

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 12 FEBRUARY 2015

<b>Chair:</b>	* Councillor Barry Kendler	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Susan Hall	* Mrs Vina Mithani
	* Ameet Jogia	* Nitin Parekh
	* Jerry Miles	* Aneka Shah
<b>Advisers:</b>	Ms N Baker	* Dr Anoop Shah
	* Mr L Gray	* Mr A Wood
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Ms Pamela Fitzpatrick	Minute 48
	Jean Lammiman	Minute 48
	Barry Macleod-Cullinane	Minute 48

\* Denotes Member present

#### 42. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance.

#### 43. Declarations of Interest

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

Agenda Item 8 – Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes – Annual Review

Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Ward Councillor for Harrow-on-the Hill and his mother lived in

Torrington Drive. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Jean Lammiman declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Hatch End. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Ms Pamela Fitzpatrick declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Headstone South. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

#### All Agenda Items

Councillor Susan Hall declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Hatch End Ward. She would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Ameet Jogia declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he lived in the area of Headstone Lane Station, was a Ward Councillor for Canons Ward and was a regular visitor to the Lohana centre. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Barry Kendler declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Ward Councillor for Edgware Ward. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Jerry Miles declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Ward Councillor for Roxeth Ward. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Kenton West Ward. She would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Nitin Parekh declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Ward Councillor for Edgware Ward. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

#### **44. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 2 October 2014 and the special meeting held on 10 December 2014 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **45. Public Questions**

To note that 4 public questions had been received and responded to and in line with the statement made by the Chairman, the recording had been placed on the website.

## 46. Petitions

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petitions, which were referred to the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise for consideration:

Petition containing 48 signatures, presented by a Resident of on behalf of residents of Somerset Road, Harrow with the following terms of reference:

‘We, the residents of Somerset Road, Harrow, petition the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel to conduct an urgent review to implement a Controlled Parking Zone on Somerset Road, Harrow during the hours of 10.00 am to 11.00 am and 2.00 pm to 3.00 pm Monday to Friday in line with the Controlled Parking Zone that is due to be implemented on neighbouring roads in North Harrow.

This petition is being lodged as the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones in the neighbouring roads will result in parking displacement onto Somerset Road and will be to the detriment of the residents of Somerset Road.’

Petition containing 32 signatures, presented by Councillor Ameet Jogia on behalf of residents of Lake View and Dukes Avenue, Harrow, with the following terms of reference:

‘Attached is a list of residents who we have surveyed and who are concerned by the parking issues faced by residents on Lake View and Dukes Avenue, caused largely by abandoned vehicles, commuter parking, congestion and obstructive parking. We have conducted our own short survey of the issue in the area and call upon the Council to review the parking situation on the estate, and mainly Lake View and Dukes Avenue and help us, the residents, with coming up with solutions to alleviate the problems mentioned.

Attached is a copy of the survey and also the letter which was submitted to the affected residents.’

Petition containing 35 signatures, presented by Councillor Susan Hall on behalf of residents of Malvern Gardens, Harrow, with the following terms of reference:

‘We, the undersigned are enormously disappointed that, at the meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel on 2 October 2014, an amendment was made to the recommendation regarding Malvern Gardens and Winchester Road. Specifically, that the recommendation of a Monday-Sunday 8 am-midnight controlled parking zone was amended to only cover Monday-Sunday 6 pm-midnight.

This last-minute change to the recommendation was made without consideration for the wishes of the many residents of these roads, and is contrary to what we have requested the Council impose for a number of years. We therefore petition the Panel to reconsider its decision, and reinstate the original recommendation for a Monday-Sunday 8 am-midnight controlled parking zone for these roads.’

#### **47. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that none were received.

### **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

#### **48. Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes - Annual Review**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which set out information regarding the identification, prioritisation, development and implementation of parking management schemes in Harrow. It also included information about requests for parking schemes received by the Council and recommended a programme of work for 2015/16.

An officer tabled an amended copy of Appendix C to the report and provided a brief overview of the report.

A Member back benching stated that in recent months, increasing numbers of residents had contacted both him and a fellow Harrow on the Hill Ward Councillor regarding the effects of displaced commuter parking in Whitmore Road and in the vicinity of Harrow on the Hill. The displaced parking was as a result of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in West Harrow. The main issues related to blocked driveways, cars unable to pass each other due to parking on both sides of the road, difficulty of access for emergency and refuse vehicles and inconsiderate and hazardous parking generally. He urged the Panel to take on board residents' views and review this situation as a matter of urgency and implement parking controls in those streets.

Another Member back benching stated that parking controls should be introduced in service roads in the vicinity of Hatch End to deter all-day parking in those roads. All-day parking was having a detrimental effect on local businesses. The introduction of parking controls would allow the flow of traffic and support local traders, who were in favour of controls. Shoppers and visitors to the area now benefited from 20-minutes free parking. The Member also requested that parking restrictions in the vicinity of St Anselm's Church be limited to mornings only. The church served as a community and cultural centre as well as a place of worship and was therefore in regular daily use. She referred to a petition received at a previous Panel meeting which had requested that parking controls be restricted to mornings only, the parking bay outside the church be removed and a dropped kerb be implemented at the rear of the church. She also stated that there should be some latitude for the church officers to park outside the church.

Another Member back benching stated that she and fellow Ward Councillors had received a large number of representations from residents regarding displaced parking in Somerset Road, as detailed in the earlier petition submitted by residents of Somerset Road. She urged the Panel to carry out an early review of Somerset Road.

A Member stated that she had received emails from residents living in the top half of Whitmore Road, regarding dangerous and inconsiderate parking in the road and requested parking controls be introduced there. The emails were from 34 of the 47 properties located at the top end of Whitmore Road. In her view, these emails could form part of the statutory consultation which would enable the scheme to be implemented sooner. Referring to the petition she had presented earlier on behalf of residents of Malvern Gardens, she stated that the recommendations which had been agreed by residents at the consultation stage, should now be implemented. She added that, in her view, these recommendations should not have been omitted from the Queensbury CPZ, which had been agreed at the October 2014 Panel meeting.

Following questions and comments from Panel Members, an officer advised that:

- the recently opened Tesco Express store in Canons Park Parade had a delivery plan, however, deliveries continued to be made outside scheduled times, which was impacting negatively on local residents and businesses. An officer advised that careful consideration was necessary by the council to impose additional restrictions on loading times as any objections would need to be resolved through a public enquiry led by an independently appointed inspector. It would be better to focus on negotiations with Tesco to improve compliance with their delivery plan. Some already approved parking restrictions in the road had not yet been fully implemented outside the store and officers recommend waiting to see what the impact of these would be on the situation and to review it later in the year;
- typically, it could take in the region of 9-12 months to remove the parking restrictions in Becmead Road and this would be funded from the Neighbourhood Improvement Scheme funds (NIS). Removal of the restrictions would lead to displaced parking in surrounding streets, and officers would need to consult residents of those streets;
- the proposed schemes had been scored and ranked by officers in accordance with the Traffic Section's Transport Programme Entry procedure, which had been agreed by the Panel in 2012. It would be for Members to prioritise those schemes they wished to see taken forward.

The Chair suggested that he would ask the Leader of Harrow Council to request the Council's Chief Executive, to write or speak to a senior executive from the Tesco Ltd to express the Council's concern over Tesco-Canons Park not acting as a good neighbour and to obtain an agreement from Tesco as to their future conduct in Canons Park.

The Chair moved a motion, which was seconded and agreed unanimously:

'That the Panel agree the following amendments to the officer recommendation:

1. Recommendation 1 be amended in light of the earlier petitions received from residents of Malvern Gardens and Somerset Road and Priority Scheme 5, in conjunction with other reviews, be considered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety, the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel and traffic officers and be agreed as a Portfolio Holder Decision;
2. Priority Schemes 1-4 and schemes 6 & 7 be implemented;
3. £60k allocated for Local Safety Parking Schemes, be subject to further consultation with the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel;
4. all of the above be subject to confirmation of the capital funding allocation by Cabinet and agreed by full Council.

Following a question from a Member, the Chair stated that he anticipated that a decision on Scheme 5 would be made by Easter 2015.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder of Environment, Crime and Community Safety)

That

- (1) All schemes, except Hatch End, listed on the proposed list of parking management schemes for 2015/16 as shown in Appendix B of the officer report, be agreed, subject to confirmation of the capital funding allocation at Cabinet;
- (2) officers be authorised to carry out scheme design and consultation on all schemes, except Hatch End, as shown in Appendix B of the officer report;
- (3) officers be authorised to implement the following area based schemes listed in Appendix B, except Hatch End, subject to further reports being provided on the outcomes of public and statutory consultation and receiving the Panel's recommendation to proceed;
- (4) Local Safety Parking Schemes, be subject to further consultation with the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel;
- (5) The Hatch End Controlled Parking Zone scheme, Malvern Road and Somerset Road petitioners' requests for schemes, in conjunction with other reviews, be considered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety, the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel and traffic officers and be agreed as a separate Portfolio Holder Decision;
- (6) any substantive requests to undertake a parking review on existing parking schemes be referred to, and considered by the Panel for inclusion in the annual programme of work.

**Reason for Recommendation:** To recommend the Parking Management Schemes programme for the 2015/16 financial year.

#### **49. Local Transport Funding schemes 2015/16**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which set out the proposed programme of schemes to be implemented with the £100k local transport fund allocated to the London Borough of Harrow by Transport for London (TfL) in 2015/16.

Following a brief overview of the report by an officer, Panel Members made the following comments and asked the following questions:

- that the speed restrictions planned for St Paul's Avenue, Earlsmead School, Merlin Crescent as well as minor road safety measures with a reduced allocation of £10k be prioritized for implementation. And the Panel agree, subject to confirmation of LTF funds being available for the 2016/17 programme, that the Panel also prioritise the scheme planned for The Ridgeway for implementation in 2016/17;
- would it be possible to reduce the amount of money allocated for some of the larger schemes and re-distributed it in such a way so that all the proposed schemes could be completed?
- road markings and signage around the borough were in need of re-refresh and should be prioritised as they had safety and traffic flow implications;
- was there any TfL funding available for bus priority schemes?

An officer advised that:

- it would be possible to amend the amounts allocated to each scheme within the £100k allocation to enable all the schemes to be progressed;
- the Council had invested in renewing road markings and signage in key areas around the borough. This activity was funded from Revenue rather than Capital Funds. There was a specific programme of works and funds allocated for this work in 2015/16;
- 2 bus priority schemes, one in Rayners Lane and the other on Eastcote Lane, had been budgeted for.

The Chair moved a motion, which was seconded and agreed unanimously, as follows:

1. that Schemes 1, 2 and 5 be prioritised and the amount allocated for Scheme 5 be reduced to £10K;
2. that traffic officers be authorised to initiate Schemes 3 and 4 following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and

Community Safety and the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel, without exceeding the £100k budget.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder of Environment, Crime and Community Safety)

That the local transport schemes included in the 2015/16 programme are:

1. Schemes 1 and 2;
2. Scheme 5 with the amount allocated reduced to £10K;
3. Schemes 3 and 4 are initiated following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety and the Chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel, without exceeding the £100k budget.

**Reason for Recommendation:** In order for the Council to spend the £100k allocated by Transport for London on prioritised local transport schemes within the 2015/16 financial year.

#### **50. Controlled Parking Schemes - Review of scheme development process**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which set out details of a review of the scheme development process for parking management schemes and recommended changes to improve this process.

An officer highlighted the following aspects of the report:

- the review of the consultation documents and materials used by the traffic and highways section had highlighted a number of issues that needed to be reviewed, and consultation materials had been amended and updated accordingly;
- the only recurrent issue highlighted by residents had been the level at which a majority view was established. It may be easier to justify a majority, if a higher 60% level of support was required in the road by road analysis of consultation responses. It was proposed that future schemes be assessed on this basis.

Panel Members made the following comments:

- residents should be encouraged to engage with consultations and the importance of putting their views across should be emphasised to them;
- the rationale behind the increase of what constituted a majority to 60% should be explained to residents;



- consultation documents should clearly state that the decisions regarding proposed parking and traffic schemes were made by Councillors and not traffic officers. This would ensure that officers were not unfairly criticised or held responsible by residents for decisions made by Councillors;
- paragraph 2.10 of the officer report should be amended to state that TARSAP Advisors were also invited to attend stakeholder meetings;
- where possible, consultation documents should be expressed in plain English and the difference between a public and a statutory consultation should be made clear. All of the above measures would lead to increased engagement by residents;
- parking issues were well managed under the current programme, however, a more structured approach should be taken for traffic-related issues;
- residents sometimes claimed not to have received consultation documents. Would it be possible for Ward Councillors to engage in door-knocking and advise residents about current consultations in their area?

The Chair stated that an assessment of whether the current balance of work between parking and traffic issues was appropriate. The Consultation process needed to be open and transparent and much of it was prescribed in law. Ward Councillors had an ambassadorial responsibility in this, and could help officers encourage resident engagement and respond to their queries.

An adviser stated that all day parking controls were detrimental to community life as they prevented traders, residents, visitors, doctors and district nurses, etc from parking in residential areas. Conversely, one-hour restrictions were successful in deterring commuter parking and allowed life to go on.

An officer advised that the hours of operation of Brent council's CPZs was 10.00 am-3.00 pm. This allowed enforcement officers a 4-5 hour window to carry out enforcement action. Traffic officers were investigating alternative models for the timings of parking restrictions.

A Member proposed a motion which was seconded and agreed unanimously that:

The phrase 'early in 2015/16' be omitted from Recommendations 2 and 3 and be replaced with 'as soon as practicable'.

**Resolved to RECOMMEND:** (to the Portfolio Holder of Environment, Crime and Community Safety)

That

- (1) the scheme development process be amended as shown in Appendix B;
- (2) a meeting be held with the Chair of the Traffic And Road Safety Advisory Panel and the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety to approve a standard format for public consultation and statutory consultation documents, as soon as practicable;
- (3) a meeting be held with the Chair of Traffic And Road Safety Advisory Panel and the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety to approve a standard set of scheme options suitable for the most common parking issues reported to TARSAP, as soon as practicable.

**Reason for Recommendation:** To assist the Panel to make recommendations on parking management schemes which are transparent, objective and reflect the majority view of communities.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **51. Information Report Petitions**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which report set out details of the petitions that had been received since the last meeting of the Panel and provided details of the Council's investigations and findings where these had been undertaken.

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

### **52. Information Report: Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme update**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which provided an update on progress with the 2014/15 traffic and parking schemes programme of works. This included schemes funded by Transport for London (TfL) and schemes included in Harrow's Capital Programme.

Following a brief overview of the report, an officer provided the following responses to Panel Members' questions:

- it may be possible to carry out localised patching to repair sections of Marsh Lane that were in need of re-surfacing and introduce pedestrian crossings;

- there had been a number of accidents involving pedestrians on Marsh Lane / Pinner High Street and the existing zebra crossings are location close to each other. It is therefore proposed that the footways would be widened to alleviate overcrowding and the zebra crossings would be slightly repositioned.

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.22 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BARRY KENDLER  
Chair