

## TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL

25 SEPTEMBER 2007

Chairman: \* Councillor John Nickolay

Councillors: \* Robert Benson \* Jerry Miles  
 \* Mrinal Choudhury \* David Perry  
 \* Nizam Ismail \* Yogesh Teli  
 \* Manji Kara \* Jeremy Zeid  
 \* Ashok Kulkarni (2)

Advisers: \* Mr A Blann \* Mr L Gray  
 \* Mr E Diamond \* Mr A Wood

\* Denotes Member present

(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor Bill Stephenson attended this meeting to speak on the first item in Minute 72 and Councillors Keith Ferry and Phillip O'Dell attended to speak on the items in Minutes 70 and 71].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS****RECOMMENDATION 1 - Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions – Zone CA phase 1 – Objections to Traffic Orders**

The Panel received a report of the Head of Property and Infrastructure which considered objections received to the traffic orders for phase 1 of the proposed extension of the Wealdstone controlled parking zone CA and associated parking restrictions and recommended which proposals should be implemented. A substitute page of Appendix A of the Officer Report was tabled and accepted by the Panel.

A Member expressed concern with regards to signage in Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) and asked officers to ensure that adequate signage was provided in all CPZs. In response to these concerns, an officer confirmed that future permit bay signs would show the period of restriction. Apart from this time the bays were available for parking without a permit. The permit bay signs had already been amended throughout the current area of zone CA but excluding Masons Avenue and Herga Road where a Phase 2 consultation was planned on a possible change to the hours of operation.

The officer confirmed the location of the proposed pay and display machines and that 15 to 20 pay and display places would be provided.

In response to a concern by a Member regarding consultation with regards to the proposed extension of the CPZ, an officer confirmed that full public consultation had been carried out in summer 2006. The current traffic order process was a second stage that must follow statutory procedures. This involved the display of street notices and placing advertisements in the local press.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment Services)

That the formal objections to the advertised traffic orders for the extension and, revision to the Wealdstone Controlled Parking Zone CA incorporating a residents parking scheme and some associated waiting and loading restrictions, with the exception of a minor amendment as detailed in Part 1 (a) of Appendix C, be set aside for reasons given in the report, the objectors be informed and officers proceed with the order making and implementation.

**[REASON:** The proposals enjoyed majority support in earlier consultation and were necessary to control parking].

**RECOMMENDATION 2 – Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions – Zone C and Zone CA phase 2 – Consultation Results**

The Panel received a report of the Head of Property and Infrastructure which set out the findings of public consultation on possible extension of the Wealdstone controlled parking zones C/CA (phase 2) and associated parking restrictions and recommended which proposals should be taken forward.

During the discussion on the items, Members and Advisers commented that:

- there had been a good response to the consultation exercise but the public needed to be better educated on the parking options available in Harrow. In particular, it was essential to take the needs of businesses into consideration with adequate signing and parking being provided to make clear to visitors what was available;
- it was disappointing that, after requesting further detailed consultation, residents just beyond the revised Zone CA boundary seemed not to have appreciated the potential displaced parking problem and therefore had decided no further extension to Zone CA.

The Chairman asked Ward Councillors for Wealdstone and Marlborough present at the meeting for their opinion on the proposals. The Members who responded stated that they felt it was a positive move and that they were content with the proposals.

Amendments to the officer recommendations were moved and carried, and it was

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment Services)

That (1) officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design in accordance with Appendices A, B, G and I and take all necessary steps under 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 for which the detailed recommendations are as follows;

(2) double yellow line restrictions be introduced at the junctions/locations shown at Appendices A and G, excluding the junction between Harrow View and Headstone Drive, but their extent be modified in line with consultation feedback and site geometry;

(3) the existing Harrow and Wealdstone Zone C CPZ be extended to include Badminton Close, Leys Close, Rugby Close, Walton Close, Walton Drive (north-eastern end), Walton Road, and the remaining section of Marlborough Hill as shown at Appendices H and I;

(4) the parking bay outside the Princes Drive parade be made permit holders only Monday to Friday 10.00 – 11.00 am but be free at other times as shown at Appendix G (zone C review layout 1);

(5) the existing Wealdstone Zone CA CPZ be further extended to include the section of Athelstone Road east of Whitefriars Avenue as shown at Appendix B;

(6) the parking bay in Cardinal Way be made permit holders only Monday to Friday 10.00 – 11.00 am and 2.00 – 3.00 pm;

(7) the layout of the parking bays in Tudor Road be modified as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 11) and that these bays have a no waiting restriction applied between 8.00 am and 10.00 am Monday to Friday;

(8) a no stopping restriction be applied to the existing school keep clear zig-zags outside Elmgrove First and Middle School in Kenmore Avenue;

(9) an exemption be made under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers Act) 1974 to allow two wheel footway parking on the west side of Bengarth Drive and the north side of Christchurch Avenue as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 13) and Appendix K respectively;

(10) the no waiting restrictions be modified in Christchurch Avenue as shown at Appendix K;

(11) the parking bay arrangement in Spencer Road and The Cross Way be modified to include shared use with pay and display and additional parking bays as shown at Appendix G (zone CA review layout 9);

(12) an additional shared use parking bay be introduced into Masons Avenue as described at 2.3.11.1 and Appendix G (zone CA review layout 10);

(13) new pay and display bays be introduced and waiting and loading restrictions be revised near the Civic Centre as shown at Appendix G (zone C review layout 11);

(14) further consultation be carried out ahead of order making in roads leading from Princes Drive to address the commuter parking problem described in 2.3.8.8 and the traffic orders to deal with this issue be published in parallel with other traffic orders mentioned herein;

(15) re-consultation / further consultation be carried out in roads or sections of roads, as shown in Appendix I, to gauge the level of support for further extension of the permit parking and CPZ to these roads, approximately 6 months after recommendation (3) above has been implemented, subject to the availability of funding;

(16) for CPZ reviews generally, further consultation take place 6 months after implementation of any extension to gauge support in outlying roads for further extension of the zone subject to the availability of funding.

[REASON: To control parking].

## PART II - MINUTES

### 59. Appointment of Chairman:

**RESOLVED:** To note the appointment at the meeting of Cabinet on 15 May 2007 of Councillor John Nickolay as Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2007/08.

### 60. Attendance by Reserve Members:

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Mrs Camilla Bath

Reserve Member

Councillor Ashok Kulkarni

### 61. Declarations of Interest:

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

- (i) Agenda Item 14 – INFORMATION REPORT – Progress Update on Key Traffic Schemes  
Councillors Robert Benson and Mr E Diamond declared a personal interest in relation to the above item arising from the fact that they were residents of Stanmore.
- (ii) Mr A Blann declared a personal interest in that he was a resident of Wellington Road in Wealdstone.
- (iii) Councillor Susan Hall, who was not a Member of the Panel declared an interest in that she was a trader in Wealdstone.
- (iv) Councillor Keith Ferry, who was not a Member of the Panel, declared a personal interest in that he was a Wealdstone Ward Councillor.

### 62. Arrangement of Agenda:

**RESOLVED:** That (1) agenda item 16 be taken with agenda item 12, while appreciating the confidential information in agenda item 16;

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

[Note: For ease of reference, the order of the minutes follows the order of the business on the agenda].

### 63. Appointment of Vice-Chairman:

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Manji Kara as Vice-Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the Municipal Year 2007-08.

### 64. Minutes:

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2007 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

65. **Public Questions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

66. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petition which was referred to the Head of Property and Infrastructure for consideration:

- (i) Petition requesting that a push-button crossing be installed at the crossing at Harrow View, Headstone Gardens and Headstone Drive.  
Presented by Councillor Bill Stephenson and signed by 181 people.

67. **Deputations:**

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

68. **Appointment of Advisers to the Panel 2007/2008:**

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services.

**RESOLVED:** That the following non-voting advisors be appointed to the Panel for the 2007/08 Municipal Year:

- Mr Alan Blann, representing CTC/Right to Ride
- Mr Eric Diamond, representing the North West London Chamber of Commerce
- Mr Len Gray, representing Pedestrians' interests
- Mr Anthony Wood, representing Harrow Public Transport Users' Association

69. **EDF Site, Substation Adjacent to 102 Roxeth Green Avenue, South Harrow: Reference from the Strategic Planning Committee Meeting held on 14 March 2007:**

The Panel received a reference from the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee held on 14 March 2007.

An officer explained that ongoing development in the area was occurring and may be the cause of mud on the road and the source of speeding concerns but was not the cause of the poor surface in Stanley Road. This was a maintenance issue that needed to be addressed by the Council. In response to Members' questions, the officer explained that he was not aware of Section 106 agreements that would provide funding to improve the surface quality of Stanley Road.

The Chairman queried whether, in view of continuing developments, something could be done to keep Stanley Road clean and to control the speed of vehicles, which used the road. In response, an officer confirmed that there were planning conditions and planning and highway enforcement powers available to ensure some level of control. Inevitable development work would give rise to some disruption but the relevant departments within the Council would endeavour to keep it under control.

**RESOLVED:** That the above be noted.

70. **Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions – Zone CA phase 1 - Objections to Traffic Orders:**  
(See Recommendation 1)71. **Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions – Zone C & Zone CA phase 2 – Consultation Results:**  
(See Recommendation 2)72. **Progress Update on Key Traffic Schemes:**

The Panel received an information report of the Head of Property and Infrastructure, which provided an update on a number of key traffic management projects.

Headstone Drive/Harrow View/Headstone Gardens junction improvements

A Councillor who was not a Member of the Panel expressed concern that revised improvements to the junction had not been taken forward as quickly as hoped. The Member noted that he was looking for support from the Panel to find a satisfactory solution for residents.

An officer explained that a revised layout had been developed that appeared to allow pedestrian facilities to be introduced without increasing congestion overall but there were concerns about predicted queuing on Headstone Drive. Further work was needed to address this. The revised layout was also significantly more expensive than the scheme previously developed and funding had not been available to take forward such a proposal. Advantage would be taken of a cycling scheme currently being developed at the junction to finalise the crossing proposals and develop a scheme for which joint funding from Transport for London (TfL) Walking and Cycling budgets would be sought in 2008/09. The Chairman queried whether modern technology could be used to address the queuing problem. An officer explained that it could possibly bring small improvements in capacity (in the order of a few percentage points) but it was not possible to put an accurate figure on this due to current modelling limitations.

An adviser to the Panel expressed the view he was also concerned that improvements to the junction had not been taken forward as quickly as hoped. Another Member queried whether funding could be diverted from other schemes. In response, the officer explained that TfL funding was ring fenced to particular schemes.

#### Kenton Lane Local Safety Scheme

A Member stated that he was concerned with the effect of double yellow lines on businesses. Officers advised that, in the light of petitions received concerning two areas of double yellow lines, the scheme had been modified as far as was possible without compromising the safety and effectiveness of the scheme.

#### 20mph zone on Harrow on The Hill

An adviser expressed concern over the scheme and in particular, concern over vertical deflections. An officer confirmed that extensive consultation had taken place over the scheme. The Chairman commented that he thought that vertical deflections in this particular case were necessary and that a Harrow on the Hill Ward Councillor, the Harrow on the Hill Forum and Harrow School had asked for an update on the scheme. A Member expressed concern over the cost of a 20mph scheme on Harrow on the Hill.

An officer explained that it was a legal requirement that 20mph zones contain traffic calming measures. The aim was to employ sufficient measures to bring the average speed down to 20mph.

In response to comment by an adviser about 20mph scheme elsewhere not containing traffic calming features, an officer explained that there were two types of 20mph control: 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits. There was no requirement for 20mph speed limits to contain traffic calming measures but they were only recommended where speeds were already very low. Guidelines suggested that they should only be used where speeds were already below 24mph. Any proposal to use them where speeds were higher than this was likely to be strongly opposed by the police who would be faced with significant increased enforcement difficulties. However, an officer agreed to further investigate the possibility of a 20mph limit for Harrow on the Hill.

#### Wembley Event Day parking

A Member stated that they hoped that TfL would consider a double decker car park at Stanmore station due to Stanmore station's direct rail link to Wembley Stadium. An adviser to the Panel stated that they had been impressed by the London Borough of Brent's signage concerning Wembley event days and hoped Harrow would adopt Brent's techniques. The Chairman confirmed that the Council was in touch with other local authorities such as Brent and Barnet and hoped to establish some long-term solutions in consultation with them and that they were considering options such as park and ride.

In further discussion on proposals for Wembley Event Day Parking, Members and Advisers expressed the following opinions:

- parking in Stanmore had become a problem;
- there were possible business opportunities when considering the provision of parking in Harrow for those visiting Wembley Stadium;

- the forecourt of Stanmore Station had insufficient capacity to accommodate coaches operating from a Park and Ride facility;
- access to Stanmore Station car park needed to be improved to prevent congestion;
- signage in Stanmore with regard to event parking at Wembley Stadium needed to be improved;
- Queensbury and Canons Park had also experienced parking problems on event days at Wembley Stadium and that a Park and Ride could perhaps be used to address this problem.

An officer explained that they hoped to deter people from parking in Stanmore. In response to a question by a Member, an officer stated that Tow-Away Zones were only necessary in exceptional circumstances.

#### Re-opening of Wealdstone High Street

An adviser to the Panel asked for an update on the proposed Town Centre Manager. An officer advised that the funding offer made by TfL to cover the cost of a Town Centre Manager was actively being taken up. An officer confirmed the timetable for consultation on the re-opening of Wealdstone High Street.

#### Petts Hill Bridge and Highway Improvements

A Member expressed the view that he was concerned about a funding shortfall for the scheme and that he hoped that increased funding would be available. An adviser to the Panel stated that he agreed with this view. An officer advised that options to meet the funding shortfall had been discussed among the schemes' funding partners but agreement could not be reached. Tender costs for the bridge replacement works were due back in October 2007 and would allow the final outturn price to be more firmly identified. It was hoped that, in light of this firmer pricing information, more positive discussions could take place and increased funding contributions could be agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.00 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JOHN NICKOLAY  
Chairman