

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 3 JUNE 2015

<b>Chair:</b>	* Councillor Barry Kendler	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Susan Hall	* Jerry Miles
	* Ameet Jogia	* Mrs Vina Mithani
	* Kairul Kareema Marikar (2)	* Nitin Parekh
<b>Advisers:</b>	† Ms N Baker	* Dr Anoop Shah
	* Mr L Gray	* Mr A Wood
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	James Bond	Minute 60
	Lynda Seymour	Minute 62
	Georgia Weston	Minute 60

- \* Denotes Member present
- (2) Denotes category of Reserve Member
- † Denotes apologies received

### 53. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Jeff Anderson	Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar

### 54. Declarations of Interest

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

All Agenda Items

Councillor Ameet Jogia declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he lived in the Headstone Lane area. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

**55. Members' Right to Speak**

**RESOLVED:** In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 40.1 – Part 4D of the Constitution, the Panel agreed that the following Members could speak at the meeting:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
James Bond	7
Lynda Seymour	9
Georgia Weston	7

**56. Appointment of Vice Chair for the 2015/16 Municipal Year**

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor Jerry Miles as Vice-Chair of the Panel for the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

**57. Co-opted Advisers' Right to Speak**

**RESOLVED:** That the following Co-opted Advisers be permitted to speak at the meeting pending formal approval of their appointments by the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety:

Mr Anthony Wood – Harrow Public Transport Users' Association (HPTUA)  
Dr Anoop Shah – Harrow Cyclists.

**58. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2015 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**59. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were received.

**60. Petitions**

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

1. Petition presented by Councillor Ameet Jogia on behalf of residents of Canons Park relating to residents' parking in parking zones DA and CS, containing 31 signatures, with the following terms of reference:

'We the duly undersigned wish to alleviate the parking problems for residents of Donnefield Avenue in zone DA by asking for extra spaces to be added to the zone or use of zone CS or to make part of zone DA residents only 24 hours per day.'

2. Petition presented by Councillor Ameet Jogia on behalf of residents of Pangbourne Drive requesting that Pangbourne Drive be included in the Dalkeith Grove parking review, containing 23 signatures, with the following terms of reference:

'We the undersigned urge Harrow Council to include Pangbourne Drive in the review for Dalkeith Grove scheduled for this year, as any restrictions implemented will have an adverse effect on Pangbourne Drive, in relation to displaced parking and further congestion.'

3. Petition presented by a resident of Kenton Road objecting to parking restrictions on Kenton Road containing 602 signatures, with the following terms of reference:

'We the undersigned users of Kenton Road, Kenton, Harrow confirm our objection to the action recently taken by Harrow Council through increasing the parking restriction on Kenton Road by the placing of double yellow lines. This will restrict our ability to use the access to the Temple premises in Westfield Lane for religious and community events and provide our custom to the businesses and shops on the Kenton Road in the course of our everyday business. We ask the elected Councillors of the London Borough of Harrow to revert to a single yellow line parking restriction to avoid any negative impact from these changes which have been made without consideration of local residents, visitors and businesses of the area. (Between Westfield Drive up to Kenton Park Avenue).

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer stated that:

- It may be possible to include Pangbourne Drive in the review for Dalkeith Grove scheduled for this year, however, officers would be obliged to carry out a consultation of those in Pangbourne Drive and Jesmond Way, which would increase the overall cost of the review. Furthermore, the Panel would need to consider making adjustments to the review and any impact on schemes which had already been agreed;
- the implementation of Double Yellow Lines on Kenton Road had been agreed as part of the Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme at a previous meeting of the Panel.

Officers undertook to evaluate the viability and implications of including Pangbourne Drive in the Review planned for Dalkeith Grove and would

update Panel Members before the next meeting of the Panel. Officers would report back regarding the other two petitions submitted, at the next Panel meeting.

## 61. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 48 (Part 4D of the Constitution), the following deputation be received:

1. Action to alleviate traffic problems on to Headstone Lane and George V Avenue

The first depute stated that she had been a resident of Elmcroft Crescent for 23 years and made the following points:

- there were safety issues relating to the existing right hand turn into Headstone Lane because the Double Yellow Lines (DYLs) on both sides of the junction were not long enough therefore sightlines were obstructed particularly when larger vehicles were parked on Headstone Lane close to the junction;
- vehicles tended to speed towards Headstone Lane station therefore there was a collision risk and there had been 7-8 such collisions in recent years, one leading to a serious injury;
- her car had been hit by a speeding car when she pulled out of the side road in November 2014 and her car had been written off;
- she was also concerned for the safety of motorcyclists and cyclists on this road. The Council had a duty of care to ensure the safety of all road users by minimising risks. Most local residents were of the view that the DYLs should be increased in length and traffic calming measures introduced in Headstone Lane for safety reasons.

The second depute stated that he had been a resident of Elmcroft Crescent for 20 years and was a retired police officer. He circulated photos regarding the issues discussed below to the Panel and officers. He stated that:

- he had seen vehicle accidents occur when turning from Elmcroft Crescent into Headstone Lane. There were also problems turning into both George V Avenue and Headstone Lane due to poor visibility, particularly at night due to parked vehicles (belonging to both local residents and to staff from Nower Hill School), speeding vehicles, a high bank and vegetation that obscured sightlines. All of this had been exacerbated by the removal of the speed camera on George V Avenue. He requested that traffic calming measures be introduced in those streets to resolve these issues.

Following questions and comments from Panel members, the deputies stated that the vegetation that was obstructing sightlines was between Hillview and Elmcroft Crescent rather than in residents' gardens.

Officers advised that:

- it was likely that the large vehicles parked on Elmcroft Crescent belonged to residents and was not as a result of displaced commuter parking;
- Headstone Lane was a key strategic route used by a number of buses and therefore was not suitable for the introduction of conventional traffic calming measures as these would impact on bus services and their passengers. It would not be possible to install a mirror there. The petitions report highlighted that fact that the Department for Transport no longer accepted applications for the erection of mirrors on the highways, for a number of reasons;
- speed cameras needed to comply with set criteria and Transport for London had strict criteria regarding the use and siting of speed cameras;
- DYLS had been introduced in those streets as part of the North Harrow Controlled Parking Zone. The length of the DYLS were calculated using standard criteria and a tracking model;
- traffic officers would carry out an assessment of those streets. This would include an assessment of the efficiency of the DYLS at the junctions, any obstructions to sightlines, a speed survey and all other road safety issues and would consider any possible mitigating measures;
- Headstone Lane was a busy distributor road, and therefore physical traffic calming measures would not be a viable option;
- officers would look at the issue of sightline obstruction by vegetation on George V Avenue.

An adviser to the Panel stated that there was a cycle route on Headstone Lane however, it was not appropriate for cyclists as vehicle speeds on the road could be quite high therefore a more radical solution was required.

A Member back benching, supported the deputies and stated that:

- she understood that TfL had recently agreed to re-instate the speed camera at the cost of £100k. This was due to the high speeds of vehicles on those roads, particularly at junctions, where the average speed was above the legally set limit;
- she had visited comparable roads in the vicinity of Long Elmes and had personally measured the DYLS, which were approximately 50 feet long

and requested that the DYLS in the above junctions be extended for safety reasons.

Another Member back benching stated that:

- the traffic related issues on the above mentioned streets had been long-standing and the council needed to be pro-active to ensure the safety of drivers, pedestrians and cyclists;
- he was disappointed to learn that the officer report stated that the DYLS at the junction of Elmcroft Crescent and George V Avenue were sufficient, and requested that they be re-evaluated.

The Chair stated that the Panel would await to hear back the results of the traffic officers' assessment of the above streets and junctions.

## **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

### **62. Appointment of Advisers to the Panel 2015/16**

Members received a report which detailed the nominations for Advisers to the Panel for the 2015/6 municipal year.

It was reported that the nomination from the Harrow Association for Disabled (HAD) People had been withdrawn and a replacement nomination would be advised in due course.

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

That the nominations for Advisers to the Panel, as set out in Appendix 1 to the officer's report, with the exception of the HAD nomination, be agreed.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **63. Information Report: Petitions**

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

An officer tabled a document which set out details of a petition which had been presented by Councillor Ameet Jogia, at the February 2015 Panel meeting, on behalf of residents of Lake View and Dukes Avenue, but had been omitted from the main agenda in error. He provided a brief overview of the report.

### Petition 3 - Wemborough Road & Weston Drive – Request for 20 mph zone

With regard to the above petition, a Member back benching stated that:

- the petition had been signed by 90% of the residents of Wemborough Road & Weston Drive;
- residents in the vicinity of Wemborough Road & Weston Drive did not agree with the official accident report figures and wanted this to be reviewed;
- the road markings on the junction of Weston Drive & Wemborough Road had only recently been re-painted;
- the residents understood that a 20mph zone could not be implemented, however, the Stanburn, Whitchurch and Avanti House schools would significantly increase the volume of traffic and consequently safety risks in the area;
- an additional assessment be carried out before the next meeting of the Panel.

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

- there were buses and a high volume of traffic on these streets and therefore the introduction of traffic calming measures on two strategic roads would not be appropriate or in keeping with Council policy;
- in the interests of transparency and fairness, officers were obliged to rely on official accident records, ie those accidents which had been reported to the police, rather than hearsay evidence. Road safety and parking were the two issues that generated the most requests for action from residents. If the official accident reporting was low then it was unlikely that an area would be prioritised. Additionally, TfL monitored the Council's road safety and accident reduction records and some TfL funding provided to Local Authorities had specific performance targets attached to them;
- traffic officers had been actively involved in the plans for school expansion, and had taken into account key travel patterns, school travel plans (STPs) and any potential impact of the school expansion programme. The Council's travel planners worked closely with schools to ensure STPs were robust;
- with regard to the Avanti House school relocation, an independent transport assessment which would include traffic surveys and personal injury accident records and the school's travel plan would be presented to the council as part of the Planning process. The transport assessment would include any mitigating measures suggested for consideration.

#### Petition 4 – Lake View/Dukes Avenue – request for parking controls

An officer stated that the issues highlighted in the petition from the residents of Lake View and Dukes Avenue would be reviewed and reported at the February 2016 meeting of the Panel.

A Member stated that the local Safer Neighbourhood Teams had been proactive in dealing with the parking and traffic issues experienced by residents in Lake View and Dukes Avenue, and sought guidance from officers regarding alternative solutions, other than inclusion in a CPZ. An officer advised that he would request the enforcement team to contact the Member to further discuss the matter.

A Member urged the Panel to reconsider the decision it made at its meeting of 2 October 2014 regarding Malvern Gardens and that parking controls there should be implemented as per the original officer recommendation.

The Chair advised that the amendments made to the officer recommendation relating to Malvern Gardens had been carried by a majority of votes. He proposed a motion that further consideration of this issue be deferred until the February 2016 meeting of the Panel.

The motion was put to the vote and won. The Panel agreed by a majority of votes that consideration of the request from the petitioners on Malvern Gardens and Winchester Road be deferred until the February 2016 Panel meeting.

*The Panel wished it to be recorded that the decision to defer consideration of this petition was by a majority of votes. Councillors Kendler, Marikar, Miles and Parekh voted to defer.*

#### **64. Information Report: 2015/16 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 2015/16 traffic and parking schemes programme of works.

Following a brief overview of the report, and following comments and questions from Panel members, an officer advised that:

- an officer confirmed that a zebra crossing was proposed in Eastcote Lane near to Brookside Close to replace an existing pedestrian refuge . The consultation process for these would begin shortly;
- both the chair of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel and the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety would be consulted regarding the locations to be included in the Local Safety Parking Schemes Programme and the relevant local Ward Councillors would be informed;



- officers confirmed that the point no entry in Radley Gardens was an experimental scheme;
- with regard to cycle lanes being introduced to the Station Road re-development, officers were considering the introduction of some off-road cycle schemes as part of the 'quietways' cycle programme.

The Panel also agreed that a report regarding road safety, including accident statistics and measures to educate residents about road safety, be provided at the next Panel meeting.

#### **65. Any Other Urgent Business**

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following items were included late on the agenda for the reasons set out below:

The Chair advised that the Review and amendments to the consultation documents and materials used by the Traffic and Highways section would be completed by early October 2015, however, as the next meeting of the Panel was planned for 8 October 2015, this would not allow sufficient time for a report to be provided to the Panel regarding this. He therefore proposed that the meeting date be changed to 6.30 pm on Monday 23 November 2015. The earlier start time was due to the large volume of items for consideration at the next meeting.

The Vice-Chair advised that Councillor Aneka Shah would replace Councillor Krishna Suresh as a Reserve Member of the Panel.

**RESOLVED:** To note that:

- (1) Councillor Aneka Shah to replace Councillor Krishna Suresh as a Reserve Member of the Panel;
- (2) the date of the next Panel meeting be changed to take place at 6.30 pm on Monday 23 November 2015.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.15 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR BARRY KENDLER  
Chair