

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 23 JUNE 2011

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Nizam Ismail	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Manji Kara (1) * Ajay Maru * Jerry Miles	* Mrs Vina Mithani * John Nickolay * Sachin Shah (3)
<b>Advisers:</b>	* Mr A Blann * Mr E Diamond	* Mr L Gray * Mr A Wood
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Brian Gate Christopher Noyce	Minute 74 Minute 72

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) and (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

### 57. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor David Perry  
Councillor Susan Hall

Reserve Member

Councillor Sachin Shah  
Councillor Manji Kara

### 58. Declarations of Interest

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

Agenda Item 10 – Information Report: Petitions Relating to (5) Elgin Avenue/Kenmore Avenue, Harrow

Councillor Ajay Maru declared a personal interest in that he was ward councillor for Kenton West. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 11 - Allocation of Local Transport Fund schemes (Transport for London funding) 2011/12

Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani declared a personal interest in that she was ward councillor for Kenton West. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 17 – Information Report: Capital Programme Update – Traffic and Parking Schemes

Councillor Brian Gate, declared a personal interest in that he was a resident of West Harrow. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

**59. Appointment of Vice-Chairman**

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Jerry Miles as Vice-Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for the 2011/2012 Municipal Year.

**60. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2010 be read and signed as correct record of the meeting, subject to clarification in relation to the items Members were in attendance for listed on page 5:

Councillor John Cowan	Minute 53
Councillor Janet Mote	Minute 54
Councillor Christopher Noyce	Minute 51

**61. Arrangement of Agenda**

The Panel agreed to consider Agenda item 16, Controlled Parking Zone: Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone – Results of Statutory consultation and item 17, Information Report: Capital Programme Update Traffic and Parking Schemes before agenda item 9, Reference from Cabinet, to allow the relevant deputations to be heard early on in the proceedings.

**62. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following public questions were received:

**Questioner:** Mr John Wythe

**Question:** “Why has the southern part of Alfriston Avenue been excluded from the CPZ

extension proposal when according to the Council data 24 out of 33 responses were in favour of being included?

I reside on the corner of Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook Drive and as a resident for 40 years. I am unhappy with the consultation process. Myself and three immediate neighbours, and there be more, did not receive the consultation documents that were apparently issued in June 2010. From what I have now seen it is very unlikely that the residents of Fernbrook Drive fully understand that the parking problem, if the proposal is approved, will be squeezed from Alfriston Avenue, the southern part of The Ridgeway and surrounding roads to this quiet cul de sac. I would request that the proposal is amended to include the southern part of Alfriston Avenue and Fernbrook Drive into the Rayners Lane CPZ extension.”

**Answer:**

I do understand your concerns about the consultation process because you and some of your neighbours did not receive any information about the consultation which must be frustrating.

Just to clarify this matter the council did hand deliver consultation documents to properties in the area in June 2010 for the review of parking in the Rayners Lane Area. The results were reported to this Panel on 16 September 2010. The overall response rate for questionnaires in the area was 46% which is higher than average when compared with other more recent consultations that typically had 25%-30%. In particular the response rate for Alfriston Avenue was 33% and in Fernbrook Drive was 51 % which is considered to be good for this type of consultation. Whilst it is regrettable that some people say that they have not received material it is clear that the vast majority have received material as the percentages are relatively high.

Residents were asked if they wanted to be in a CPZ and a supplementary question was also asked about what their view would be if a road next to theirs supported a CPZ. This is intended to allow them to take into account

parking displacement. It is generally the case that when consultation results are analysed in detail there will be stronger support at the end of a road nearest the source of any problems. The proposals that were recommended to the Panel were therefore based upon the response from areas that supported the CPZ that represented a majority of respondents. In Fernbrook Drive 19 of the 51 responses responded saying they supported the CPZ whilst 32 said they did not. Several residents commented that they did consider the need for parking controls to deal with the displacement of parking from surrounding streets and these comments were included in the Panel report for consideration.

Unfortunately it is not possible to simply amend the proposals to include these lengths of road as they have not been through a statutory consultation process whereas the remainder of the Rayners Lane proposals detailed in a separate report to this Panel meeting have already been subject to this process. However, with the agreement of the Panel it would be possible to carry out a re-consultation in Fernbrook Drive and the small adjoining length of Alfriston Avenue that are currently to be excluded from the CPZ. This could be carried out at the same time as a re-consultation of the northern length of Central Avenue which was agreed by the Panel at its last meeting. This would give a second opportunity to residents to consider being included in a CPZ.

**Questioner:**

Mr Seamus English

**Question:**

'The dissatisfaction of the West Harrow Residents with the Council's Double Yellow Line design is well documented. A summary of what has happened, as part of this question, was circulated to the members of this TARSAP panel. Residents wanted a better design, as did the Police, but their messages were ignored by the Council and there is no comment in the report about any of this. Residents have not seen any effort by the Council of trying to improve matters for residents and residents feel very let down by the Council. On this basis, I respectfully

ask the Panel to re-submit the review back to officers for a more thorough consideration in full participation with West Harrow residents?'

**Answer:**

I note your group's continuing dissatisfaction with the scheme implemented despite a considerable amount of time and resources being spent on this matter over the last year. An update on recent events is provided in agenda item 17 but I will summarise these for you.

In July 2010 the council reviewed the extent of the double yellow lines which had been introduced at junctions, bends and other locations to improve vehicular access and road safety. A site trial was organised with a refuse vehicle and attended by all interested parties in order to establish if any compromises could be made. This test identified three locations where the double yellow lines could be cut back and the necessary statutory consultation was subsequently organised with the agreement of the Portfolio Holder. The yellow lines were physically amended in March 2011 and additional space for approximately 7 to 8 vehicles was made.

It is accepted that the number of additional spaces from this review did not meet the group's expectations and so your group were given the opportunity in November 2010 to carry out their own review of the CPZ and double yellow lines. Your group subsequently produced a report in March 2011 entitled "10/5 The Residents' Solution" a copy of which is included in the agenda at pages 301-308. A site trial was then organised with the support of the Fire Brigade who provided a fire service vehicle to test your proposal. The site trial was witnessed by me, the chairman of TARSAP, as well as other parties. The formal views of the trial from the Fire Brigade and Police were provided in their own independent reports, copies of which can be seen at pages 309-311 of the report, and they concluded that the proposals unfortunately would not work.

Having now undertaken two site trials it is quite clear that the physical constraints of the road layout prevent any further reductions of the yellow lines if we are to maintain access for the fire service and refuse vehicles. Whilst your group have called for a better design of the yellow lines there appears to be no viable options available to reduce them further.

Following discussions with the Portfolio Holder about the situation in the West Harrow area it was felt that all reasonable attempts to address the concerns of your group have been made. In particular there are growing concerns from local people about the delay in undertaking a review and so it was agreed to proceed with the wider consultation of all residents and businesses in the area.

The public consultation documents have now been prepared and distribution is due to commence on 24 June. Your group will receive a copy of the documentation and can continue to contribute comments alongside those individually from people in the local community. It is envisaged that the results of consultation will be presented to the next Panel meeting for consideration.

### **63. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at this meeting.

### **64. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution), that the following deputations be received:

- (1) Residents of Raynton Close, Trescoe Gardens, Newlyn Gardens, Waverley Road, entrance to Roxbourne Park – (Nursery & Scout Hut).

The first depute, a resident of Raynton Close, stated that:

- in the 44 years he had lived in Raynton Close, emergency vehicles, refuse vehicles and the council's transport bus had had no difficulty in accessing this road;
- placing Double Yellow Lines on the right side of the road would force emergency vehicles to drive on the wrong side of the road;

- this would both inconvenience residents and have health and safety implications;
- to his knowledge, none of the Members of the Panel represented Rayners Lane, had not visited the ward or spoken to residents about this issue;
- properties with even numbers all had unpaved front gardens, whereas properties with odd numbers had off-road parking; this had been the case for over 40 years. The property deeds of some of these houses stated that driveways must be kept clear;
- he requested that the Double Yellow Lines be implemented on the opposite side of the road.

The second depute, a resident of Trescoe Gardens, Rayners Lane stated that:

- Trescoe Gardens was too narrow a road to allow cars to be parked on both sides;
- emergency and delivery vehicles had been able to access the road, however, if the current proposals were implemented, this would block residents' access to their drives;
- these proposals were not essential or desired by residents and the money for this scheme would be better spent on other local services for residents.

(2) West Harrow Residents Group (WHRG), regarding the Review of the Double Yellow Lines (DYL's) in West Harrow.

The depute, a resident of Vaughan Road, stated that:

- the conclusions in the document produced by WHRG, '10/5 – The Residents' Solution', had been rejected by Traffic officers;
- he encouraged Panel Members to read the 10/5 report as a great deal of work, effort and expertise had gone into it and it was based on common sense;
- at the meeting between traffic officers and residents in October 2010, residents had stated that they were against the DYLs and since their introduction, there had been 5 accidents due to increased vehicle speeds. This should be taken into consideration;
- officers had failed to hold a meeting requested by WHRG;
- the Police and Fire Brigade reports on tests carried out by the emergency services had only been released recently; WHRG

required more time to consider these reports, ask questions and get further advice before arranging a meeting between residents and officers;

he hoped that it would be possible to arrive at a solution before the September 2011 Panel meeting.

#### **65. Reference From Cabinet**

The Panel received a reference from the Cabinet meeting held on 19 May 2011: the reference related to a petition received from the residents of Elgin Avenue, Kenton, seeking resolution to the parking problems in this road.

**RESOLVED:** That the reference be received and noted.

### **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

#### **66. Appointment of Advisers**

The Panel considered a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services on the appointment of non-voting advisers to the Panel for the 2011/12 Municipal year.

With the agreement of the Panel, the Chairman invited the advisers present to participate in the meeting, pending formal approval of their appointment.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the following non-voting advisers be appointed to the Panel for the 2011/12 Municipal Year:

1. Mr Alan Blann, representing the Cyclists Touring Club 'Right to Ride';
2. Mr Eric Diamond, representing the North West London Chamber of Commerce;
3. Mr Len Gray, representing Pedestrians' Interests;
4. Mr Anthony Wood, representing Harrow Public Transport Users' Association.

**Reason for Decision:** To appoint advisers for the 2011/12 Municipal Year to assist in the work of the Panel.



**67. Allocation of Local Transport Fund schemes (Transport for London funding) 2011/12**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director, Community and Environment, which outlined the proposed programme of schemes to be implemented with the £100K local transport fund allocated to the Council in 2011/12. An officer stated that these schemes had to adhere to both the Local Implementation Plan (LIP), the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy and Harrow’s Corporate Priorities. It also focused on locally determined priorities, particularly on those schemes likely to have the greatest local benefits and impact.

The report recommended four such schemes, which had been developed following discussion between Traffic officers and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

Members of the Panel stated that in future, they would prefer to be given a wider choice of schemes, prior to making a recommendation to the Portfolio Holder.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that all relevant stakeholders would be consulted in relation to the traffic management projects on Kingshill Avenue. He added that the contra-flow cycle scheme on College Road would extend from the footway outside St Ann’s car park but that the proposal could only be fully developed once the funds were received. The off-side bus stand, pedestrian, cyclist and bus driver safety would need to be factored in, as would any possible future alterations to the bus garage. Officers were in discussion with TfL regarding a possible bicycle scheme similar to the Barclays bicycle hire scheme currently in operation in the central London area.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the proposed programme of local transport schemes be approved, as summarised in the table below:

Cycle Parking	To increase cycle usage/uptake it is vital that secure cycle parking is provided at key strategic locations throughout the borough	£15,000
College Road contra flow cycle scheme	A low cost interim measure to eliminate the barrier for cyclists along College Road as well as to link up with completed cycle routes to the east and west of the town centre.	£15,000
Kingshill Avenue area – traffic management scheme	Traffic management scheme to mitigate the impact of through traffic in the area and reduce personal injury accidents.	£60,000

Aylward School, Harrow on the Hill, Kenmore Park School – 20 mph zones	Amendments to the existing traffic calming in the zones identified to reduce traffic speeds to comply with national guidelines.	£10,000
--	---	---------

**Reason for Decision:** In order for the Council to spend the £100,000 allocated by Transport for London on prioritised local transport schemes within the 2011/12 financial year.

**68. Mollison Way, Streets for People Scheme: Public Consultation**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment relating to the consultation relating to Mollison Way, streets for people scheme initiated in partnership with Transport for London (TfL). Of the responses received, approximately 80% supported the proposals, which had been developed over 18 months working with the local community. He added that officers may apply for finance to extend the scope of the project at a later date with a view to making localised changes to the road to best accommodate parking and through traffic.

The 'CTC Right to Ride' Adviser to the Panel requested a copy of the Consultation documents, which traffic officers undertook to forward to him after the meeting.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to Cabinet)

That the Mollison Way, streets for people scheme as set out in the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, proceed to statutory consultation and implementation.

**Reason for Decision:** To implement the Mollison Way, streets for people scheme as identified in the Local Implementation Plan for the benefit of the local community.

**69. Proposed Procedure for Filming on the Highway**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, which set out the procedure for discharging the Council's network management duty in respect of filming on the highway and regulating such activity in accordance with current legislation.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the procedure regarding Filming on the Highway contained in the report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment be adopted and kept under review.

**Reason for Decision:** In order that the Council fulfils its responsibilities under the Traffic Management Act and to mitigate inconvenience to local residents and businesses.

## **70. Off-Road Shared Cycle Facilities**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment which outlined the methodology to be adopted to determine the suitability of off-road shared pedestrian and cycle facilities and the measures that could be taken to mitigate any conflict.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer reported that it would be difficult to enforce fixed penalty notices against persons caught cycling on pavements and it was preferable to educate cyclists in cycling etiquette through a number of different schemes, such as cycling training.

A Member of the Panel proposed an amendment to the recommendation, which was seconded and agreed unanimously.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the procedure outlined in the report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment be used to assess the suitability of off-road shared cycle / pedestrian facilities, but that consideration for the safety of pedestrians must always be paramount.

**Reason for Decision:** To enable the Council to deliver cycle schemes and take account of the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in order to benefit the wider community and to be able to meet the objectives set out in Harrow's Local Implementation Plan.

## **71. Parking Schemes Programme 2011/12**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community Environment which set out the revised parking programme for 2011/12 following confirmation of the capital programme allocation and also the methodology associated in considering schemes for parking controls under the Local Safety Parking Schemes programme.

A Member suggested that the 'Service Request Assessment' criteria should be amended so that requests from the emergency services had a higher priority on the table.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That

- (1) the revised priority list of schemes shown in Appendix A to the report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment be agreed for 2011/12;

- (2) the criteria and process involved in considering sites under the Local Safety Parking Schemes programme (formerly known as the Problem Streets programme) be agreed.

**Reason for Decision:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones, Parking Schemes and Local Safety Parking Schemes programme in 2011/12.

## **72. Controlled Parking Zone: Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone - Results of Statutory Consultation**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment which provided the results of the formal statutory consultation, which had followed an exhibition, stakeholder meeting and informal public consultation, regarding the proposed extension of the Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

In response to the earlier deputation relating to Rayners Lane, an officer stated that they had taken into consideration the fact that there had been in some roads and sections of road no majority support from residents for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). He added that consultations focused on safety and amenity and a consistent approach was taken for all such consultations. A detailed site visit had also been conducted by officers and some restrictions had been proposed to allow access for emergency vehicles.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, the depute who was a resident of Raynton Close responded that under current proposals, emergency vehicles would be forced to enter the road from the 'wrong' side', and residents' request to position the DYLS on the opposite side of the road should not impact the effectiveness of the scheme. An officer explained that parking schemes under consideration were amended and refined on the basis of responses to consultations to ensure that any final proposals included those aspects of the scheme that received majority support from residents.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer reported that when formulating double yellow lines (DYLS), the intention was to maximize available parking spaces. He added that Harrow residents' parking requirements currently outstripped availability. A lack of DYLS encouraged irresponsible parking and officers tried to carry out reviews and consultations in the most economic and cost effective way, whilst taking local factors into consideration.

An adviser to the Panel stated that traders and businesses in Harrow did not, on the whole, support DYLS as they restricted economic growth by making it difficult for shoppers and delivery vehicles to park in the vicinity of businesses.

Following a point raised by a Panel Member, an officer stated that the Pinner Road traders had rejected the Council's suggestion of allocating a section of their forecourts for inset parking bays and agreed he had received a request from the Honey Pot Lane traders near Canons Park Station to introduce parking controls as road space was regularly taken up by commuters and would be explored further.

It was agreed by Panel Members and officers that the length of Alfriston Avenue outside the proposed CPZ together with Fernbrook Drive be included in a re-consultation.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, stated that although 90% of the residents consulted about the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in Rayners Lane supported it, traffic officers had met with some of those residents who were against the CPZ proposals. Officers had agreed to take on board the suggested reduction of the double yellow lines in specific locations, however, these had not been included in the proposals.

An officer responded that this may be due in part to physical constraints. Vehicle tracking information had been used to formulate the extent of the CPZ proposals and following feedback from residents, small adjustments had been made where possible. He added that due to safety issues, some of these could not be implemented as they would impact on the effectiveness of the overall CPZ, for instance turning circles for emergency vehicles had to be taken into consideration.

In terms of parking in Raynton Close, the custom and practice for many years had been to park on the left side of the road, however, officers proposals were to put DYs on the right side of the road, as this would help to maximise the number of parking spaces.

Residents of Raynton Close presented a copy of a plan that had been circulated by traffic officers during the informal public consultation in Rayners Lane. Residents had marked their proposed changes on this plan. The Panel agreed to a five minute adjournment to consider this plan.

An officer emphasised that residents' request for the DYs to be implemented on the left hand side of Raynton Close could result in fewer parking spaces. Officers indicated that they would investigate the possibility of doing this, on the proviso that it did not impact on access for emergency vehicles. He added that as some areas in Rayners Lane had been agreed to be re-consulted, it would be possible to re-consult residents on these streets.

An officer stated that because some areas in Rayners Lane were being re-consulted, which would allow for Raynton Close residents to be re-consulted also. He emphasised that vehicle tracking would need to be used assess accessibility for emergency vehicles. He asked that one person from the deputation be nominated to be the central contact for future communication and liaison.

Following further questions from Members of the Panel and other Members in the room, an officer responded that the Police no longer had the resources to deal with obstructive parking and following decriminalisation increasingly Local Authorities were responsible for enforcement of traffic and highway contraventions.

A Member of the Panel drew attention to a petition from residents in Southbourne Close who did not want DYs. He also drew attention to a

request for a proposed parking bay at the end of West Avenue to be switched to the opposite side because, although this would reduce parking spaces, there was under use of parking bays in that part of the CPZ. Following an explanation from an officer about the likely implications of implementing the other parking controls in the area under consideration, his request for these items to be reconsidered was not supported.

An officer stated that he had attended a site meeting with the project engineer, and there had been calls for and support for parking controls in Village Way, however as, there would be no visitor parking on Village Way it was important to provide some compensatory facilities in nearby adjoining roads.

The Chairman stated that the Council had to take a balanced view of parking schemes, taking into consideration the views of the majority of residents affected by the scheme, particularly since safety issues had to be prioritised.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That

- (1) an extension to the existing Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Zone L be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in Appendix G, to the report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment, with operational hours of Monday-Friday 10.00 am – 11.00 am and that residents and businesses within the new CPZ be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
- (2) single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday be introduced in sections of Village Way as shown in Appendix G;
- (3) double yellow lines be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in Appendix H; except in Raynton Close, Trescoe Gardens, Newlyn Gardens and northern end of Waverley Road which would be subject to re-consultation;
- (4) the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone in Ovesdon Avenue, Capthorne Avenue and Kings Road south of the junction of Capthorne Avenue as detailed in Appendix A not be included within the extension;
- (5) the proposed double yellow lines at the junctions of Torbay Road, Exeter Road and Lynton Road with Capthorne Avenue remain as recommended in Appendix A;
- (6) the proposed double yellow lines be reduced as shown in Appendix H for the following roads:  
Newlyn Gardens  
Trescoe Gardens

Waverley Road  
Dewsbury Close  
Southbourne Close  
Fernbrook Drive  
Lynton Road  
Torbay Road

- (7) the proposed double yellow lines on the southern side of the carriageway adjacent to 1 Village Way as shown in Appendix A be extended to the boundary of 5-7 Village Way as shown in Appendix G;
- (8) the location of the bays proposed outside 16-18 Downs Avenue and 24-26 Downs Avenue be relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway as shown in Appendix G;
- (9) the location of the bay proposed opposite 112-114 The Avenue be relocated to the opposite side of the carriageway as shown in Appendix G;
- (10) the existing double yellow line on the north eastern corner of the junction of Capthorne Avenue and Kings Road be extended on Kings Road as shown in Appendix G;
- (11) objections to the proposals in Appendix C be set aside excepting those objections accommodated by the revised proposals listed at (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10) above;
- (12) officers undertake a re-consultation of residents in Fernbrook Drive and the section of Alfriston Avenue not included in the revised CPZ, and report those results to a future Traffic And Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting;
- (13) further to (3) above, officers liaise with a representative of the residents Raynton Close, Newlyn Gardens and Trescoe Gardens and the northernmost section of Waverley Road to agree a satisfactory layout for waiting restrictions in that area;
- (14) the relevant officer be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown in Appendix G and Appendix H;
- (15) all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of the final decision.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking on the periphery of the existing Rayners Lane CPZ – Zone L as detailed in the report.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 73. **Information Report: Petitions relating to (1) Green Lane, Stanmore (2) Uxbridge Road, Harrow (3) Marlborough Hill, Harrow (4) Harley Road/Harley Crescent, Harrow (5) Elgin Avenue/Kenmore Avenue, Harrow**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment outlining petitions that had been received since the meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel on 2 February 2011.

#### Green Lane – Request for permanent road closure

Officers had met with the two lead petitioners and looked at the results of traffic surveys of the area, carried out observations of traffic flows during a planned closure of Green Lane in May 2011, and reviewed all personal injury accident data for Green Lane and looked at available traffic data about the area.

Following consideration of the above information, officers did not recommend a permanent closure of Green Lane at the junction of Stanmore Hill or the alternative left turn ban suggested by the petitioners. It may be possible to revisit this issue in the future once the traffic signals along Stanmore Broadway corridor were completed, as it was possible that traffic patterns and levels of capacity may change.

#### Uxbridge Road – traffic scheme – objection to the removal of the pelican crossing near the Grimsdyke Road junction

Officers had agreed with the Portfolio Holder that the existing pelican crossing be retained and the proposed zebra crossing be omitted from the final scheme. Additionally:

- the timing of the Pelican crossing would be amended to help ease congestion along this corridor;
- the proposed additional zebra crossing west of Anselm Road would be replaced by a pedestrian refuge;
- the crossings would be monitored once the scheme was implemented.

#### Marlborough Hill – Request to review existing CPZ

Statutory consultation would begin in July 2011 the results of which would be reported at the September 2011 Panel meeting.

#### Harley Road/Harley Crescent – Request to review parking

Currently there was no funding allocated to review parking in these roads. Additionally, the proposed re-development of the nearby Kodak site could impact on parking patterns in the area. The area would be considered as part



of the next annual parking scheme prioritisation, which would be reported at the February 2012 Panel meeting.

#### Elgin Avenue/Kenmore Avenue – Request for parking controls

The location would be examined under the Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme (LSPS). If the scope of the parking problems proved to be outside the scope of the LSPS, then the issue would be placed on the priority list and considered at the Panel meeting in February 2012.

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

#### **74. Information Report: Capital Programme Update - Traffic and Parking Schemes**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment which provided an update on the delivery of the Capital Programme of transport schemes for 2011/12. This included schemes funded by Transport for London and those schemes included in Harrow's Capital Programme.

Further to the deputation from the West Harrow Residents Group, the Chair stated that this scheme had been widely consulted on and there had been two trials. The scheme review under consideration took safety issues and expert advice from the emergency services into consideration and would benefit the wider community.

A Member stated that he welcomed the '10/5 – The Residents' Solution' report and the expert advice provided by the Police and Fire Brigade, however, safety issues had to take priority. The emergency services agreed that the 10/5 proposals were currently not viable in their present form and that there would be further discussion of this at the Panel meeting in September 2011.

A Member of the Panel stated that there needed to be stricter control of unlawful parking in the borough, particularly since the Council were now effectively responsible for enforcing a number of the rules contained in the Highway Code .

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that Harrow council's policy towards reducing car ownership and usage focused on a 'modal shift' and was in accord with national policy. An officer also stated that Traffic officers would continue to engage in dialogue with residents in West Harrow.

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

**75. Termination of Meeting**

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (part 4D of the Constitution)

**RESOLVED:** At 9.59 pm to continue until 10.15 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.31 pm, closed at 10.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NIZAM ISMAIL  
Chairman