and nationally which Councils are obliged to meet.

- 2.34 We continue to receive requests for traffic calming, whereas the request for removal of road humps is extremely small. Similarly, we get an increasing number of complaints about vehicle speeds and request for measures to deal with these through some form of traffic calming measures. However, in light of the concerns raised we will review the request in line with the above criterion.

Petition 6 – Whitchurch Gardens – objection to double yellow lines

- 2.35 This petition was presented to TARSAP at the meeting in February. The petition stated:

“ We object to the proposed double yellow lines TMO on Whitchurch Gardens, Whitchurch Close and Woodstead Grove as it will simply create more congestion on other parts of our streets, there will be less parking spaces overall, and our street is already a very safe and very quiet cul de sac so it is totally unnecessary, unwarranted and costly proposal. Please therefore reduce the scale of the overall TMO ref DP 2018 -24.”

- 2.36 This petition is a duplicate of the petition already presented at the last panel meeting in February and has already had a report.

Petition 7 – Wildcroft Gardens – Request for a controlled parking zone

- 2.37 A petition containing 13 signatures was received by the Council in February 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, request Harrow Council to implement a controlled parking zone between 11am and 12pm from Monday to Friday. This is to prevent congestion and bottlenecks on the road particularly on weekdays whereby commuters are parking in order to walk to the train station. Furthermore it will help increase visibility so that children in particular can cross the roads safely.”

- 2.38 This request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which is discussed in February. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 8 – Harrow on the Hill – Change in proposed hours of CPZ

- 2.39 A petition containing 45 signatures was received by the Council in March 2018. The petition states:

“The reason for this petition is in regards to the parking permits affecting local businesses on Harrow on the Hill. These restrictions will cause great dismay to both the businesses and their customers.”

We the undersigned are concerned citizens who urge our council to act now to instill the parking restriction times of 9am-10am and 3pm -4pm. This will allow our local businesses to successfully operate without risking loss of business and loss of customers. From a business point of view these would be acceptable times for the parking restrictions, safe guarding customer footfall.”

- 2.40 The petition along with all the other comments, representations and objections received during the statutory consultation period were collated and presented to the Portfolio Holder for Environment in May for consideration before deciding on any changes to the proposed scheme.

Petition 9 – Kenton Lane / Elmore Drive – Request for double yellow lines

- 2.41 A petition containing 19 signatures was received by the Council in March 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned call upon Harrow Council to install double yellow lines at the junction of Kenton Lane and Elmore Drive, Harrow as the sightline leaving Elmore Drive is extremely poor and is causing a hazard to drivers and pedestrians”.

- 2.42 This request was assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP) and has met the criteria and is now being processed in the next batch of waiting restrictions schemes.

Petition 10 - 704 / 738 Kenton Road, HA3 9QX – Request for parking controls

- 2.43 A petition from local businesses containing 10 signatures was received by the Council in April 2019. The petition states:

“We, the business owners of above – mentioned addresses, would like to restrict the use of parking bays for the customers and business owners. NOT FOR COMUTERS.

Please advise on the best course of action be it a restriction on parking times or pay and display.”

- 2.44 This request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which will be included on the February 2020 agenda. As members are aware all requests for

parking controls are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes is presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year.

Petition 11 – 1- 17 Courtenay Avenue – Request for access road

- 2.45 A petition containing 8 signatures was received by the Council in May 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, request from Harrow Council an access road for Courtney Avenue 1 -17.

This would be similar to that of the access road adjacent to the main traffic road all along the odd numbered side of Courtenay Avenue. The requested access road is not intended for parking, hence does not need to be as wide.

The access road is for residents of 1-17 Courtenay Avenue to safely drive their cars into their front gardens. This will enable safe access for emergency service vehicles, accessibility and freedom of mobility for disable residents and reduce the parking strain on Secker Crescent and the end of Augustine Road.

At present there is no access for emergency service vehicles and disabled residents must be manually supported a lengthy distance to be able to access vehicles. There is also high parking tension in the area with increasingly poor parking practices being conducted. This is resulting in cars being blocked ad grass verge being damaged.”

- 2.46 Transport policies nationally, regionally and locally in Harrow support the reduction of car ownership and car use in order to address the issues of increasing population and demand to travel, increasing level of traffic on the network resulting in congestion and the adverse affect on air pollution and public health. Therefore schemes that encourage or promote car use such as constructing new roads are not supported or funded.
- 2.47 Not withstanding the Council policies on this matter the conversion of a grass verge area would be very expensive because of the potential need for statutory undertakers plant to be diverted and because of the requirement to comply with carriageway construction specifications and the Department of Transport design standards for Roads and Bridges. In this case this request would not be financially viable or feasible in any case.
- 2.48 The council appreciates that due to the current level of car ownership, demand for on-street parking in the evenings and weekends in this area is usually quite high. Unfortunately the council cannot control the number of vehicles people own and that choose to park on the public highway.
- 2.49 As a point of information the council, as the highway authority, is not required and has no obligation to provide any on-street parking for any

resident or motorist on the public highway. The council, like most local authorities, will allow parking on the public highway where it is safe to do so and does not obstruct access.

- 2.50 It is also worth noting that parking on footways or grass verge is prohibited in the London area including the borough of Harrow. This applies to all roads, subject to any statutory exemptions. Where footway parking is allowed the footway must be constructed as outlined above to take the additional loading and marked out using appropriate signage and lining. Any contraventions could be reported to the Parking Operations team for enforcement action.

Petition 12 – Dudley Road – South Harrow - Request for one way scheme and residents parking permits.

- 2.51 A petition containing 67 signatures was received by the Council in May 2019. The petition states:

“We the residents of Dudley Road, South Harrow, Middlesex, hereby ask that you take note, and remedy several serious concerns that our road is currently experiencing. It is essential that changes are made, as it has become a battle ground for most of the day, and indeed the night. Everyone has had enough. Please look at the issues and proposals below, which have put together to improve the safety and quality of the lives of all Dudley road residents.

We strongly believe that Dudley Road should be a one way road. The direction should be from Shaftesbury Avenue to Roxeth Green Avenue.

There must be double yellow lines on the junction of Dudley Gardens and Wesley Close, including double yellows directly opposite Wesley Close.

Provide resident parking permits and this must include visitor parking permits for all residents. Only permit holders will be able to park between Mon – Fri 10-11am and 2-3pm and Sat –Sun 10-11am.”

- 2.52 The funds available to the council to implement traffic management schemes come directly to us from Transport for London and are primarily intended for delivering the Transport Local implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment. The council has a set assessment method for considering requests such as these to check their suitability for inclusion in the LIP programme and to help us prioritise our work. The criterion is strongly weighted towards targeting sites where there is a history of personal injury accidents this is in line with the mayor for London’s Vision Zero initiative. This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise roads so that the worst accident and traffic problems can be dealt with first.
- 2.53 A check of the council’s most up to date personal injury accident data for Dudley Road indicates that there have been no reported personal injury accidents within the last three years. A three-year period of study is the standard nationally, by which traffic engineers assess the frequency of

road accidents and identify particular accident trends for the purpose of assessing road safety and for making comparisons with other areas. On this basis the request for a one way street is considered a low priority for the council at the present time.

- 2.54 The request for double yellow lines will be assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP) using an assessment criteria previously agreed by this Panel. If the threshold score required for intervention is met a scheme will be added to the programme and will be batched and then progressed through design, consultation and the implementation phase. Typically this process takes between 3 - 6 months to complete.
- 2.55 The request for residents permit parking will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which is discussed in February. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration are also assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 13 – The Ridgeway, Stanmore – Request for a CPZ.

- 2.56 A petition containing 57 signatures was referred to TARSAP via Cabinet in April 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned residents formally request Harrow Council to prohibit XXXXX from continuing to operate in our road. However we appreciate that, given his past performance, he may still not agree to remove the vehicles with which is associated (either/ by personal / corporate ownership or otherwise) from our road.

Accordingly, we also formally request the Council to make The Ridgeway a Residents Only parking road, with limited parking outside of this permitted say, from 10:00am – 11am and from 2:00pm - 3:00pm.”

- 2.57 The request for residents permit parking will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which is discussed in February. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration are also assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 14 – Oxford Road and Byron Road – Request to remove parking controls

- 2.58 A petition containing 48 signatures was referred to TARSAP via Cabinet in April 2019. The petition states:
- “We the undersigned putting this petition against 24 hours parking restriction on those two above roads. We are the members and associates of London Kalibari which is a Community organisation at 18 Byron Road, Harrow HA3 7ST. The community celebrates socio-religious functions at the centre. We also use the centre every Monday for Senior Citizen Luncheon Club from 12:30pm to 4:00pm and evening meetings. It is very inconvenient for the senior citizen not to park the cars near the centre. There is no need to put 24 hour from Monday to Sunday. Hope you will consider the situation so that we can park near the centre especially on Saturday and Sunday.”*
- 2.59 The introduction of controlled parking zone J with longer operational hours in a large part of Wealdstone between the Leisure Centre and the A409 was introduced following an extensive statutory consultation with all the businesses and residents in 2018.
- 2.60 Residents in many of these streets were either previously within CPZ zone CA or in roads which were not within a CPZ. These residents petitioned the council to be included in a new zone to help deter long term commuter parking caused by the local businesses, shoppers as well as those using nearby bus and train stations.
- 2.61 The suggestions put forward in the petition from London Kalibari to remove the parking restrictions on Oxford Road and Byron Road especially on a Saturday and Sunday that were implemented as a part of CPZ zone J are noted, however, this would simply reverse the situation back to how it was before. TARSAP will recollect that prior to the most recent changes there were significant on-street parking pressures leading to request for a scheme to be considered. Therefore to reverse the scheme to its previous state would disregard the views of a large number of local residents that responded to the public consultation about the original parking pressures. In order to make such a significant change to the scheme would require the same mandate to do so as well as extensive and lengthy public consultation and statutory consultation to be undertaken again. However, it is unlikely that many of the residents who campaigned for the changes in the first place are likely to support this request and currently there are no other local people making similar representations.
- 2.62 It is currently the policy of the panel not to review new parking zones once they have been introduced because the council already has a surplus of requests for new parking schemes on the list and public concerns continue to be expressed that it takes too long to implement parking schemes and that the programme is slow to respond to community needs.

2.63 Whilst we appreciate the comments raised by London Kalibari the Council considers that there is sufficient parking provision within the Wealdstone Town Centre area already. For example there is a large multi-story car park by Canning Road which is a relatively short walk from Oxford Road / Byron Road, parking provision in the Leisure Centre site and there are also “pay and display” parking bays further along Masons Avenue and Headstone Drive.

2.64 A review of CPZ zone J in this area is not recommended.

Ward Councillors' comments

2.65 No Ward Councillor's comments have been sought for this report as it is for information only.

Staffing/workforce

2.66 The review of petitions has been undertaken using existing staff resources within the Traffic, Highways & Asset Management Team supported by technical consultants as required.

Performance issues

2.67 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims, objectives and targets in the current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and help to deliver Harrow's corporate priorities and in particular building a better Harrow.

Environmental Implications

2.68 The LIP underwent a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the programme of investment. The main benefits are in improving air quality and public health. No negative environmental issues were identified as part of the SEA.

2.69 Key air quality benefits identified were from reducing car travel, encouraging greener vehicles and reducing congestion.

2.70 Key population and human health benefits identified were from reducing casualties, encouraging active travel, health walks and as a result of improving air quality. The benefits associated with increased active travel and health walks are reduced diabetes and obesity levels.

Risk Management Implications

2.71 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

2.72 The development of any schemes arising from a petition would be subject to separate risk assessments.

- 2.73 There is a requirement to undertake a design risk assessment during scheme development under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations in order to manage any potential health and safety risks.

Legal implications

- 2.74 There are no legal implications.

Financial Implications

- 2.75 There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report that require further investigation would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.76 The petitions raise issues about issues that affect the traffic and transportation programmes of work as well as identifying new areas of work for investigation. The officer's response to a petition will indicate a suggested way forward in each case.
- 2.77 If members subsequently suggest that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions these will accord with the Council's current Transport Local Implementation Plan which has been subject to a full Equalities Impact Assessment. These Equalities Impact Assessments have been identified as having no negative impact on any protected equality groups and demonstrate positive impacts on the disability and age equality groups.

Council Priorities

- 2.78 Any findings or investigations in response to petitions detailed in the report support the Harrow ambition plan and will contribute to achieving the administration's priorities listed below:
- Building a Better Harrow
 - Supporting those most in need
 - Protecting vital Public Services
 - Delivering a Strong Local Economy for All
 - Modernising Harrow Council.

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 13/06/19		
Name: Patrick Kelly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 14/06/19		

Name: Paul Walker	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Director
Date: 13/06/19		

Ward Councillors notified:	NO, as it impacts on all Wards
EqIA carried out:	YES, as a part of LIP3
EqIA cleared by:	Dave Corby, Community - Equality Task Group (DETG) Chair

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Barry Philips
E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports

LIP3

Decision Records

Public and statutory consultation documents highlighted in the report

Petitions

PH Reports

**Call-In Waived by the
Chair of Overview and
Scrutiny Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

*[Call-In does not apply as the
recommendation is for noting
only]*