

# **TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES**

## **23 OCTOBER 2019**

<b>Chair:</b>	* Councillor Jerry Miles	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Peymana Assad	* Ameet Jogia
	* Christopher Baxter	* James Lee
	* John Hinkley	* David Perry
<b>Advisers:</b>	† Mr N Long	* Mr A Wood
	* Dr Anoop Shah	
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Simon Brown	Minute 58
	Sarah Butterworth	Minute 55

\* Denotes Member present

† Denotes apologies received

**The audio recording of this meeting can be found at the following link:**

<https://www2.harrow.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=260&MId=64656&Ver=4>

### **51. Attendance by Reserve Members**

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

### **52. Declarations of Interest**

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

Harrow View/Headstone Drive/Headstone Road Junction Improvement (Goodwill to All) – Progress Update (Agenda item 10)/Other Relevant Agenda Items

Councillor Ameet Jogia, a member of the Panel, declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was Ward Councillor for Canons and owned a property in Headstone Lane. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

Councillor Simon Brown, who was not a member of the Panel but would be back-benching on this item, declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was Headstone South Ward Councillor and lived in a street within the proposal which would be impacted upon.

Information Report - Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme (Agenda item 12)

Councillor John Hinkley, a member of the Panel, declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was Ward Councillor for Hatch End and roads in his Ward were referenced in the report. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Relevant Agenda Items

Councillor James Lee, a member of the Panel, declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was Ward Councillor for Edgware and lived in Canons Park. He would remain in the room whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

**53. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2019, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**54. Public Questions**

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

**55. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petition which was referred to the Corporate Director of Community for consideration and it be noted that a report on this petition would be submitted to the February 2020 meeting of the Panel:

Pedestrian Safety at Salt Bar Road Crossing, HA2 0JY

Councillor Sarah Butterworth, together with Councillors Dan Anderson and Honey Jamie, presented a petition signed by 119 people with the following terms of reference:

“We the undersigned are seriously concerned with the safety of pedestrians crossing by the Salt Bar road junction at the bottom of Roxeth Hill. We therefore demand that the Council, as a matter of urgency, implements improvements at this junction for pedestrians, including the introduction of a ‘green man crossing facility for these lights that notifies pedestrians when it is safe to cross.”

## 56. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 48, the following deputations, which were both received after the deadline, be received:

- (1) (Agenda Item 10) - Harrow View/Headstone Drive/Headstone Road Junction Improvement (Goodwill to All) – Progress Update – Deputation led by Yiannis Christofi and Jagdish Trivedi

Objection to the proposed Plan.

- (2) (Agenda Item 10) - Goodwill Junction – No Right Turn Ban – Deputation led by Inqilab Kassam and Mohamed Assaria

To speak on behalf of residents and individuals affected by Goodwill to All junction improvement.

Full details in relation to both the deputations, including questions asked and answers given, were set out in the audio recording and referenced, in brief, at Minute 58. The audio recording of this meeting can be found at the following link (Agenda Item 10, Minute Number 58 refer):

<https://www2.harrow.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=260&MId=64656&Ve r=4>

## RECOMMENDED ITEMS

### 57. Appointment of a non-voting Adviser to the Panel 2019/20

The Panel received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services, which set out a nomination for the appointment of an additional Adviser to the Panel for the 2019/20 Municipal Year.

The Chair reported that, previously, the Panel’s membership had included a representative from Living Streets, formerly known as the Pedestrians’ Association and recommended that this further appointment be made to reflect the priority given by the Mayor of London to increased use of walking.

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

That the nomination for an additional Adviser to the Panel, as set out in the report at paragraph 2.4, be agreed.

**Reason:** To assist in the work of the Panel.

**58. Harrow View / Headstone Drive / Headstone Road junction improvement (Goodwill to All) - Progress Update**

Prior to the consideration of the report, the Panel heard from deputees present at the meeting (Minute 56 also refers) who spoke on behalf of shopkeepers and residents living in the area of the proposal, full details of which were available under this Minute by following the link below:

<https://www2.harrow.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=260&MId=64656&Ver=4>

In brief, the deputees, whilst welcoming the proposed pedestrian crossings, urged the Panel to reject the recommended proposal (option 4B) as they were concerned that it would lead to an increase in accidents, impact adversely on surrounding streets and businesses which would also lose out on passing trade and enquired if officers had made provision in respect of any economic benefits resulting from the proposal. They were also concerned about increased traffic congestion in an area that already suffered from congestion. The deputees also referred to a petition opposing the proposal and how it would impact on what was essentially a residential area with schools and businesses. The proposal to ban right turns would result in U-turns as residents tried to get to their homes. It would also increase pollution in the area which would impact adversely on the vulnerable.

The deputees also related various examples of how traffic would travel if the scheme was implemented and the resultant impact on residents. They urged that officers work with residents/businesses to achieve an amicable scheme.

The deputees responded to the questions from the Panel, which then proceeded to consider the officer report.

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community, which set out details of the Goodwill to All junction improvement scheme, informal consultation and recommended that the scheme progress to the statutory consultation stage.

Harrow View / Headstone Road / Headstone Drive junction also known as the Goodwill to All junction was a four arm traffic light controlled junction located close to the old Kodak site. The junction currently had no controlled pedestrian crossing stages and operated during weekdays at or near capacity in the morning and afternoon peak times causing congestion in the area.

An officer introduced the report and referred to the development of the Kodak site which would have a significant impact on the Goodwill to All junction for both pedestrians and traffic. He added that money had been secured for improvements to the junction from the developer of the Kodak site and the money would be released when a viable scheme had been approved. The deadline was 2019/20 financial year.

The officer outlined the key issues and explained how officers had arrived at a decision, following consultation with local residents, which recommended option 4B, details of which were set out in the report. He added that a roundabout was not feasible and traffic signalling was the only viable way forward. The junction was constrained and without any improvements there, the traffic would increase particularly on side roads. The option proposed would help keep traffic congestion to a tolerable level. He was confident that the investment would result in significant improvements to the area and offer a better environment for businesses as loading/unloading facilities would improve. Access for pedestrians would also improve and the proposal would create a safer environment for them. Design work and assessments had been carried out with Transport for London (TfL), including modelling of traffic and assessment of the options. Extensive traffic surveys had also been undertaken. The officer explained how work on accurate representations of where traffic flow was conducted.

Members were informed that further discussions with residents would be undertaken to help mitigate impact on side roads once the funding for the improvements at the junction had been secured.

The officer responded to a number of questions from the Panel. The questions related to the definition of both local and through traffic, consultation undertaken and what methods were being used to reduce congestion. It was suggested by an adviser that the only way of reducing congestion was to make driving expensive or cycling/public transport cheaper. The Panel was informed that Ward Councillors had also been consulted on the options. It was clarified that parking provision on the Kodak site would be constrained by current parking standards and people needed to be offered incentives, such as using sustainable transport, to help reduce congestion. Making dedicated provision for cycle lanes at the junction was very limited due to the site constraints.

The officer responded to additional questions and explained that, the side roads experienced heavy parking and would not provide easy access for traffic. For traffic coming from further away, it would be quicker for road users to travel using main roads and a study had shown which routes would be used. He advised that experience had shown that most people would opt to take the easiest and most convenient routes. The officer explained that economic considerations related to trading opportunities and recognised what the depute had said about the new development providing new trading opportunities to replace those lost when the Kodak factory closed. With regard to assessing the cost associated with any increased mileage, petrol/diesel output and air quality for local residents who would be inconvenienced by the proposal, the officer explained that this was too difficult to assess as the impacts would be spread over a wide area and would be difficult to monitor, although, on balance, it might not result in any overall increases because the number of journeys across the area would not change.

A back-benching Member was of the view that the proposal would create more right turns in the vicinity of the area and that he would not be comfortable in making a decision based on a day's data. The officer explained that sufficient survey work had been undertaken to make

assessments and it was impractical and expensive to carry out such an extensive survey on multiple occasions. He explained that the surveys undertaken had been cross referenced with other surveys undertaken to check for accuracy and care taken to ensure that there were no adverse weather conditions or accidents and incidents on the network to ensure accuracy. The officer explained that a proactive direction signing strategy would be implemented to guide traffic along appropriate alternative routes.

In response to additional questions from Members, the officer stated that, initially, the proposal would have an impact on the area but over a period of time, drivers would adjust to the new environment, experiment with different routes and adopt new travel routes. It was easy to speculate what drivers would do as a result of the proposal but his professional view was that traffic would disperse much more widely than envisaged and there would be a very limited impact on the immediate area over time. There would be a dialogue with local residents on the types of traffic measures suitable for side streets.

A Member thanked the deputies for their submissions. He was of the view that local residents had the knowledge and that their vehement opposition to this proposal related to their own experiences. If such opposition had been received for any CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone), it would not have been approved.

The Panel was of the view that they could not support the proposal before them and amended recommendations to those set out in the report which were moved and seconded and it was

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

That

- (1) the comments received during the informal consultation exercise be noted;
- (2) the report's suggested transport interventions proposed to mitigate the impact of the proposed right turn restrictions at the junction be noted;
- (3) the elements of the scheme introducing traffic and parking restrictions, as shown in Appendix A to the report, be noted;
- (4) the overwhelming consultation opposition from residents, businesses and stakeholders to the suggested banning of right turns be noted but the broad support for the ambition of a safer pedestrian junction be acknowledged;
- (5) junction improvements suggested in Appendix A to the report be placed on hold, and for any traffic and parking restrictions to be taken forward further detailed informal local consultation needed to take place to bring forward proposals which gained wider public support; and such proposals must minimalise and further mitigate against traffic

volumes using side residential streets as a result of junction improvements;

- (6) the Panel recognises the importance of the junction improvements and urgency of the scheme and therefore once a scheme which properly addressed the concerns of residents was devised, this be brought to a special meeting of the Panel prior to moving to statutory consultation.

**Reason:** To address the concerns of residents and businesses.

## **59. Parking Permit Charges Consultation**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community setting out details of the public consultation undertaken in September / October 2019 to make changes to parking permit charges. The Panel also received and accepted a supplementary paper for the reasons set out on the supplemental agenda. The supplementary paper provided an update to the consultation results to reflect the final results.

An officer introduced the report and informed Members that the Parking Management and Enforcement Strategy set out a number of structural changes to parking control measures and the charging regime. He summarised the proposed changes as follows:

- residents' permits – use of vehicle emissions based charging
- business permits (on-street) - use of tiered charges in line with the London Plan classification of centres
- traders' permits – introduction of a new permit to facilitate traders working in CPZs (Controlled Parking Zones)
- doctors' (GPs) permits – introduction of a new permit to facilitate parking of emergency call out vehicle at surgeries without off street parking
- diesel vehicles – introduction of a surcharge for more harmful vehicle emissions
- electric vehicles – introduction of subsidised charging for zero emission vehicles.

The officer clarified the position in relation to question 8 in the report, which specifically related to businesses and asked about varying parking charges based on the location and type of a town centre.

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

That

- (1) the results of the parking permit charges consultation detailed in the report be noted;
- (2) a statutory consultation on the parking permit charges, as proposed in the public consultation document at Appendix A to the report, be undertaken.

**Reason:** To enable implementation of the proposed changes to parking permit charges set out in the public consultation and the Council's Parking and Enforcement Management Strategy.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **60. Information Report - Petitions**

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

An officer introduced the report and explained the outcomes relating to each petition, details of which were set out in the officer report.

An adviser supported the outcome reported in respect of Nugents Park petition where changes to bus standing arrangements were made by TfL.

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

**Reason:** To be availed of the outcomes in relation to the petitions submitted previously.

### **61. Information Report - Wealdstone Transport Infrastructure Projects**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community, which set out the progress made in developing major transport infrastructure projects for Wealdstone to support regeneration and growth.

The Chair reported that the infrastructure projects covered three main sites in the Council's regeneration programme which were the Poets corner (existing civic centre site), Byron Park (leisure centre site) and the new Civic Centre site (Peel House car park).

An officer introduced the report and explained that a great deal of work had been carried out and the projects were at an advanced stage. The modelling work had been funded by the TfL (Transport for London) and the results for the Wealdstone Scheme was showing significant benefits in bus journey time reductions for the area. Public consultation was planned for November 2019. The officer reported on other transport infrastructure initiatives for the area, such as a Cycle Way for the borough.

In response to questions from the advisers about the need for a cycle network and bus network to move together, the officer reported that this was underway and broad plans had been prepared and would be available at the consultation stage. The officer undertook to share details with the relevant adviser in this regard. He added that the road layout would be regulated to assist movement of buses, including a central bus lane in George Grange Way which would operate all day and revised loading/unloading areas in the



High Street. In response to a question from a Member, the officer reported that consultation would mainly focus on the bus improvement project.

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

**Reason:** To be availed of the work undertaken.

**62. Information Report - Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme Update - 2019/20**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Community updating Members on the progress made with the 2019/20 traffic and parking management programme of works.

An officer introduced the report, which set out the current programme of transport schemes and initiatives funded in the 2019/20 programme. It included schemes funded by the grant from the TfL (Transport for London) and the Council's capital programme. He added that appendices A and B provided a summary of progress made with all the schemes within the current programme. The report detailed specific schemes where they had reached the public consultation, statutory consultation or implementation stages and any other specific issues that would be of interest to the Panel.

The Panel was also informed that the World Car Free Day, an event in which one day is set aside to encourage people to be less dependent on their cars, celebrated by the Council on 22 September 2019 by the closure of a section of Greenhill Way, a strategic road network, for a street party, had been received well and the attendance had been good.

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

**Reason:** To be availed of the progress made on the various schemes within the traffic and parking programme.

**63. Change in CPZ timing in Methuen Close, Edgware - Urgent Business**

In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 40.1, the Panel agreed to the item being included on the agenda on grounds of urgency given and set out on the agenda sheet.

Councillor Lee stated that recent decisions on parking timings in neighbouring streets to Methuen Close, namely Buckingham Road, had resulted in this matter being brought back to the Panel. He was of the view that it was important for the Council to revisit the issue of how reviews were dealt with in the context of an allocated budget and the need to revisit all the Wards in Harrow. He also referred to a petition he was gathering in relation to Methuen Close.

An officer reported that Methuen Close would be included for consideration in the report on the 'Annual Parking Management Schemes Review' which would be submitted to the Committee at its meeting scheduled to be held on 5 February 2020. He referred to a previous decision of the Panel, which had discouraged automatic reviews and clarified how reviews could be carried out.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.31 pm, closed at 9.46 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES  
Chair