

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

24 JUNE 2003

Chair: Councillor Jerry Miles

Councillors: * Currie (3) Arnold
Choudhury Harriss
Anne Whitehead Mrs Kinnear
Ismail John Nickolay

* Denotes Member present
(3) Denote category of Reserve Member
† Denotes apologies received

RECOMMENDATION 1 - Queensbury CPZ Proposals - Objections to Traffic Orders

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which considered formal objections to advertised traffic orders for the reduced Queensbury scheme, and made appropriate recommendations.

The Chair reminded the Panel that they had agreed to the implementation of the minimum scheme at the Panel's March meeting.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from a representative of the Queensbury Residents' and Traders' Association (QARA). The depute thanked Officers for their co-operation with the residents' association on this scheme, but suggested that three further alterations should be made. He requested that the advertised double yellow line from 252 Mollison Way to the proposed bus clearway be abandoned and the existing single yellow line retained. This proposal was at the request of some residents from Mollison Way. He also requested that the proposed double yellow lines across the front on 120 Turner Road be removed, shortening the yellow line by roughly three metres. His third request was for the reduction of the proposed double yellow lines at the entrances to alleyways on Reynolds Drive to half a house width either side.

In response, officers informed the meeting that they had taken all objections into consideration and, where possible, had accommodated them. Officers commented that the alterations requested on Reynolds Drive and Turner Road were possible. Officers opposed the alterations requested on Mollison Way as the scheme was designed to clear the bend in Mollison Way of cars and the shortening of the yellow line would compromise this. The scheme had already been reduced to the minimum possible and had to comply with the requests of the refuse collectors. An advisor to the Panel commented that the 114 Bus was delayed regularly in this area and welcomed a scheme which would reduce this. Members agreed and acknowledged Mollison Way was a problem.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That (1) objections to the advertised traffic orders as detailed in Appendix C be set aside for reasons given in the report, subject to the proposed amendments.

(2) officers be authorised to proceed with the amended traffic order making and implementation in accordance with Appendix D, subject to the shortening of double yellow lines outside 120 Turner Road by three metres and the reduction of double yellow lines where feasible to half a house width either side of alleyway entrances in Reynolds Drive, and advise the objectors accordingly.

REASON: To deter obstructive parking and improve access and road safety.

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Parking Charges, Objections to Traffic Order and Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone Consultation

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which considered formal objections to the Traffic Orders relating to borough wide changes to parking charges and presented the results of consultation on extension of the Harrow Town Centre, CPZ

The Chair informed the Panel that Sunday car parking charges had been part of the budget review. He noted that, following objections, the proposals for Chapel Lane car park had been withdrawn. No changes to the Harrow Town Centre CPZ would be made, although it would be reviewed as part of the annual CPZ review next year.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received deputations from representatives of Churches Together in Central Harrow and Middlesex New Synagogue. The deputees opposed Sunday car parking charging.

The deputee from Churches Together in Central Harrow informed the meeting that his organisation represented five churches in Central Harrow and all objected to Sunday car park charging. He stated that both the Harrow Baptist Church in College Road and the Church of St John the Baptist, Greenhill in Sheepcote Road would be badly effected by the charges, with parishioners potentially having to pay parking charges of £3 to £4 each Sunday. He objected to the charges on the basis that people would be penalised for attending church and claimed the proposals were religiously insensitive as Sunday was a special day for Christians. He added that there were several objections raised by the Harrow Town Centre Forum and that the charges would have a derogatory effect on the town centre. In response to a question from a Member, the deputee stated that the churches held events throughout the day on Sundays.

The deputee from Middlesex New Synagogue informed the Panel that his organisation opposed the charges because it would have a detrimental effect on people using the synagogue on Sundays. The synagogue's own car park was closed for safety reasons so patrons were either required to use the car park in Vaughan Road or park on the road outside. The synagogue was used for weddings and a religious school on Sundays and patrons of these events would potentially be subject to car park charges. In response to a question from a Member, the deputee stated that the majority of users were not town centre residents.

Officers commented that there were also demands in the Vaughan Road car park from local residents as there was insufficient car parking spaces in Vaughan Road and the surrounding area for residents and that all people's aspirations could not be met. The car parks in Harrow town centre were there to provide vitality and viability for shops and offices and not parking for churches. The proposals did not prevent attendance at church, as there are several alternative methods of transport if church goers did not want to pay. These measures are proposed to increase the turnover of parking spaces.

A Member commented that Sunday charging would encourage shoppers to go elsewhere. In response officers stated that the scheme would attract shoppers to the town centre as finding a parking space would be easier. Shoppers were attracted to a shopping centre by the certainty of finding a parking space. However, without extending the CPZ operating hours parking on side roads could be a problem.

In response to a question from a Member, officers confirmed that measures to protect bus routes into Harrow were included in the scheme. Residents immediately affected would be consulted on these measures at the Traffic Orders stage. The proposals included placing double yellow lines 'under' pay and display bays to allow their suspension for road works etc. Officers assured the meeting that no parking spaces would be lost as a result of this scheme.

In discussion on the parking account, officers confirmed that parking revenue was ring-fenced and was spent on Freedom Passes and that the account was in deficit.

In response to comments from Members, officers assured the meeting that the scheme was designed for traffic management purposes, not revenue raising. Sunday charging would create a better turnover of cars, attracting more people to shop in Harrow town centre.

The Advisor to the Panel from the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association commended that bus use was not free on a Sunday, so why should parking be free. He reiterated that the availability of parking spaces was an important tool in attracting shoppers to Harrow. He noted that both Watford and Uxbridge charge on Sundays and that had not seen a reduction in business. He suggested that a flat charge for parking could be applied, as suggested in the letter from Debenhams.

A Member commented that free parking on Sundays meant that visitors to Harrow town centre on Sundays did not consider alternative means of transport. She added that churches would have to consider car sharing and green travel plans. In response a Member commented that Sunday was traditionally a family day with the family going to

church or shopping together by car and that in his experience he had no problems with the levels of traffic in Harrow town centre on a Sunday.

A Ward Member for Greenhill, present to speak on this item, commented that while he had sympathy for the deputees, he was satisfied that the changes were in the interest of the town centre and that the car park charges were for traffic management purposes.

A Member commented that churches were an important part of Harrow's vitality and the charges would affect the number of worshippers attending church. They suggested that Sunday charging was not inclusive and was penalising Christians. A Member stated that with the current level of car parking provision in Harrow town centre, she saw no reason to implement charging.

The deputy leader of the Council, present to speak on this item, commented that the trend towards increased Sunday trading could not be stopped but needed to be managed effectively. He again reassured the meeting that traffic management issues and not financial gain motivated this scheme. He reminded the Panel that no exceptions to parking charges were made for other religious communities on other days of the week, so to make the exception for churches would be creating inequality between religious groups. All new places of assembly, including religious buildings were required to submit a Green travel plan to obtain planning permission.

Summing up, the Chair thanked the Panel for a positive debate. Harrow would be falling in line with other town centres by introducing Sunday car park charging. It was not a revenue generating exercise but an attempt to improve the vitality and viability of Harrow town centre. In addition the scheme would improve the efficiency of buses, encouraging the use of alternative forms of transport.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That

(1) (a) for parking charges, the objections be set aside for reasons given in Appendix 3 except for (b) below and that the objectors be advised accordingly; and

(b) for Chapel Lane car park on a Saturday, both the proposed and existing charge for long stay (over 6 hours) be withdrawn;

(2) for the Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone no action be taken as this time, but a review be carried out after parking charges implementation, with the timing of the review to be considered at the next annual CPZ programme review in March 2004.

(3) certain on-street waiting restrictions be upgraded under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the proposals as shown in Appendix 7 subject to the consideration of any formal objections received by the advertising of the necessary Traffic Order.

(REASON: To control parking and to allow for the monitoring of potential parking problems after implementation)

(Councillors Arnold, Harriss, Mrs Kinnear and John Nickolay wish to be recorded as having voted against recommendations 1(a) and 3).

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Sudbury Hill Stations Area Controlled Parking Zone and Related Traffic Management Works

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which outlined proposals for a Sudbury Hill Stations Area controlled parking zone (CPZ), incorporating other traffic management proposals for Greenford Road. The report made appropriate recommendations based on the results of consultation to date.

The Chair informed the Panel that the Traffic Orders for Brent's CPZ in neighboring roads would be released shortly. The Brent zone would operate Monday to Saturday, 8.00am to 6.30pm. The consultation had produced a clear majority for both the CPZ and for the safety and cycle features.

Officers tabled an amended appendix 2 which contained an update on the consultation results and drew the Panel's attention to the second supplemental agenda which contained the withdrawal of the rearrangement of pedestrian refuges in Greenford Road. This revision was made following consultation with a local builders merchant over the size of lorries accessing the premises. This change would require reconsultation of affected residents. Officers confirmed that the Bus stop clearways would operate for 24 hours.

In response to questions regarding the long term plans for a pedestrian and cycle bridge, officers informed the meeting that a bid for a feasibility study would be made next year. If the feasibility report was positive, a bid for funding for the implementation of the scheme would be made the following year. Officers commented the bridge was situated on the proposed route of the 'Capital Ring' strategic walking route.

Members commented that the consultation response favoured CPZ operating hours from 11.00am to 12.00pm while the report proposed operating hours of 8.00am to 6.30pm. Officers explained that this had been proposed as the original appendix 2 showed an even split for the two options and to match Brent's operating hours. The CPZ could operate from 11.00am to 12.00pm, but this would require additional signing and may cause some confusion for motorists. Officers also advised a review of the scheme in the spring may lead to residents preferring the longer hours following experience, resulting in abortive costs and resource implications. Officers recommended that, even if the operating hours were revised, the Pay and Display parking spaces should still operate from 8.00am to 6.30pm.

In response to comments from a Member, Officers explained that the objections from residents' to the new bus stop adjacent to Sudbury Hill Station was because they felt it would restrict their view when making a right turn out of Cavendish Avenue. The installation of pay and display bays instead, officers felt would cause more restriction of vision than a bus which would seldom be there.

In response to further questions from Members, officers confirmed that consultation on the Toucan crossing on Sudbury Hill had not yet commenced and that any objections received would be reported to the Portfolio Holder.

In discussion of the scheme, a Member encouraged the Panel to adopt the 11.00am to 12.00pm CPZ operating hours to assist local businesses, who he suggested would be badly effected by a lack of parking for shoppers with longer operational hours. Another Member endorsed these comments and stated that short term parking spaces were key for long term economic viability of the area. She commented that commuter parking was the main problem in the area, and while the residents of Cavendish Avenue would be pleased with the scheme, there were some concerns that residents of South Vale would have insufficient parking spaces. The Member also stated objections to the cycle lanes and curb build-out and her support for the objection from residents to the new bus stop adjacent to Sudbury Hill Station.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Executive)

That the following be implemented:

- (1) the Sudbury Hill Stations Controlled Parking Zone incorporating other measures for Greenford Road as shown in Appendix 4, the operational hours to be Mondays to Saturdays 11am to 12pm subject to the advertising of the necessary traffic orders under Sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the consideration of any formal objections that may be received as a result.
- (2) the two toucan crossings on the Greenford Road as shown at Appendix 4 under Section 23 of the same Act;
- (3) the Clementine Churchill funded toucan crossing in Sudbury Hill as shown at Appendix 3, subject to consideration of consultation responses, under section 23 of the same Act;
- (4) the local safety scheme measures, the bus priority measures, advisory cycle lanes and advance stop lines as shown at Appendix 4; and
- (5) the long-term 'walkway' bridge feasibility study for Sudbury Hill (mainline station) will be subject of a future report be noted.

REASON: In order to control parking, reduce accidents, improve bus services and

encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.

(Councillor Mrs Kinnear wishes to be recorded as voting against recommendation 4)

1. **Appointment of Chair:**

RESOLVED: To note the appointment of Councillor Miles as Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2003/04.

2. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

RESOLVED: To note the attendance of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Reserve</u>
Councillor Burchill	Councillor Currie

3. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note the following declarations of interest:

(1) Councillor Mrs Kinnear declared a personal interest in item 11b as she was a resident in the Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone and a member of a local church.

(2) Councillor Bluston, present to speak on item 11b as an ward Councillor, declared a personal interest as a member of the Town Centre Forum, a trustee of Victoria Hall and a regular attendee at a synagogue.

4. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That all items on the agenda be considered with press and public present.

5. **Appointment of Vice-Chair:**

Councillors John Nickolay and Ann Whitehead were respectively nominated to the office of Vice Chair. Upon a vote it was,

RESOLVED: That Councillor Ann Whitehead be appointed as Vice-Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the 2003/2004 Municipal Year.

6. **Appointment of Advisors:**

RESOLVED: That the appointment of non-voting advisors to the Panel for the 2003-04 municipal year be noted:

Harrow and District Pedestrians' Association – Mrs R Belinfante
Harrow Public Transport Users' Association – Mr A Wood
North West Area Traffic Management (Met Police) – Mr M Faul

7. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a true and correct record.

8. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions.

9. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petition:

(1) Petition regarding a request for a residents' parking bay scheme from the residents of Bruce House, Sovereign Place: Councillor Bluston presented the above petition signed by 37 residents. Officers undertook to investigate the request and

report back to a future meeting.

10. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following deputations:

- (1) Re – Queensbury CPZ proposals – Objections to traffic orders: From a representative of the Queensbury Residents' and Traders Association. (See recommendation 1)
- (2) Re – Parking charges, objections to traffic orders and Harrow town centre controlled parking zone consultation: From a representative of the Churches Together in Central Harrow. (See recommendation 2)
- (3) Re – Parking charges, objections to traffic orders and Harrow town centre controlled parking zone consultation: From a representative of Middlesex New Synagogue. (See recommendation 2)

11. **Extensions to and Termination of the Meeting::**

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14(Part 4B of the Constitution it was:

RESOLVED: At 10.00pm to continue until 10.10pm

12. **Items Placed on the Agenda at the Request of a Member of the Panel**

(i) Rowlands Avenue Closure:

A Member informed the Panel that the Panel had agreed to the closure of Rowlands Avenue on 5 December 2001. At the last meeting the Panel, had been informed that work would begin in June, with work now due to start on 30 June. Gareth Thomas MP had raised the closure of Rowlands Avenue in Parliament and accused TfL of delaying the implementation of the scheme through failure to provide funding. The Member expressed his regret that a motorcyclist had died prior to the implementation of the scheme.

A Member commented that perhaps the implementation of the Rowlands Avenue closure could have been speeded up at the expense of other schemes. He added that he was alarmed at the number of rat-running drivers he saw. The Chair expressed his regret on behalf of the Panel at the accident. He assured the Panel a report would be presented to the Panel once the Coroner's investigation had been completed. He added that the implementation of the Rowlands Avenue closure was subject to objections to the experimental Traffic Orders. A Member commented that the local residents' association had campaigned for the closure of Rowlands Avenue for several years.

RESOLVED: That a report on the accident at the junction of Oxhey Lane and Rowlands Avenue be submitted to a future meeting.

(ii) Policy on Crossovers:

A Member had raised this issue as local residents had contacted him regarding the policy for permitting crossovers. A Member commented that he had been informed that permission for a crossover fell into the following categories, corners, trees, size of garden and number of crossovers permitted. A Member added that previous changes to policy on crossovers had led to some inconsistencies in the granting of permission for crossovers.

RESOLVED: That a report on crossover policy be submitted to the next meeting

13. **Portfolio Holder Decisions:**

RESOLVED: To note the report submitted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.01 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chair

This page is intentionally left blank