Portfolio Holder Decision Meeting

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

DATE: **Wednesday 19 August 2020**

AGENDA - PART I

6. RECOMMENDATION FROM THE TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL - 10 AUGUST 2020 - HARROW STREET SPACES PROGRAMME - 2020/21 (Pages 3 - 32)

The minutes of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting are attached.

AGENDA - PART II

Nil

Note: In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda item has been admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and urgency detailed below:-

Agenda item	Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency
6. Recommendation from the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel - Harrow Street Spaces Programme – 2020/21	Due to the proximity of the meeting of the Panel to this Portfolio Holder Decision meeting, the Panel's recommendation was not available at the time the agenda was published. The Deputy Leader is requested, in the Leader of the Council's absence, to consider the recommendation as

	the funding for this programme of work covered the period up to the end of September 2020 and the delivery of the schemes was required to be completed within this period. The time remaining to mobilise contractors, materials and traffic regulation orders and complete works following September Cabinet would be insufficient to meet this timescale.

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL (SPECIAL)

MINUTES

MONDAY 10 AUGUST 2020

Chair:	*	Councillor Jerry Miles		
Councillors:	*	Peymana Assad	*	James Lee
	*	John Hinkley	*	Anjana Patel
	*	Ameet Jogia	*	David Perry
Advisers:	*	Mr J Leach	*	Dr A Shah
		Mr N Long	*	Mr A Wood

In attendance: (Councillors)	Marilyn Ashton	Minutes 77 and 80
	Philip Benjamin	Minutes 77 and 80
	Simon Brown	Minutes 77 and 80
	Stephen Greek	Minute 80
	Vina Mithani	Minute 77
	Paul Osborn	Minutes 77 and 80
	Varsha Parmar	Minute 77
	Kanti Rabadia	Minute 80
	Sachin Shah	Minute 80

* Denotes Member present

Recording

The recording of this meeting was available by following the link below:
https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting

75. Welcome

On behalf of the Panel, the Chair welcomed Councillor Anjana Patel to the Panel and thanked Councillor Baxter, a former Member of the Panel, for his contribution to the work of the Panel.

76. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

77. 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 and the following further declarations made at the meeting by Councillors under this item in relation to agenda item 5 and during consideration of the same item, Harrow Street Spaces Programme – 2020/21, be also noted:

Councillor Marilyn Ashton: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – Local Authority appointed Governor of Park High School
Councillor James Lee: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – Lived in Canons Park
Councillor Vina Mithani: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – Ward Councillor for Kenton West where Kenton Park Shopping Parade was situated
Councillor Paul Osborn: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – Lived on Vaughan Road, part of the West Harrow Low Traffic Neighbourhood Scheme.
Councillor Varsha Parmar: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – Marlborough Ward Councillor where schemes were being proposed

(2) Members and Advisers who had declared interests remained in the virtual meeting whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

RESOLVED ITEMS

78. Appointment of Vice-Chair and Non-Voting Advisers

RESOLVED: To defer the appointment of Vice Chair and Non-Voting Advisers to the next ordinary meeting of the Panel and to suspend Executive Procedure Rule 35.4 to allow the following Advisers appointed in 2019/20 to participate in the meeting pending their formal appointment at the next ordinary meeting of the Panel:

Mr J Leach	-	London Living Streets
Mr N Long	-	Harrow Association of Disabled People
Dr A Shah	-	Harrow Cyclists
Mr A Wood	-	Harrow Public Transport Users' Association

79. Deputations

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rules 43.2 and 48, the following deputations be received in respect of agenda item 5 – Harrow Street Spaces Programme – 2020/21:

1.

Title of Deputation	Residents concerned about proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhoods Green Lane Area and Dennis Lane Area
Reason for Deputation [12 Signatories]	There is sufficient local unhappiness with Schemes LTN-05 and LTN-08 per harrowstreetspaces.commonplace.is The schemes should not go ahead. The Deputation wants to argue why those Schemes should not proceed.

2.

Title of Deputation	Residents of Stanmore Hall
Reason for Deputation [32 Signatories]	To object to the closure of Dennis Lane, Stanmore.

3.

Title of Deputation	Honeypot Lane – Barrier
Reason for Deputation [14 Signatories]	As a shopkeeper greatly affected adversely by the barrier and we are in great danger of losing our businesses.

4.

Title of Deputation	Objection to Low Traffic Neighbourhood LTN-02 Pinner View, Headstone Scheme GC021238-R1
Reason for Deputation [12 Signatories]	Scheme will adversely impact on residents, residents do not want the changes, residents have not seen any evidence of benefits or alternatives options.

5.

Title of Deputation	The Hillview Community against the imposition of School Streets Grimsdyke Primary School Scheme SS-01
Reason for Deputation [18 Signatories]	We, the undersigned, representing over 70 residents in the above community feel strongly that the above scheme is badly conceived and instead of achieving its aims, it will provide greater congestion and pollution, increased traffic flows and lead to issues of road safety.

Full details in relation to the deputations, including questions asked and answers given, were set out in the audio recording and referenced, in brief, at Minute 79 and at Appendix 1 to these minutes. The recording of this item/minute can be found by following the link below:
https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting

RECOMMENDED ITEMS

80. Harrow Street Spaces Programme - 2020/21

Prior to the consideration of the report of the Corporate Director of Community, the Panel heard from the five deputees present at the meeting (Minute 78 also refers), full details of which were available by following the link at Minute 78 and listening to the audio recording.

In summary, the deputees urged the Panel to reject the schemes that they were speaking on and that they were vehemently opposed to proposals because of the adverse impact they would have on their communities. Their submissions are also set out at Appendix 1 to these minutes.

The deputees responded to questions from Members of the Panel and stated that:

- the proposed schemes for Dennis Lane and Green Lane areas were counter productive and would not increase the use of public transport or walking;

- the pedestrian barriers in the Honeypot Lane area had not encouraged people to walk to their local shops and there was evidence that the foot fall had dropped considerably which was crippling businesses in the area. The situation had been exacerbated by the lack of parking, including the provision of parking for people with disabilities;

- the proposals for the Pinner View area (Scheme LTN-02 at revised Appendix A to the report referred) would lead to traffic congestion in the surrounding roads. A Member cited the proposals previously rejected by the Panel for the Goodwill to All junction and asked officers how the two proposals were related. An officer responded that there

were plans to consult on the Goodwill to All junction which had had to be delayed due to Covid-19. Another Panel Member stated that in light of the officer response it was best that both the schemes were held in abeyance and was of the view that the response given appeared to give an impression of silo working mentality;

- the School Streets Grimsdyke Primary School Scheme SS-01 was poor and would increase traffic flows and congestion and did not interact with other schemes in the area. The consultation was poor and a 20mph zone was required in Hillview if the scheme were to proceed. An officer replied that funding was only available for SS-01 but that he would ascertain if a 20mph could be incorporated but he was not certain that the parking issue (Grimsdyke Road) could be resolved.

The Chair thanked the deputees for their presentations.

Prior to the consideration of the report of the Corporate Director of Community, the Panel also heard from a number of back-benching Members who, in brief, were opposed to the implementation of a number of schemes, as follows:

- Green Lane/Dennis Lane – the proposals were unrealistic and partial closures would impact on the surrounding area and would result in traffic gridlocks. Both Green Lane and Dennis Lane had steep gradients and would not encourage cycling. The problems would be exacerbated when children returned to schools in September 2020. The existing width restriction at Dennis Lane would need to be removed and were the proposed scheme to fail, it would result in a greater volume of traffic, particularly heavy traffic traversing through this road. It too would benefit from a 20mph zone;

- Streatfield Road, Queensbury (PS-07) and Cycle lanes at Honeypot Lane (SC-01) – had had an adverse impact on businesses and restaurants which relied on night time trade as there was no parking available. The cycle lane had been badly designed, it also included a bus stop, and would endanger cyclists and lead to rat-running traffic. A 20mph zone was required for the area which might help improve the cycle lane;

- there had been an overall lack of consultation and good decision-making had been compromised, particularly when the proposals could have been presented at programmed meetings of the Panel, including the Cabinet. Additionally, the lack of available detail for a number of schemes and how they would operate was lacking. The approach taken had had reputational damage and it would have been better to have fewer schemes in place supported by residents instead of imposing schemes that had been ill-conceived in order to deliver a better street scape and a better Harrow;

- Pinner View area, Headstone South (LTN-02) and Southfield Park area, North Harrow (LTN-06) – the schemes would split Headstone Ward into two and would lead to congestion and impact upon children

and parents travelling to Vaughan School. The schemes should only proceed if supported by the emergency services, particularly the Fire Brigade, and if they were reviewed on a monthly basis. Perhaps only one scheme ought to be implemented and that the barrier in Pinner View could be installed at a latter date;

- Streatfield Road, Queensbury - shops (PS-07), Kenton Road –shops (PS-10) and Kenton Lane – Belmont shops (PS-11) – the barriers and traffic cones were unwelcoming and the proposals were impacting adversely on independent businesses and giving priority to supermarkets. Deliveries to some of the shops was being compromised due to lack of parking and all the schemes ought to be rejected;

- Uxbridge Road, Harrow Weald – cycle lane – the scheme was poor and not safe. A joined up approach was lacking. The scheme should be removed or not made permanent.

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community in respect of the delivery of the London Streetspace Programme (LSP) in Harrow as a response to the COVID-19 public health pandemic. The Panel also received the following:

- a Supplemental Agenda, which included a Revised Appendix A, setting out the Pedestrian Space Measures, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, School Streets, Strategic Cycling, Schemes not approved and Revised Indicative Implementation Schedule, on the grounds of special circumstances and urgency set out in the Supplemental Agenda;

- a Second Supplemental Agenda, which included additional appendices setting out the outcomes of consultations with Ward Councillor, including representations received from a local MP and other Members to the report of the Corporate Director of Community, on the grounds of special circumstances and urgency set out therein.

The Director of Environment introduced the report and informed the Panel that

- the Covid-19 health emergency had significantly affected the way in which people worked and travelled;

- the government was providing £2 billion to support areas with high levels of public transport such as London to take measures to reallocate road space to people walking and cycling to encourage active travel, enable social distancing and prevent an increase in private car use that could detrimentally affect the road network;

- currently the bus and rail systems could only take up to fraction of the normal capacity. Therefore, there was a significant potential for many journeys to convert to private car instead, as the economy opened up and more journeys were made;

- Harrow Council, along with the other London Local Authorities, had applied to Transport for London (TfL) for funding for pedestrian space, low traffic neighbourhood and school streets schemes as a part of the Street Spaces Programme. Separate funding had also been made available from the Department for Transport directly to be used on strategic cycling schemes;

- the schemes had been developed in accordance with the applicable criteria and publicised online via an engagement portal and, more recently, officers had met with Ward Councillors in relation to schemes in their Wards. There were two supplementary reports to the main report which provided additional information in this regard;

- the report collated all the comments, feedback and contributions on the schemes for the Panel, including feedback from Ward Councillors to allow the Panel to consider which schemes should be recommended and proceed to implementation;

- the duration of the schemes was as follows:

- the pedestrian space schemes that had already been implemented at an earlier stage in the programme were temporary only and would be removed when no longer required;

- all other schemes were experimental using temporary or low cost measures that could be easily removed at a later date following a detailed review after approximately 6 months.

The Director informed the Panel that the report also indicated an additional regular review process for schemes so that the impact could be regularly monitored and adjustments made quickly as and when they were necessary. He added that the funding available was of a short term nature and any schemes recommended for implementation needed to be completed by the end of September 2020 to comply with the funding requirements. The 7-8 weeks remaining period represented the minimum length of time to successfully deliver these.

The Chair stated that he was conscious of the time and wanted to ensure that sufficient time was allowed for debate on those schemes that were contentious and he listed them as LTN-05, LTN-07/08/09 and SC-10 and referred to a proposed draft recommendation in relation to George V Avenue scheme which was read out at the meeting. Panel Members expressed concerns and were of the view that decisions ought not to be left to officers only and that the Panel ought not to be by-passed and that, as elected Councillors, they were accountable to residents.

A couple of the advisers to the Panel stated as follows:

- the proposals ought to be supported in order to improve the general health of people living and working in Harrow, as diabetes was prevalent amongst the residents of Harrow;

- road space needed to be re-organised and changes needed to be put in places now and before the schools re-opened in September 2020;

- consultations had been put in place and true consultations would effectively commence during the trial period;

- low traffic neighbourhood schemes would improve road safety and increase walking. It was important that the schemes were in place now and, in time, residents would appreciate their benefits. Harrow had the lowest cycling rates in London and this needed to be improved. The use of electric bikes would help negotiate gradients;

- the Honeypot Lane schemes could be improved further but it was not a busy route for buses;

- the scheme proposed for George V Avenue should be implemented and would help protect children cycling to school;

- the scheme proposed for Uxbridge Road ought to be extended;

- the proposals were bold and appropriate and showed that Harrow was committed to dealing with the issues it faced in public health and encourage active travel. Children (1 in 5) in Year 6 in Harrow were obese, car ownership was the second highest in London and Harrow was in the fifth lowest quartile of frequent walkers. The Council needed to address all these aspect for a better and healthy Harrow.

Members of the Panel commented as follows:

- they needed to listen to the deputees and residents who had made representations to them;

- consideration needed to be given to the adverse impact on Harrow's communities, such as places of worship and businesses. The barriers installed in certain areas needed to be removed;

- some schemes need to be removed with immediate effect;

- Ward Councillors ought to be fully involved and consulted.

Members of the Panel moved and seconded a number of changes to the recommendations/proposals set out in the report of the Corporate Director of Community and indicative votes were taken in respect of PS-07, PS-08, PS-10 and PS-11 details of which were set out in the Revised Appendix A to the report of the Corporate Director of Community. It was also recommended that schemes LTN-04/05/08 be removed.

A Panel Member stated that Members had been put in a difficult position and the Panel would generally support walking and other health benefits that would ensue. He acknowledged the passionate comments from the advisers who spoke in support of the proposals. However, as elected officials, Members needed to balance and consider the impact of the schemes on

Harrow's residents, schools and businesses. He was of the view that local residents and businesses were best placed to realise how schemes would impact on them and this factor could not be ignored. He stated that the discussions he had had with officers in respect of his Ward had not been captured in the appendix circulated with the Second Supplemental Agenda.

The same Member suggested that the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition make representations to the government/TfL in order to negotiate the best deal for Harrow.

Prior to moving to a formal vote on the recommendations set out in the report, the Chair stated that he had read all the comments, including those set out in the Portal as part of the consultation process. He reminded Members of the Panel that no other funding would be available as part of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP).

The Panel was of the view that they could not support all the recommendations/proposals before them and amended some of the recommendations/proposals to those set out in the report of the Corporate Director of Community and these were moved and duly seconded and it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Leader of the Council)

That

(1) the impact of the health crisis on travel and public transport due to social distancing requirements and the measures proposed by the Government and the Mayor of London to address the crisis be noted;

(2) the pedestrian space schemes implemented, as shown in the revised Appendix A, table 1, be noted, except that the following Pedestrian Space Measures be withdrawn:

PS-07 – Streatfield Road, Queensbury – shops
PS-08 – Honeypot Lane, Canons Park – shops
PS-10 – Kenton Road, Kenton – shops
PS-11 – Kenton Lane, Belmont – shops

(3) the low traffic neighbourhood schemes shown in the revised Appendix A, table 2, for implementation on an experimental basis by the end of September 2020, be approved, with the exception of the following:

LTN-05 – Green Lane area, Stanmore
LTN-07 – Byron Road area, Wealdstone
LTN-08 – Dennis Lane area, Stanmore
LTN-09 – Princes Drive area, Stanmore

and on the basis that the Low Traffic Neighbourhoods Scheme – LTN-02, Pinner View area, Headstone South, be subject to consultation with Ward Councillors

[Note: Councillors Hinkley, Jogia and Patel wished to be recorded as having voted against the implementation of LTN-04 – Vaughan Road area, West Harrow. Councillors Assad, Lee, Perry and Miles voted in favour of the implementation of LTN-04. Therefore the Recommendation to the Leader of the Council to approve the implementation of LTN-04 was carried.]

(4) the school streets schemes, as shown in the revised Appendix A, table 3, for implementation on an experimental basis by the end of September 2020, be approved;

[Note: Councillors Assad, Hinkley, Jogia, Lee, Patel, Perry and Miles wished to be recorded as having voted for the implementation of School Streets, SS-01 to SS-04. Members voted unanimously for the Recommendation.]

(5) the cycling schemes – SC-01, SC-03 and SC-09 – implemented as shown in the revised Appendix A, table 4, be noted;

(6) the George V Avenue (Hatch End) cycle scheme, SC-10, be approved for implementation as shown in the revised Appendix A, table 4, on an experimental basis by September 2020, subject to the Corporate Director of Community amending the scheme to reduce the length of the scheme to avoid it continuing past Nower Hill High School or to incorporate dedicated cycle lanes without the need to utilise a lane either side of the road;

(7) the making of the experimental traffic orders, where required, to implement the necessary traffic and parking restrictions for the schemes for a minimum of 6 months be approved;

(8) the Corporate Director of Community, following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, be delegated authority to undertake a regular review of the schemes and provide a monthly update to members of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel and Ward Councillors and determine whether any amendments were required for schemes, including ending any experimental scheme;

(9) a report be submitted to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel following the initial 6 months of operation of schemes, to feed back the results of consultation and the equality impact assessments and to consider whether schemes should be ended, extended up to a maximum of 18 months or made permanent.

Reason for Recommendation: To implement the Street Spaces Schemes in order to address the impact of the Covid-19 health crisis on travel and public transport and to support more active travel by walking and cycling and public health in line with current Department for Transport and Transport for London guidance.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 9.13 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chair

Proposed Road Closures – Citizens Deputation

Introduction

Thank you, Chair, for hearing our citizens' deputation this evening concerning the proposed Low Traffic Neighbourhoods for Green Lane and Dennis Lane.

We are representing the residents of the Green Lane and the Dennis Lane areas and are speaking on behalf of thousands of Harrow residents and stakeholders who are seriously concerned about the effect of these proposed road closures in Stanmore for two main reasons:

1. It is unclear if the Health & Safety and Equalities impacts have properly been thought through

2. The demography and topography of this area means that a Low Traffic Neighbourhood will provide very limited benefit

The council state that road closures are "divisive". In fact, these proposals have united all ages and sections of our community because of the negative impacts they will have. 94% of feedback to the commonplace website on the Green Lane and Dennis Lane proposals is against it. In addition a petition has already reached over 2,000 signatures and will therefore trigger a full council debate on this matter in due course.

Many of us already walk and cycle, and our issue with the proposed closures of Green Lane and Dennis Lane is that there is no identifiable problem that requires this "low traffic neighbourhood" solution.

Health & Safety and Equality issues

The council's own report to this Panel acknowledges that there were only 1 – 2 weeks in which to prepare these proposals. That report covers those issues inadequately and confirms that no risk assessment has been performed and the safety implications need further consideration.

The Harrow Transport LIP notes The Broadway, Uxbridge Road and Church Road as a strategic E-W route to the M1, A1, A41 and M25 which are not roads for cycling or walking. It further identifies The Broadway having emissions exceeding the EU annual mean limit value for NO2, and also for having high human exposure. Closing Green Lane and Dennis Lane would funnel more traffic through The Broadway, exacerbating the pollution problem.

The Green Lane / Uxbridge Road junction is already over capacity with a dangerous right turn. It is made worse by many driving on the wrong side of Uxbridge Road to get into Old Church Lane. Diverting additional traffic onto this junction will cause more accidents and additional risk to the very cyclists and pedestrians this proposal is seeking to help.

Access for large vehicles including delivery lorries, refuse trucks and emergency vehicles will become difficult. There is nowhere for these vehicles to turn should these roads be closed which will cause safety issues for passing cyclists and pedestrians whilst they manoeuvre.

The proposed road closures will risk gridlock across key junctions on a major N-S / E-W route and also have serious implications for the emergency services, in particular response times for the Ambulance Service and Fire Brigade, both of which are already under pressure.

The Harrow Transport Bus is the council's own service to carry children with high needs as used by the daughter of one of our deputees. These children can suffer from claustrophobia if trapped in standing traffic; they cannot sit still on a bus for prolonged periods. The proposals will significantly increase their time on the bus, worsening their experience and health, and placing a greater strain on the borough's staff looking after them.

A number of religious and other institutions will be negatively impacted by the proposed road closures. These are:

St John's Church of England Primary School, a faith based school. It has a wide catchment and children travel long distances to it from across the borough.

The mosque and temple in Wood Lane have large and active communities drawn from the North-West London area and beyond that rely on access via Green Lane and Dennis Lane.

The temple has written a letter to the council setting out their concerns in which they state "this will very much inconvenience community members who attend our temple and the mosque next door and we cannot begin to imagine the chaos it will bring during our festive seasons".

The Orthopaedic Hospital's own transport service will be negatively impacted as it uses Dennis Lane as its preferred route for hospital staff and patients to get to it from Stanmore Tube station.

Demography and topography of the area

TfL's definition of an area suitable for a Low Traffic Neighbourhood fails when applied to Green Lane and Dennis Lane. In addition, the Implementation Plan does not list Stanmore as an area with high potential for switching from using cars. This is because the geography, average journey distances and demographics are too great a barrier to encourage journeys to be undertaken by bike or on foot.

Green Lane and Dennis Lane are both incredibly long and steep hills. Cycling up these hills is extremely challenging and many people especially the elderly find it difficult to walk up these roads. The proportion of older people in Stanmore is a third higher than the national average, which means many residents rely on their cars for access to amenities.

Both these roads are already very safe for walkers and cyclists who do use them. They benefit from traffic calming measures including speed bumps, width restrictions and Green Lane being a 20 mph zone. TfL's Strategic Neighbourhood Analysis lists the area in the safest category across the whole of London.

There are plenty of open green spaces such as Stanmore Country Park and Bentley Priory in close proximity to these roads. This is where people walk for exercise rather than on the street!

The proposed closures would also impact the Little Common and Stanmore Hill conservation areas.

Conclusion

We can only conclude that the council chose not to do a formal consultation into proposed road closures since they were concerned they might not get a positive response. Most residents have only found out about these proposals by chance. The Department for Transport's statutory guidance

says, “Authorities should seek input from stakeholders during the design phase.” Residents are stakeholders! We should have been consulted.

The council’s own report from 2006 that led to the traffic calming measures on Green Lane clearly states that a full road closure would require a turning area at the top of Green Lane, that it would impact emergency response times, cause inconvenience to residents, overload the junctions on the Uxbridge Road and would be unacceptable, and Dennis Lane is subject to similar considerations. What has changed between then and now?

If the council is looking for problems to solve to encourage Stanmore residents to be more active we would suggest fixing the broken play equipment in our local park and the broken zebra crossing on Stanmore Hill for starters.

All of the data available from Harrow and TfL shows that the proposals, which are deeply unpopular, will actually cause problems for numerous people with protected characteristics while producing no material benefit.

We thank you for your time this evening and would be grateful if the council would take on board the views represented here this evening and agree not to proceed with the proposed LTNs for Green Lane and Dennis Lane.

DEPUTATION 2

Proposed Closure of Dennis Lane

My name is RG, I live in and represent the residents of Stanmore Hall which for those who may not know is in Wood Lane close to the junction with Stanmore Hill. We comprise 23 flats. 35 people reside here and 32 have signed the request for this deputation. I have also been asked to represent the interests of the Little Common Residents Association which I am happy to do. The association has written directly to yourself, Chair and to Cllr Henson, leader of the Council. We all oppose the closure of Dennis Lane.

Initially I would like to thank the chair for allowing us to send this deputation.

Secondly, I would like to complement the officers on a comprehensive and clear report. However, we are sorry not to see current traffic flow reports together with anticipated flows after the closure. How can considered decisions be made without them? Also, although chart 6 clearly shows 'Worse for the Community', and 'restricts access' as the leading views of those answering the questionnaire it would have been helpful to have seen individual site by site responses. Stanmore Hall & Little Common residents are surprised not to have been circulated individually by the Council about these proposals which we found out about totally by accident.

We do support the aims of the report in encouraging cycling and walking particularly for short journeys.

There are currently three roads which service Wood Lane running south to north. Brockley Hill, Dennis Lane and Stanmore Hill

Paragraph 2.29 of the report states that these proposals ‘were developed by identifying neighbourhoods with established problems with vehicular traffic cutting through estates and causing environmental and road safety problems’.

I would like to take issue here with the report because any past traffic problems have been effectively eliminated by the installation of a width restriction and by three chicanes along Dennis Lane.

People do currently walk along Dennis Lane mainly as the most convenient and shortest route from the Wood Lane area to Stanmore Station. The pavements are wide enough to avoid too close a distance between walkers. People do not use Dennis Lane for recreational walks and never will. Why should they when much more picturesque walks are available, with an access 200 yards further along Wood Lane to the Stanmore Country Park or another 200 yards to Pear Wood or through Stanmore Common? And for a spectacular walk how about further up Stanmore Hill to the Bentley Priory Nature Reserve. I don’t wish to upset our neighbours in Dennis Lane but a walk up and down their street is not a patch on the other 4 options.

Cyclist do use Dennis Lane now and will continue to do so closure or no closure

So, the closure of Dennis Lane is unlikely to attract more Walkers or more cyclist but what is likely to be the impact if the closure does go ahead?

Residents beyond the width restriction in Dennis Lane will encounter delays in emergency vehicles reaching them and will be unable to receive deliveries particularly from Supermarkets, due to the position of the current width restriction.

Now what happens to those drivers who currently use Dennis Lane in a northerly direction?

Those coming from Marsh Lane will probably turn left onto an already congested Stanmore Broadway joining those wishing to turn up Stanmore Hill at the lights. Those coming from London Road will join the melee at the Dennis Lane lights.

Heavens knows how many extra miles would be done by these vehicles. Not very environmentally friendly is it?

So far we have managed to cause traffic jams at traffic lights and pumped unnecessary exhaust fumes to be breathed in by the toddlers at the Cottrell Nursey and the Stanmore shoppers.

Now what happens to the current users of Dennis Lane who want to drive in a Southerly direction ?

Unable to drive down Dennis Lane the traffic will go mainly in one of two directions:

1) East along Wood Lane to the junction with Brockley Hill. At rush hours there is already a build-up of traffic wishing to turn into Brockley Hill so the build-up will get worse with idle traffic pumping fumes into the grounds of the RNOH and the Aspire Leisure Centre which is used for patient rehabilitation. OR
2) West along Wood Lane until its junction with Stanmore Hill. Again, during rush hours there is a build-up of traffic, often blocking our exit gate.

At this stage I would remind you that Wood Lane is a country lane not built as a through road but here you are wishing to pump more traffic into it!

The relatively recent housing developments off The Grove were given planning permission based on an ease of traffic dispersal which included Dennis Lane. Without that option the traffic will now be shunted along Wood Lane to either Brockley Hill or Stanmore Hill.

Users of the Hindu Temple currently having three options available to them when leaving. That option will be reduced to two.

Users of the Muslim Centre park their cars mainly in the Rugby Club car park. Again, their options with dispersal will be reduced by a third.

Planning permission for conversion of both of these sites was given on the assumption of some traffic flow down Dennis Lane. Both sites are operated responsibly and relationship with their neighbours are currently convivial. Will they remain convivial when through no fault of their own the users of these centres exacerbate traffic jams?

Should recovering patients at one of the country's leading Orthopaedic hospitals suffer increased traffic fumes?

During rush hour with the kids at school, here at Stanmore Hall we often have to wait for the traffic outside our exit gate to dissipate in order for us to drive out.

With the extra traffic forced to exit Wood Lane at the Stanmore Hill end there is a very good chance that our entry gate here at Stanmore Hall will be blocked in. Vehicles (unfortunately sometimes including ambulances) wishing to turn right from Wood Lane into Stanmore Hall may find their paths blocked. As they wait for the traffic to clear they will undoubtedly hold up cars behind them wishing to drive further along Wood Lane, thus causing major traffic jams possibly stretching into Stanmore Hill.

Stanmore Hall and Little Common are both part of Conservation Areas. On page 20 of Harrow's Conservation Policy document you will see that one of the key issues in this

area is ‘Traffic along Wood Lane’. So, the proposal for closure of Dennis Lane which will undoubtedly increase traffic flow through our Conservation areas, is clearly contrary to your own policy. So, if you voluntarily break one of your own rules will you be able to uphold the others?

One of our residents, 88 years young S, potters around in the greenhouse which is against the wall flanking the road. Do we want him to be subject to increased car fumes?

One of our more senior citizens aged 93, for anonymity we will call her J, who still drives but sadly can’t walk very well has emailed me with the following message. ‘they are crazy changing a system that works well…go for it… and if you need my help let me know.’

The proposals in front of you will cause increased traffic jams, are environmentally unfriendly and break your own rules for conservation areas.

For the sake of the residents in Stanmore Hall and Little Common, the users of the Muslim Centre, the users of the Hindu Temple, the patients at the RNOH, the residents off The Grove but particularly for Stuart and Jane, please remove Dennis Lane from your list of road closures.

I am happy to take any questions from the panel.

DEPUTATION 3

TARSAP - Deputations
Service road petition GC021337-R

I have set out below the main point of my deputation:

The scheme was not thought out properly as businesses are really suffering through lack of parking for customers. There is virtually no footfall to the shops. People attending Honeypot Lane clinic have nowhere to park. The thought that the barriers will increase football is sheer ludicrous and cyclists do not visit the shops.

All the shops are suffering and some are thinking of closing permanently. The restaurants have no business as customers cannot find anywhere to park. Residents who live above the shops and have parking permits can only park on the east side of the service road therefore using up what places there are.

Cars are using the slip road to avoid queuing at the traffic lights and speeding through the service road thus being a danger to other road users. I had previously asked the council if the can put a road hump at the beginning of the service road to slow the traffic but was told that the flat residents would object because of the noise created.

Why was Honeypot Lane shops and Queensbury roundabout shops chosen for these barriers and not Stanmore? This is totally unfair to the shops involved. Whilst supermarkets have their own car park facilities, this is leaving the small shops at a total disadvantage as the barriers are closing car parking bays.

DEPUTATION 4

Thank you for the opportunity to present this deputation to Harrow council.

I object to the proposals for the Low Traffic Neighbourhood LTN02 scheme Pinner View area and Headstone South.

I live on Chandos Rd in the middle of LTN-02 where there are plans to implement a scheme which will place physical vehicular blockades, or planters, on Pinner View, thus leaving residents stranded on one side of the road or the other and having to drive in various directions to get to the nearest main road and onwards.

When I first heard there were proposals to improve the local environment, encourage walking etc I looked forward to seeing the proposals. To learn that the proposals amount to planters blocking resident's main access road was disappointing and there was frustration at what is a wasted opportunity.

Normally one would expect that when a public scheme is tabled that a number of options would be discussed and assessed in terms of impact on the environment, impact on crime, impact on other forms of transport, impact on the public realm, impact on health and safety, impact on residents. From the responses I have received from Harrow Council, either none of these impacts are known or else are not being disclosed.

For any scheme to get the green light, the benefits must be clear, otherwise the default option is do nothing. Going ahead with a scheme which has no benefits is playing with residents' lives and is reckless. If the proposer cannot articulate the benefits and back up the proposals with evidence or data, then it must be questioned whether the benefits exist or are achievable.

Residents that managed to hear about the proposals have been given no data, reports, impact assessments or modelling that suggest the scheme will benefit residents; Residents will actually be worse off after the scheme is implemented in terms of traffic, air pollution and additional travel time; Residents are being penalised for the driving habits and behaviours of non-residents; No alternative options have been presented, e.g. ANPR; The so called "problem" has been overstated and the council has been disingenuous about this now being a reaction to covid. If there ever was a real problem there would be data to support it.

The additional traffic on Pinner View from traffic cutting through from Parkside to Pinner Road during rush hour is negligible, it is certainly not a "rat-run" that needs to be fixed. There is no logic in imposing a poor scheme which will adversely affect residents 24hrs a day because of a negligible increase in traffic for a short time during the day. Remember the scheme not only blocks Pinner View to non-residents, it blocks it to residents. 14 roads lead on to Pinner View and you are sending every one of the residents of those roads in another direction, it is ridiculous and will result in gridlock elsewhere in the area. Pinner View is a road, it's meant for traffic and is currently doing what it was built for, why you would look to block it is a mystery.

What options were discounted in order to arrive at the solution to place planters blocking Pinner View? Surely the technology exists that will not adversely affect residents, while keeping non-residents to the main roads, as other areas in London have managed to do successfully? The technology absolutely exists to fix the alleged problem without adversely affecting residents. We live in an age of autonomous cars and intelligent traffic management, if the best that the council can suggest is blocking the roads with big flowerpots then questions must be asked. I note that Hounslow council has made ANPR work in south Chiswick but Harrow has gone the flowerpot route. Why can't we make this work?

Residents can continue to use Pinner View and visitors will have to use the side roads, which is what they would have to do under the LTN-02 proposals anyway. In this way you are only penalising non-residents and allowing residents to carry on as before. There is a win-win solution out there if only the scheme was planned correctly. Any solution is not the best solution. What Harrow should be concerned about is the additional traffic coming from the new developments Harrow View West and Eastman village. It is insanity and a disaster waiting to happen to force us into Harrow View given the current traffic flows on that road. What traffic modelling has been done on this or are residents expected to take a leap of faith and wait for the inevitable accident on Harrow View? If you tried to design a worse solution you couldn't have done it any worse than the current proposals.

One of the reasons we decided to make our home in Harrow was accessibility. We can drive to tube stations, supermarkets, church, schools and work relatively easily. To lose access to 2 of our 3 tube stations and to make all of the other destinations longer and further, for no discernible benefit and for no apparent reason, is unacceptable.

Many of my neighbours have expressed a similar view where losing access via Pinner View will have a negative impact on their lives and there is frustration that no other options have been discussed.

The proposed blockade of Pinner View is unnecessary. There are no stated benefits for the scheme other than alleged reduction in air pollution and walking, but these are aspirational. Nothing has been quantified and the scheme has no success criteria. I have asked Harrow for this information twice and both times nothing has come back other than it is now being done for "covid crisis" reasons. Which is it? I don't believe these schemes have anything to do with coronavirus mitigation as the council now claims as the plans for LTN-02 were in place long before the virus outbreak.

Harrow planning told me in July this year that "*the proposals are to assist with the corona virus crisis".* This is demonstrably untrue, Harrow wanted to implement these schemes long before coronavirus was an issue.

If the proposals were allegedly being consulted on before the crisis they couldn't have been part of a response to a "crisis" that didn't exist 6 months ago.

If *"the council`s priority is to address the health crisis"* which didn't exist when you started trying to implement this, what were the original reasons for implementing this scheme pre-Covid?

A company called Sustrans allegedly held consultation and workshops with stakeholders some months before the coronavirus outbreak. If the proposals were being consulted on before the virus outbreak how can Harrow say that these proposals are part of a response to the coronavirus health crisis, it isn't and it wasn't, LTN-02 was in motion long before anybody had heard of coronavirus. If it is now to do with coronavirus what were Sustrans discussing back in January 2020?

I believe the council has received, or is about to receive, funding which it wants to spend on these schemes. I can't comment on other LTN's but LTN02 has not been planned properly, there are no reports available and therefore no assessments of traffic modelling, environmental or crime impacts other than the claim that "it's worked elsewhere". I don't live "elsewhere", my family and I live in Harrow. It's not clear what it is that has worked elsewhere but despite zero evidence of any planning having taken place Harrow Council are happy to proceed at haste. The implementation has now been accelerated without adequate consultation. I fear that because of the lack of planning and in an attempt to secure and spend funding as quickly as possible, a poor scheme is about to be implemented on the basis that somebody "thinks" it is a good idea. This will adversely impact the lives of hundreds of residents, many of whom are <u>still</u> unaware of the proposals or it's impacts.

I believe the planned implementation of LTN-02 should be stopped or at least postponed so that proper planning can take place and the data on which the decision should have been made can be made available and properly assessed and the benefits quantified before public money is wasted. I find it unusual that Harrow Council are adamant that they will proceed with a proposal that will adversely affect hundreds of residents' lives, without a shred of data existing upon which this decision has been based. The notion of doing something just because you've been given money is wasteful and I'm sure was not the intention of the funding source. Implementing this scheme is the equivalent of firing shots into a crowd just because you've been given free bullets, it's reckless and negligent. Blowing money on a half-baked scheme that is detrimental to many residents' lives is worse than doing nothing.

It is folly to disrupt the lives of hundreds or maybe thousands of residents under the guise of coronavirus crisis management. I work for a telecoms company and I can state for a fact that working patterns have changed forever, the telecoms industry has reacted to put in place fibre and 5G infrastructure to allow people to work from home, it is conjecture from Harrow to say that we need to change road layouts because of the "risk" of an increase in traffic. That is an opinion bordering on misrepresentation.

While we are talking about the involvement of Sustrans, I have looked at Sustrans' website and their "Introductory Guide to Low Traffic Neighbourhood Design". Sustrans's website says the issues to consider are;

- *poorest air quality*
- *highest deprivation*

- *poor access to green space*
- *highest traffic volumes, particularly percentage of through traffic*
- *the high density of collisions, particularly for the most vulnerable users*
- *the greatest number of schools*
- *low public transport accessibility*
- *low car ownership*
- *highest childhood obesity*
- *local support.*

On Harrow's own Transport Local Implementation Plan it states *"Harrow contributes 2.1% of all the CO2 emitted across London. This puts the borough in 28th position out of the 33 London boroughs".* Further, a report by Switchcraft in Aug 2019 confirmed that Harrow has the 2nd lowest CO2 emissions of all the London Boroughs. Harrow must be commended on having such excellent air quality, but if you are trying to adversely disrupt our lives to improve us from being second best to best, i.e. one position, that is ridiculous. Have you completed modelling that measures air pollution and what levels you expect emissions to reduce to? This scheme will increase pollution rather than helping the health and wellbeing of residents.

By Sustrans's own design criteria therefore, there is no justification. The environmental situation is certainly not a priority. So we can safely discount this being about covid and its certainly not about the environment. If anything, sitting in cars making longer journeys and queuing at the traffic lights on Harrow View will make sir pollution worse not better. This scheme is impossible to justify under Sustrans's own planning guidelines.

According to Plumplot.com, robbery, anti social behaviour and drug crime in Harrow have increased in the last year. Anti-social behaviour has increased by 47%. Why not spend the money on crime reduction which is actually needed, rather than blowing money on an aspirational scheme?

(I ran out of time here).

DEPUTATION 5

School Streets ANPR camera proposal for Grimsdyke School, Hatch End.

Scheme SS-01 25 June 2020

The proposed School Street timings are from 8.15am for 1 hour and 2.45pm for 1 hour, Monday to Friday. Entry by Permit Holders will be free in these time periods but those without a permit will incur a penalty.

https://harrowstreetspacesproposals.commonplace.is/schemes/proposals/school-streets/details

https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/commonplace-customer-assets/harrowstreetspacesproposals/SS-01_GA%20GIMSDYKE%20SCHOOL_B.pdf

Deputation to TARSAP 10 August 2020

Good evening and thank you Chair for accepting this deputation.

My name is DS, a resident of Hillview Road, Hatch End. I am representing over 75 residents in the Hillview Community all of whom feel strongly that the Grimsdyke School Streets scheme SS-01 is badly conceived and instead of achieving its aims, it will promote greater congestion and pollution, increased traffic flows and lead to issues of road safety.

Critique

1. This scheme with all its caveats of being experimental, subject to amendment, of limited or indefinite duration, is being imposed on residents however laudable and well intentioned it may be. Explanations that there was little time (despite being conceived in May) and speed was of the essence, do not explain why until recently there has been no proactive publicity by Harrow Council and still no communication with residents either in Sylvia Avenue or the wider affected area. Just as incomprehensible is the fact that considering that the scheme drwg. Is dated 19 & 25 June, this scheme was not mentioned in the Grimsdyke Road Parking Review documentation which was being officially consulted at the same time (12 June to 2 July). This disconnect is incomprehensible. It is highly probable that consultees would have a given a significantly different response if they had been aware of this scheme. Whilst the 2 projects are different, and contrary to the implied position of Officers, these 2 schemes do and should interact. A holistic approach is required which would evolve into an integrated scheme for a healthier and safer environment for walking, scooting and cycling and substantially resolve traffic problems in the area.
   As of now, residents are astonished, resentful, distrustful and angry that it is being imposed in this way.

2. Pre & post Covid, the yellow school entrance markings at *both* Sylvia Avenue entrances to Grimsdyke School, other yellow lining and the periodic presence of the mobile CCTV vehicle, appeared to discourage parents vehicles from this stretch of road. Instead they are using Shaftesbury Playing Fields car park, other adjacent roads such as Hillview, Colburn, Lyndon, and across the main railway line, The Avenue. What vehicle count measurement do Officers have for Sylvia Avenue and for what date / time period and by how much do Officers think that this will reduce?

3. Vehicles which do not have valid entry permits will either enter the zone (and pay the penalty) or wait until end of the period. As there is no surplus space in the Shaftesbury Playing Fields car park or on-street in the feeder roads or adjoining roads, where will they wait? This will add to congestion and environmental noise and air pollution and potentially adversely impact on safety.

4. The scheme as proposed will require children /parents going from/to/through Shaftesbury Playing Fields to cross the uncontrolled 2 way traffic flow in Colburn Avenue at the “dog leg” to access Sylvia Avenue which will now be closed off. This area is already congested as there is insufficient access road width for 2 way vehicle flow into/out of the carpark, and insufficient pavement capacity to this carpark for the children and parents, some with buggies, scooters and bikes. How can this be safer or healthier as there will now be increased manoeuvrings of vehicles which are not permit holders looking to find a set-down place or park until entry permitted?

5. Regrettably this scheme does not improve the environment or enhance safety for the children / parents who already walk/cycle / scoot along upper Hillview Road and into Colburn Avenue. These are the feeder roads to the Playing Fields car park, Sylvia Avenue and adjoining roads.

6. Overall, except for those living in Sylvia Avenue, residents and pedestrians in adjoining and feeder roads, are likely to be adversely affected with increased air and noise pollution, reduced safety, inconvenience, arrogant driving behaviour and potential damage.

Questions

In the absence of information about this scheme either on the council website or in the Report for this evening's mtg., we have a number of questions

1. What criteria are being used to measure the success of this scheme and what are the base line metrics?
2. The intention is to implement this scheme by way of an Experimental Traffic Order valid for 6 months. The Report on the table for this evening refers to scheme amendments. How will they be implemented during the 6 month period or any extension thereof?
3. There are many questions regarding eligibility for a virtual permit:-
   How many vehicles per address in Sylvia Avenue can be registered free of charge?
   Do they all have to be registered with the DVLA to that address?
   How will teachers and others with legitimate purpose at Grimsdyke School have access during these restricted times?
   Will relatives of residents within the Scheme area be able to have a permit?
   How will taxis, blue badge holders and similar have penalty free access?
   How will visitors, nurses, carers, tradesmen, deliveries etc. be permitted?
   How will any of the above be able to register in advance – will system be open 24/7?
   How will their legitimacy to enter be determined?
   Will access by local authority vehicles be exempt? If so why? They are a major contributor to congestion etc. Why cannot they be rescheduled?

   If all of the above are allowed to enter, what is the environmental and safety benefit?

4. Where will vehicles without entry permits park?
5. Will vehicles without entry permits e.g. they may have entered before the restricted time period, be able to leave the Zone without penalty?
6. Will this scheme operate during school holidays?
7. Whilst the permit is currently free, what guarantees are there that a charge will not be made in the future if the scheme is extended or made permanent?
8. What is the penalty cost for entry with no permit? Where is that displayed?
9. Who is the beneficiary of the penalties?
10. What access will law enforcement and other agencies have to camera images & data? For how long will these records be kept?

Requests

1. To further encourage walking, scooting and cycle riding and safer road crossing and irrespective of the Parking Review, please use an Experimental Traffic Order to expand the local 20mph zone to include the section of Grimsdyke Rd from Uxbridge Rd to Hallam Gardens and all of Hillview Road.

2. Currently in the absence of a marked layout, car parking in the Shaftesbury Playing Fields car park is not optimised. The Environment Portfolio Holder is requested to authorise the relevant Council department to promptly mark out this space so that it is available from the commencement of this scheme SS-01 to minimise on-street carparking at peak school traffic times.

3. The responses to the SS-01 Consultation in the coming months will be materially influenced by the imminent Parking review outcome. When will this be in the public domain?

4. Many residents are of the view that the consultation on the Parking Review is now compromised and invalid if SS-01 is going to be continued after 6 months. A classic Catch 22 situation. It would be helpful if the Officer's report on the parking review and the SS-01 consultation took into account both schemes and gave the implications if SS-01 was terminated or it continued (if necessary in an amended form) indefinitely.

5. Residents request that a leaflet plus a website link, explaining the proposed scheme with Q&A's and the registration process is distributed to all houses who were invited to participate in the recent Grimsdyke Road parking review. The leaflet should also explain the interaction of this scheme with the Parking Review, the time table for taking this review forward to Stage 2 and a proposal from Officers to engage with residents, suitably socially distanced.

In conclusion, and in the spirit of constructive engagement, I can make this presentation available to TARSAP and / or Officers if this would be helpful and also offer to meet Officers with relevant Councillors to assist in going forward.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank