

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

3 MARCH 2004

Chair: * Councillor Miles

Councillors: * Burchell * John Nickolay
* Choudhury * Anjana Patel (2)
* Ismail * Ray (1)
* Kara * Seymour (4)

* Denotes Member present
(1), (2), (4) Denote category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**RECOMMENDATION 1 - Edgware Controlled Parking Zone Review - Consultation Results**

Your Panel received a report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which considered the results of consultation reviewing the Edgware Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and made appropriate recommendations.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received deputations from local residents. Dr Driscoll was unable to attend the meeting, and a statement from him was circulated and read out by the Chair. The statement was in support of the existing restrictions in Montgomery Rd and requested that no changes were made to the current operational hours of the CPZ.

The second deputation was from a resident of Gresham Road supporting the proposed revisions to the operational hours of the CPZ. The depute stated that he had been asked to address the Panel by several local residents who felt that although the area clearly needed a CPZ, not all roads required the same operational hours which were in force at the present time. He stated that the operational hours of the CPZ should be reduced in Gresham Road, Churchill Road and Montgomery Road. He refuted the points made in the previous depute's statement, and suggested that displaced parking would not be an issue in Gresham Road, Churchill Road and Montgomery Road. He noted that there were split zones over the borough boundary in Barnet, put the parking problems these roads faced were different to those faced in Edgware. The operational hours of the CPZ was causing problems to some residents who required regular visits from carers and family members. He stated that support for the current operational hours of the CPZ was based on unsupported claims and, excluding commuters, there was little demand for parking in Gresham Road, Churchill Road and Montgomery Road.

In response to a question from a Member, the depute stated that a one hour operational time discouraged commuters sufficiently, but still allowed residents to continue a normal life. He suggested that different operational hours were suitable for Mead Road and Handel way as they faced a different problem.

The Chair reminded the meeting that the Panel had agreed to recommend to the Portfolio Holder the implementation of the Edgware CPZ in June 2002. As part of the decision, a six to twelve months timetable for the review of the CPZ after implementation had been agreed, which begun in October 2003 and was now reported to the Panel.

In response to a question from a Member, an officer explained that the roads in the area had different problems, requiring different solutions. However, he did not think having two different zones would cause excessive confusion, as the zones would operate in two different sets of roads. Following further questions, officers stated that there were strict regulations covering the signing of zones, although they undertook to make the signage as clear as possible while maintaining consistency with other zones.

The Chair stated that the review of the Edgware CPZ had been difficult and complex. Response to the consultation had been high, and the proposed changes corresponded with the requests of individual roads. A Member paid tribute to the residents who had contributed to the debate from both sides of the argument.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Portfolio Holder)

That (1) the existing Edgware Controlled Parking Zone be divided into different zones: Meade Road and Handel Way operating 8.30 am to 8.30 pm, Monday to Saturday and Montgomery Road, Gresham Road and Churchill Road operating 11.00 am to 12.00

noon, Monday to Friday, as shown at appendix G;

(2) the Edgware Controlled Parking Zone be extended to cover the area shown at Appendix N, the operational hours to be 11.00am to 12.00 noon, Monday to Friday;

(3) double yellow line waiting restrictions be introduced in Canons Drive, Stonegrove and at junctions in Buckingham Road, Chandos Crescent, Overbrook Walk, Methuen Road, Methuen Close, Milford Gardens and Camrose Avenue as shown at Appendix L and Appendix O;

(4) The existing yellow line waiting restrictions in Whitchurch Lane operating from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday, at the junction with Winton Gardens be extended into Winton Gardens on the west side as shown at Appendix K;

(5) 15 shared use "pay and display"/business spaces be introduced in High Street Edgware as shown at Appendix O, operating from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Saturday, the tariff to be 30p for 20 minutes, 60p for 40 minutes, £1 for one hour and £2 for up to 4 hours, with maximum stay of 4 hours, no return for 2 hours;

(6) 19 shared use "pay and display"/residents spaces be introduced in Canons Drive and Rye Way as shown at Appendix O, operating from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday, the tariff to be the same as the "pay and display" spaces in the existing CPZ: 30p for half hour or part half hour, maximum stay 2 hours, no return for 2 hours;

(7) the existing "pay and display" spaces in Mead Road, Handel Way and Montgomery Road be amended to shared use, "pay and display"/residents' permit holders/business permit holders operating from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday in Montgomery Road and operating zone time in Mead Road and Handel Way;

(8) officers be authorised to take all necessary steps under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to advertise the traffic orders, the details of which be delegated to officers and implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections and funding;

(9) the statement of reasons to be "The Traffic Management Order is considered necessary because the results of the public consultation show that there is a majority of respondents in favour of these proposals which conform with the Council's corporate objectives 'to improve residential amenity, enhance the environment and promote the use of sustainable transport.'"; and;

(10) inform the head petitioners accordingly.

REASON: To Control Parking.

RECOMMENDATION 2 - Harrow on the Hill Local Safety Scheme - Request for Review of Yellow Line Waiting Restrictions and 20 mph Zone

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transport which outlined a review of the yellow line waiting restrictions in High Street and the proposed 20 mph zone for the Hill. The Chair commented that the report proposed the extension of the yellow line on West Street and that the implementation of the 20 mph zone be brought forward.

An Officer informed the meeting that the proposed extension to the yellow line outside 38-40 High Street arose from a request from a Ward Councillor. Officers were careful not to remove too much parking away from traders' clients or to reduce parking to such an extent that it encouraged the speed of cars to increase. He added that the scheme had the support of the Harrow on the Hill Forum.

There had been requests for implementation of the proposed 20 mph zone to be brought forward from 2007 to 2005-06. Officers were concerned that the physical measures required for the implementation of a 20 mph zone would not be accepted by local residents, although the Harrow on the Hill Forum were keen advocates of the scheme.

A Ward Councillor, present to speak on this item, commented that 20 mph zone was of great importance for the safety and conservation of the Hill. Too much traffic was already using the Hill, especially along High Street, West Street and Middle Road. He suggested that Government policy was to introduce 20 mph zones near schools, and considering the number of school children using the Hill, the Hill was a perfect location.

A Member commented that he had witnessed buses struggling to negotiate the Hill on several occasions and suggested that consultation should begin now to ensure the scheme is ready for implementation by 2007. He added that there appeared to be a gulf between the physical works the Harrow on the Hill Forum felt was required for a 20 mph zone and what officers thought was required. A Member suggested that attempts could be made to create a 'slow atmosphere' on the Hill.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Group representative commented that he had been in contact with the bus company that operated the 258 and they informed him that although they had faced some problems in the area, it was no worse than the rest of the borough. He added that buses had a very important role to play on the Hill, especially for the pupils of St Dominic's.

In response to a question from a Member, officers commented that 20 mph zones needed to be self-enforcing, and therefore consist of physical measures. They commented that it would be a very challenging design issue to keep speeds down to 20 mph while ensuring residents were happy.

During discussion of the 20 mph scheme, officers agreed that the scheme would take at least two years to complete, due to the need for comprehensive consultation and thorough planning. An officer suggested that starting this scheme earlier would delay other 20 mph schemes. Instead, he suggested that the Panel wait until the scheme is fully resourced and then can be fully launched into by officers. The Chair reminded the meeting of the expected disruption which would be caused by the implementation of the scheme. Members agreed that officers would liaise with the Forum, particularly regarding the implications of implementing a 20mph zone.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (To the Portfolio Holder)

That (1) officers be authorised to take all necessary steps under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984 to advertise the necessary traffic orders associated with the proposed changes to yellow line waiting restrictions and parking spaces as shown at Appendix A for order making purposes and implement the scheme subject to consideration and to allow an appropriate assessment of objections;

(2) the proposed 20 mph zone for Harrow on the Hill remains on the 2006/07 programme for implementation subject to funding

REASON: To control parking and to improve safety and traffic flow and to allow an appropriate assessment of the effectiveness of the existing road safety scheme to be made as normal.

RECOMMENDATION 3 - Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes - Annual Review and Related Petitions

Your Panel received the report of the Interim Head of Environment and Transportation which presented the annual review of Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes and related petitions. It included assessments of the existing zones, requests for new zones including petitions received in the last 12 months and a reference from the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel.

Prior to discussing the report, the Panel received a deputation from Gareth Thomas MP, Member of Parliament for Harrow West, on parking in North Harrow. The depute stated that he was speaking on behalf of a variety of constituents and paid tribute to the work of Headstone Residents' Association. He noted the negative impact the closure of Safeways had on the area, suggesting that improved parking facilities could help the area. He also suggested that North Harrow should be the next area for the New Harrow Project. He stated that the businesses on Pinner Road were not benefiting from the parking bays as the cost was prohibitive.

He urged the Panel to reconsider its decision not to recommend the installation of parking bays on Station Road. Traders and residents were keen for their installation to help revive North Harrow in the wake of the closure of Safeways. He also informed the Panel that residents of Southfield Park were concerned over the speed of traffic using their road. Residents of West Harrow had also expressed their concerns over parking, especially in the area surrounding West Harrow Station. In response to a question from a Member, the depute agreed that discussions over North Harrow with Transport for London (TfL) were necessary.

Following comments from a Member, the depute stated that the installation of a cycle lane helped fund parking bays in Pinner Road. However there were issues regarding

the cycle lane in Station Road which needed to be looked at in the context of the Safeways closure. He reiterated that he felt the 'Clean and Green' aspect of the New Harrow Project would benefit the area greatly. A Member stated that he had recently walked round North Harrow and had sympathy with the residents. He suggested that parking bays might be financed through a Section 106 agreement with a future developer of the Safeways site. Officers were requested to compile a report on the cost of installation of parking bays on Station Road.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Group representative commented that facilities for buses needed improvement in North Harrow and suggested that solving North Harrow's problems required joined up thinking. Officers undertook, in conjunction with TfL, to investigate the cycle lane in North Harrow.

The Chair commented that the report had changed little since the Panel had considered it last year. He noted that the report stated that the Harrow town centre CPZ would not be extended to Sundays. In response to comments from a Member, Officers confirmed that the Stanmore College area was included in the review of the Stanmore CPZ.

Commenting on the petition received from Holwell Place, officers stated that residents had asked for the provision of parking lay bys as residents were currently parking on the verges.

The Harrow Public Transport Users' Group representative commented that he had seen a fire engine delayed for three minutes due to parked cars on both sides of the road in High Street, Pinner due to parked cars.

In response to comments from a Member, officers confirmed that consultation had indicated that there was not sufficient support from residents in North Harrow for a CPZ. North Harrow had subsequently been taken off the review list, which would be reconsidered next year. In discussion of Argyle Road, officers agreed that there was a parking problem on the road, but consultation results had not indicated that residents of North Harrow as a whole were in support of a scheme. It was suggested that residents be encouraged to present a petition if they felt the road needed a yellow lines.

A Member commented that residents often became frustrated waiting for minor adjustment to parking schemes, and suggested that there should be a simpler method to adjust and implement small schemes. Officers commented that efficiency was a priority due to the limited resources available. CPZs were an efficient use of resources which comprehensively dealt with a parking problem across an area. Schemes designed as a 'quick fix' often did not solve problems effectively and often stored problems for the future.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: ((1) To the Portfolio Holder and (2) to Cabinet)

That (1) the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport, subject to funding, adopt the priority list as shown at Appendix D as the controlled parking zones programme, to include it in the Borough Spending Plan submission to Transport for London and advise the Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel accordingly; and

(2) Subject to (1) above, approve £100,000 per year be included in the three year Capital Programme for 2004-05, 05-06 and 06-07.

REASON: To prioritise and fund the Controlled Parking Zone programme.

PART II - MINUTES

32. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Anne Whitehead
Councillor Arnold
Councillor Mrs Kinnear

Reserve Member

Councillor Ray
Councillor Seymour
Councillor Anjana Patel

33. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Item 10(b)	Councillor Ray	The Member indicated that he had a prejudicial interest as he was a resident of the road to be discussed. The member left the room and took no part in the debate on this item.
Item 9(a)	Councillor Harriss (Present to speak on item 9(a))	The Member declared a personal interest in as a resident of the area. He remained present and took part in the debate.

34. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

35. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2003, having been circulated, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

36. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

37. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petition:

- Re: Objections Regarding Parking Restrictions in Greenford Road, Cavendish Avenue, Rosebank and Fernbank. - From businesses in the local area.

38. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following deputations:

- (1) Re – Edgware Controlled Parking Review – Consultation Results: From a local resident
(See Recommendation 1)
- (2) Re – Edgware Controlled Parking Review – Consultation Results: From a local resident
(See Recommendation 1)
- (3) Re – Edgware Controlled Parking Review – Consultation Results: From a local resident
(This deputation was withdrawn at the meeting)
- (4) Re – Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes - Annual Review and Related Petitions: From Gareth Thomas M.P.
(See Recommendation 3)

39. **Reference from Development Control Committee Meeting of 14 January 2004:**

Your Panel received a reference from the Development Control Committee asking the Panel to consider the proposed relocation of a bus stop as part of development works at Edgware Hospital. Officers commented that the road was wide enough to allow parking and two way traffic. In response to comments from a Member, officers confirmed that Barnet had liaised with bus operators.

40. **Reference from Development Control Committee Meeting of 11 February 2004:**

Your Panel received a reference from the Development Control Committee which requested the Panel consider poor visibility for drivers when approaching the roundabout on Uxbridge Road. Officers commented that the roundabout had a good

safety record, but there had been several reports of damage only accidents. Consultants were currently compiling a report on the area, which would be ready in a few weeks.

A Ward Member, present to speak on this item, commented that a short-term solution was needed at the roundabout to prevent further accidents. He commented that the fence on Uxbridge Road had been knocked down several times by vehicles. He suggested that potentially a flyover was the long-term solution, but in the short-term, revisions needed to be made to the roundabout island to promote road safety in the area.

A Member commented that traffic from the east usually approached the roundabout slowly and from the west traffic usually approached the roundabout at speed. Officers confirmed that the comments of the Panel would be considered within the consultant's study.

41. **Reference from Wealdstone Regeneration Advisory Panel Meeting of 15 January 2004:**

This was considered under Recommendation 3.

42. **Edgware Controlled Parking Zone Review - Consultation Results:**
(See Recommendation 1).

43. **Harrow on the Hill Local Safety Scheme - Request for Review of Yellow Line Waiting Restrictions and 20 mph Zone:**
(See Recommendation 2).

44. **Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes - Annual Review and Related Petitions:**
(See Recommendation 3).

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

(i) **Traffic Control on Kenton Park Avenue and Kenton Park Road, and the possibility of a filter traffic light to turn right from Kenton Road on to Kenton Lane**

The Chair reminded the meeting that the banned right turn was an experimental traffic order and noted that the scheme had many knock on effects.

A Ward Councillor, present to speak on this item, commented that many residents are unhappy with the increased traffic flow on residential roads. Residents were being disturbed at night by vehicles traversing speed bumps and buses were also having problems. A Ward Councillor, who was also a Panel Member, commented that he had received a lot of complaints from residents related to the Kenton Road/Kenton Lane junction. He noted that the banned right turn had improved east-west traffic flow, although some of the other consequences were unwanted. He suggested that two lanes and a right filter phase could be introduced at the junction.

A Member voiced his sympathy for residents and commented that there was under capacity in the roads leading to the junction. He suggested that officers needed to collaborate with Brent officers to find an appropriate solution to the problems at this junction.

Officers informed the meeting that the experimental traffic order expired on 26 April, so officers needed to consider options before then. Officers added that they had funding for traffic calming on Kenton Park Road and Kenton Gardens.

(ii) **One Way Traffic at 'The Close'**

Officers informed the meeting that they had received a request for one-way traffic at 'The Close'. Instead, it was proposed to install a 'No Entry' point which was intended to have a similar effect to a one way system, but would reduce costs and would have minimum impact on the environment.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.20 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES
Chair