

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

17 SEPTEMBER 2003

Chair: * Councillor Miles

Councillors: * Arnold * Mrs Kinnear
 * Burchell * Kinsey (4)
 * Choudhury * John Nickolay
 * Harriss * Anne Whitehead

* Denotes Member present
 (4) Denotes category of Reserve Member

PART 1 - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Controlled Parking Zones - Review of Permits**

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which considered the provision of business permits, special care and school parking permits with Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), and considered charges for environmentally friendly cars.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from a representative of a Wealdstone business. The depute informed the meeting that his business had been located in Wealdstone for nearly five years. The business employed five other staff, including one member of staff from outside the borough, and good parking was essential for successful running of the business. He stated that he expected parking facilities for businesses to be provided in the area, especially as residents parking bays were often empty during the day. He added that he would be interested in obtaining a business permit, but the proposed level of cost was prohibitive.

In response to a question from a Member, the depute informed the meeting that his business required convenient parking for both staff and visiting clients. He added that the business permits for the local car parks were also too expensive. In response to further questions, he suggested that £100 was a reasonable amount to pay for a permit, considering residents only paid £40 a year.

Officers informed the meeting that this report considered permits for businesses, schools and carers. He clarified that business permits were designed for operational use, not all day parking by staff. This was a reflection of local and regional policies and was in line with the policies of other boroughs. As the introduction of business permits was a new policy across many boroughs, there was not yet a consistent method of best practice. The results of the policy would be revisited as part of the annual CPZ review, and adaptations made if necessary.

An Officer reminded the meeting that CPZs were only introduced following extensive consultation with both residents and businesses. Policy within CPZs was to make short stay parking easier and restrict long stay parking, such as commuters.

In response to a question from a Member, Officers informed the meeting that a business permit for the multi-storey car park in Wealdstone was £400 per year. He added that it was good practice to charge more for on street parking than off street parking. Following further questions, it was confirmed that the proposal was to charge £500 for an annual business permit to park on the street.

During discussion of the limit of two permits per business, Officers reminded the meeting that the aim of CPZs was to manage parking and prioritise residents. The issuing of more than two permits per business could create problems the parking schemes were designed to solve.

In response to comments from a Member, Officers confirmed that business permits only allowed parking for up to three hours at any one time, unlike permits for the proposed off street car parking. Officers reiterated that this was because there was still too much parking on the street and they were keen to encourage parking in car parks.

A Member commented that Harrow should make greater efforts to accommodate small businesses such as the depute's, or Harrow would lose out to neighboring boroughs. An Officer commented that on street capacity was often a problem, hence the need for a CPZ in the first place, and it was a question of balance between the needs of

businesses and residents and others. Following further discussion, a Member informed the meeting that the cost of a permit was tax deductible.

A Member of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel, present to speak on this item, stated her support for the depute and voiced her concern for the effect the high charges would have on Wealdstone. She suggested that there should not be a borough-wide charging policy, instead charges should be bespoke to each area. A Member suggested that the possibility of relating business permit charges to rateable values should be investigated. In response, a Member reminded the Panel that CPZs were put in at the request of local community because of the excessive demands on limited road space.

A Member commented that it acted as a disincentive to use public transport if parking costs were cheaper. Other issues to consider included the environmental impact of car use and the costs of this impact. In conclusion, she suggested that the cost of a permit could be reduced slightly from that proposed.

Following a suggestion from a Member, Officers stated that it was technically possible to issue differing numbers of permits based on the size of applicants' businesses, although it may be difficult to verify the number of employees. He noted that other boroughs did not operate in this way.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association Advisor reminded the Panel that roads were for moving traffic, not for parking. Therefore, it was essential that parking charges encouraged the use of off-street parking over on-street parking. He suggested that charges for off-street parking could be reduced to encourage this.

Members noted their support for the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association Advisor's proposal and suggested that certain Pay and Display bays could be made available to business users. A Member also commented that some small businesses were unable to use public transport, as they required a car for their work.

A Member of the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel commented that while she would welcome reduced charges for long stay off-street parking, it was still necessary to make Wealdstone more user-friendly.

Officers informed the meeting that only Harrow town centre, Wealdstone, Pinner and Stanmore had provision for off street parking for business use. Spaces were only offered when capacity allowed and preference was given to short-term use.

Following discussion, Members agreed that charges for both on and off street business parking should be reviewed, and should reflect the need to encourage off-street parking. Members also suggested that the Wealdstone CPZ area could be used in any pilot scheme.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That (1) Business Parking Permits within the Borough's Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) as described in paragraph 6.12 (with the exception of 6.12 (b) and (f)) of the report and as set out below, be authorised, and officers be authorised to make provision for business permits under the powers provided by Section 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984,

- (a) Business parking should be in shared use (Business/P&D) bay converted from existing parking spaces.
 - (b) The maximum stay should be limited to 3 hours or that of the associated P&D, whichever is less.
 - (c) The maximum size of a vehicle should be 2.3 metres high and 5.5 metres long.
 - (d) The maximum number of permits per business per year should be two;
- (2) a further report be prepared considering options for setting charges for business permit parking on and off-street;
- (3) the introduction of (1) above be carried out for each zone at their next review;
- (4) carers parking permits as described in paragraph 6.19 of the report and as set out below, be introduced
- (a) In order to minimise abuse, a carer's permit bearing the resident's road name,

is issued to the resident in question in receipt of Disability Benefit or Attendance Allowance for use on any visiting vehicle. The permit be free of charge and renewable annually;

(5) up to two permits to schools within a CPZ as described in paragraph 6.22 of the report and as set out below, be provided

- (a) When designing future zones, and when reviewing existing ones, a small number of free, or pay and display bays be introduced near school entrances, where this will not unreasonably disadvantage residents, and where off-street parking is not available. These would be intended for school visitors. Where it is not possible to introduce these bays, a Head Teacher be allowed to purchase visitors permits provided the school is within a CPZ and has a Green Travel Plan
- (b) Where the Head Teacher believes it is essential, for school operational reasons, for staff vehicles to park near to the school, the Head Teacher may apply for up to two "resident's" permits, subject to the following;
 - (i) There is no, or insufficient, on-sit parking
 - (ii) The school has a Green Travel Plan
 - (iii) Such provision will not unreasonably detract from residents parking space

These permits to be charged at the 'first vehicle' rate and to be endorsed with the school name for use by any vehicle authorized by the Head Teacher;

(6) the existing 50% discount on residents' permits, offered to drivers of environmentally friendly vehicles, as defined in the traffic order, be made free of charge, as described in paragraph 6.24.

[REASON: To control Parking]

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Sudbury Hill Stations Area Controlled Parking Zone - Formal Objections to the Advertised Traffic Order

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which considered formal objections to the advertised traffic order to introduce a CPZ in the roads near Sudbury Hill Underground and Overground Stations. Introducing the report, the Chair reminded the meeting that the Panel had agreed to the implementation of the scheme at its last meeting, subject to the consideration of formal objections to the traffic order.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from residents of Greenford Road. The depute apologised for the late notice of the deputation and stated there had been some difficulties with communication. He stated that it was inappropriate for consultation to be carried out during August and suggested that there could have been several further objections if the traffic orders had been published during September. He requested that implementation of the scheme be delayed for reconsultation with residents. There was support for residents' parking bays, but the scheme would lead to the loss of 16 parking spaces. The need for enough space for lorries to turn was recognised, but the needs of residents should take priority.

The original plans had the existing pedestrian refuge outside 63 Greenford Road positioned further south on Greenford Road, allowing increased residents' parking in this area of the road. Due to an objection from a builder's merchants, the island had returned to its original location with no consultation with residents. This has resulted in insufficient parking for residents of 62-76 Greenford Road. He added that the proposed yellow lines outside 73 Greenford Road would leave the resident with no alternative parking and that residents of Greenford Road were being unfairly punished. He also suggested that the road was too busy for a cycle lane to be effective and that bus stops had led to the removal of a further six parking spaces on Greenford Road. He appreciated that the scheme was an attempt to stop commuter parking, but stated that the revised scheme would ruin the area.

A second member of the deputation informed the Panel that, with the revised scheme she would not be able to park outside her house because of double yellow lines. This was particularly important as she had a young child. She asked the Panel to consider the situation of local residents and ensure all had a place to park.

Officers informed the meeting that the main consultation with residents had taken place prior to the Panel's June meeting. The Panel was now considering objections to traffic

orders, which had been advertised on 7 August 2003. He stated that there was urgency in the introduction of this scheme as Brent intended to introduce a CPZ on neighboring roads in the immediate future, and this scheme was required to deal with the displaced parking.

Objections received have related to details of the design, not the principle of the scheme. The aim of the scheme has been to provide as much residents' parking as possible, while taking safety into account. In the original plans, the existing pedestrian refuge had been sited further south. However, following investigation, it was shown that the refuge would prevent deliveries entering a builders merchants and the refuge had been moved back to its original location. Double yellow lines would be placed at and both sides of the refuge as parked cars had contributed to two pedestrian accidents at this site in the last three years. Double yellow lines had been placed outside 73 Greenford Road to prevent parking within 10 metres of a junction, improving sight lines for pedestrians and motorists.

In response to a question from a Member, Officers commented that footway parking was not viable in this area as the footway was too narrow and the speed of traffic on the road would make manoeuvring difficult. Following further comments from Members, Officers noted that it would be difficult to alter the builders merchants premise to allow alternative delivery access. Rear access was not available for 62-76 Greenford Road.

Officers explained that when Brent had originally proposed a CPZ in this area, a joint meeting between Ealing, Brent and Harrow had been arranged, which Ealing did not attend. The meeting proposed a joint scheme, of which Ealing was informed. A further meeting was called which both Brent and Ealing attended. It appeared that Officers at Ealing had not informed Ward Councillors of the scheme and Ealing had requested implementation of the scheme be delayed but had not made a formal objection.

Officers informed the meeting that the closing date for objections to the advertised traffic orders for Brent's scheme was 25 September 2003, after which any objections received would not be considered by Brent. Funding for the Brent scheme from Transport for London (TfL) had already been secured, meaning that the Brent scheme could be implemented as quickly as October or November. Officers advised that Harrow needed to act quickly to protect its residents from the knock on effects of the Brent scheme, and should not delay the scheme waiting for Ealing to be ready.

In response to a question from a Member, Officers informed the meeting that the off road parking scheme proposed by the Housing Department in Hartington Close had been rejected by residents.

A Member commented that it was clear that there was a need for a CPZ in the area, especially in Cavendish Avenue. However, she would prefer to see a scheme which guaranteed residents' parking spaces. She proposed that the implementation of the scheme be deferred until Ealing's scheme was introduced.

Members stated that it was important to get the correct balance between pedestrian safety and the needs of residents. A Member commented that she was not convinced that the problems envisaged by residents would materialise when the scheme was implemented. If there were problems, the scheme could be reviewed at a future date.

A Member suggested that this area had outgrown itself and that the conflicting pressures of being an important transport link, allocation for businesses and a residential area were difficult to reconcile with each other.

Officers reminded the meeting that the majority of residents of Greenford Road supported the scheme. For the 63 houses on Greenford Road, of which 20 had off street parking, 47 parking bays had been provided.

An amendment to the resolution was moved by Members, and upon a vote, was lost. The amendment proposed that the scheme only be implemented from the borough boundary with Brent and Ealing to the junction between South Vale and Greenford Road.

(Councillor John Nickolay asked to be recorded as voting in favour of the above amendment)

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That (1) the objections be set aside for reasons given in appendix B of the report and

that the objectors be advised accordingly;

(2) all necessary steps be taken to complete the order making so that the controlled parking scheme can be implemented; and

(3) that officers be requested to seek advance funding to enable the scheme to be implemented within the current financial year in conjunction with the London Borough of Brent scheme.

[REASON: In order to control parking, improve bus services, improve safety and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.]

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Harrow Town Centre - Upgraded Waiting Restrictions - Objections

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which detailed objections to the statutory advertisement of upgraded waiting restrictions in Harrow Town Centre and recommended a modified scheme be implemented.

Officers informed the meeting that these changes had been proposed to tackle displaced parking from the introduction of Sunday car parking charges.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That (1) the objections be set aside for reasons given in appendix B of the report, and that the objectors be advised accordingly;

(2) the proposed no waiting at any time restriction not be implemented between the boundaries of 87/89 and 119/121 on the south-eastern side of Headstone Road, as shown at Appendix C of the report;

(3) officers take all necessary steps under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the proposals previously advertised subject to the amendment as stated at (2) above and as shown at Appendix C.

(4) the request to convert the resident bay in Headstone Road immediately north of Oakley Road be considered again at the next controlled parking zone review for this area.

RECOMMENDATION 4 - Crossover Policy Review

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which appended previous policy decisions relating to the determination of applications for vehicle crossovers and made appropriate recommendations.

Officers informed the meeting that they had reviewed the policy and attempted to improve it. In response to comments from a Member, Officers confirmed that pedestrian dropped kerbs would be moved if possible, although pedestrian safety and disabled access would remain the priority.

Members commented that the Council's 10% rejection rate for crossover applications was very good. A Member referred to the current appeal process and suggested that applicants be advised of the process.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the executive)

That (1) existing policies for vehicle crossings be re-affirmed, but

(2) that having reviewed the safety criteria to be applied for new vehicle crossings to corner properties, they should be formally adopted as:

- (i) access should only be taken from the less busy road (defined as the road of lower status according to the Harrow Unitary Development Plan)
- (ii) Where access is required to the side of the front garden it should preferably be located as far from the junction corner as possible, but in any event the tapered kerb must not start less than 6 metres from the channel of a main road, or 1.8 metres from an existing dropped kerb for pedestrians.
- (iii) The existing policy and practice of charging the costs of re-siting street furniture (to allow the construction of a vehicle crossing) to the applicant, be extended to include costs of relocating such pedestrian dropped kerbs.

(3) the likely provisions of the new London Local Authority & Transport for London Bill be noted.

[REASON: To enable consistency in the determination of applications for vehicle crossings]

RECOMMENDATION 5 - Pinner Wood School - Safe Routes to School Consultation Results and Recommendations

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which outlined proposed local improvements around Pinner Wood First and Middle Schools.

A Ward Member for Pinner, present to speak on this item, welcomed the proposals and noted that they tackled the problems suffered by both the school and residents. He added that residents of Blythwood Road were in favour of a limited scheme in their road, which they felt was most suited to their area.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That (1) in principle, the Safe Routes to Schools proposals for Pinner Wood Schools, as shown on drawing numbers CD75479/SS/GA/01 and CD75479/RM/01 in the consultants report be agreed;

(2) subject to statutory consultation and consideration of any formal objections to the following:

- (i) Latimer Gardens to be made one-way working from Pinner Hill Road to a point just South of the vehicle entrance to Pinner Wood School near the junction of Latimer Close under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- (ii) A puffin crossing to be provided on Pinner Hill Road just south of Latimer Gardens under section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- (iii) Traffic calming be provided along Latimer Gardens, and Blythwood Road under The Highways (Traffic Calming) Regulations 1999.
- (iv) Proposed waiting restrictions, school safety zones in Latimer Gardens, Latimer Close, Pinner Hill Road and Albury Drive be provided under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- (v) Bus stop clearways be provided in Pinner Hill Road at the southbound stop opposite Lyndhurst Avenue and the northbound stop by Crossway.

(3) details of order making for 2(i) to 2 (iv) be delegated to officers;

(4) to note that the traffic calming measures as shown on drawing number CD75479/SS/GA/02 for Blythwood Road is subject to consultation.

[REASON: To improve safety, reduce congestion and encourage walking to school]

RECOMMENDATION 6 - West Street - Petition for Bollards

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which responded to a petition received requesting the installation of bollards on the footway of West Street.

A Member of the Panel, who was also a Ward Member for Harrow on the Hill, informed the meeting that residents were unhappy with traffic speed and parking on West Street. In response to a Member's suggestion of raising the kerb, officers referred the Panel to the report where this was dealt with and reminded them that this it would cause problems with drainage.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That the Head petitioner be advised that the installation of bollards in West Street and other options considered would not be practicable nor desirable for reasons given in the report, but that the Police have been asked to carry out enforcement.

[REASON: To address the petitioners request]

Councillors Arnold, Harriss Mrs Kinnear and John Nickolay wish to be recorded as voting against the above resolution)

RECOMMENDATION 7 - Manor Road and Francis Road Areas Controlled Parking Zone - Consultation Results and Recommendations

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which outlined consultation results for the possible extension of the Harrow Town Centre CPZ to the Manor and Francis Road Area.

Officers recommended that those roads that had a clear majority in favour of joining should be included in the scheme. He suggested that roads on which the consultation results were close should be reconsulted and given the opportunity to join the scheme again as shown in the amended table and plan contained in the first supplemental agenda.

Resolved to RECOMMEND (To the Executive)

That (1) Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone and Residents Parking Scheme be extended to cover the area as shown in the amended Appendix C of the first supplemental agenda, the operational hours to be Mondays to Fridays 11.00 am to 12 noon; Subject to (2) and (3) below;

(2) the northern end of Francis Road as shown in Appendix C be included in Zone F; which operates Mondays to Saturdays 8.30am to 6.30pm;

(3) Crofts Road, Grange Road, Hill Road and Hill Crescent be reconsulted and if majority support, be included in the traffic orders to be advertised;

(4) officers be instructed to advertise the necessary traffic orders under sections 6 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and subject to the consideration of any formal objections that may be raised take all necessary action to implement the proposals.

PART II - MINUTES

14. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

<u>Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Ismail	Councillor Kinsey

15. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note the following declaration of interests:

- (1) Councillor Whitehead declared a pecuniary interest in part of item 9(c) as a carer of a resident within a controlled parking zone. She took no part in the debate and did not vote on part of the item.
- (2) Councillor Kinnear declared a personal interest in item 9(a) as she was a resident in the Harrow Town Centre controlled parking zone.
- (3) Councillor Harriss declared a personal interest in item 9(g) as he owned a premise in the West Street area with no off street parking.

16. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: (1) That all items be considered with the press and public present;

(2) that St Anselm's School – Petition for Pedestrian Crossings at the "Timber Carriage" Traffic Lights be moved from the Information Circular to the Agenda.

17. **Appointment of Advisors:**

RESOLVED: That the appointment of Mrs Carratt as representative of Harrow Association of Disabled People for the 2003/2004 Municipal Year be noted.

18. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a true and correct record.

19. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions

20. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no petitions received.

21. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following deputations:

- (1) Re – Controlled Parking Zones – Review of Permits: From a representative of a Wealdstone business

(See Recommendation 1)

- (2) Re – Sudbury Hill Stations Area Controlled Parking Zones – Formal Objections to the Traffic Order: From representatives of local residents

(See Recommendation 2)

22. **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 (1) 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm.

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

- (ii) The Box junction at the junction of Headstone Lane, George V Avenue and Pinner Road:

A Member informed the Panel that traffic was tailing back across this junction from North Harrow and requested that a report on the possibility of a box junction be submitted to the Panel by way of an information item following consultation with Ward Councillors. Members also commented that there had been similar problems at the junction of The Ridgeway and Imperial Drive and requested a similar report.

- (iii) Access Difficulties for Refuse Collection:

A Member, present to speak on this item, informed the Panel that the issue of access difficulties was borough-wide. She highlighted that certain roads in her Ward had suffer particular difficulties. The access difficulties had led to some residents' bins not being emptied on certain weeks.

The Member commented that the cause of the problems was obstructive parking blocking access for refuse collection vehicles. She suggested operating parking restrictions on rubbish collection days could solve some of the problems.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Association Advisor commented that if the rubbish collection vehicles were being obstructed, then so were emergency vehicles. He proposed that, with the co-ordination of neighbourhood watch, all streets should agree to park down one side of the street. The possibility of an awareness campaign to seek voluntary compliance to non-obstructive parking was also discussed.

Members agreed that this was a difficult problem to tackle and suggested that departments within the Council should work together to tackle areas that suffered repeat problems.

RESOLVED: That Officers report back to a future meeting on options to address the increasing problem of access difficulties for refuse collection

24. **St Anselm's School - Petition for Pedestrian Crossings at the "Timber Carriage" Traffic Lights:**

A Member of the Panel, also a local Ward Member, commented that a large number of children were unable to cross the road safely to reach St Anselm's School. Officers advised that a review of the signals at this junction had slowed because of an internal restructuring within Transport for London (TfL), meaning a new team was now responsible for the scheme. Officers agreed to seek a further site meeting with TfL and the Ward Member to consider the matter.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.06 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chair