



He added that, as a result, agenda items 10 and 11 would be brought forward and taken after agenda item 8, Deputations, and agenda item 9, Information Report on Petitions, would be taken thereafter.

The Panel was in effect thereby Suspending Executive Procedure Rule 48.9 and receiving the Deputation in relation to Honey Pot Lane which had appeared before the Panel at its special meeting on 10 August 2020.

The Panel noted that Councillor Marikar was reserving for Councillor Perry.

A Member of the Panel sought the Suspension of a Procedure Rule 49, Public Questions, to allow some additional questions and a Deputation submitted after the deadlines for questions and deputation to be asked/received. The Chair shared the discussions he had had with a late questioner/deputee. The Panel was advised that a number of questions, including requests for deputations, had been received after the deadlines. A vote was taken on a motion to suspend the Procedure Rule and to allow additional questions to be asked. This was duly seconded and voted on but was lost.

The Chair explained that officers would contact those that had submitted late questions.

[**Note:** Councillors Assad, Lee, Marikar and Miles voted against the motion. Councillors Hinkley, Jogia and Patel voted for the motion.]

## 82. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor David Perry

Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar

## 83. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that

- (1) the Declarations of Interests published in advance of the meeting on the Council's website were taken as read and the following further declaration made at the meeting by a Councillor under this item in relation to agenda item 7 – Petitions, be also noted:

Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar: (Non-Pecuniary Interest) – A Ward Councillor in respect of the petition submitted by a local resident titled 'Road Closure' which related to Headstone South Road (Minute 88 also refers)

- (2) Members and Advisers who had declared interests remained in the virtual meeting whilst the matters were considered and voted upon.

#### **84. Appointment of Vice-Chair**

The Panel received two nominations for the position of Vice-Chair. Both nominations were both duly seconded and, following a vote, it was

**RESOLVED:** To appoint Councillor David Perry as Vice-Chair of the Panel for the 2020/2021 Municipal Year.

#### **85. Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting - 5 February 2020**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **86. Minutes of the Special Meeting - 10 August 2020**

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to the following amendment, the minutes of the special meeting held on 10 August 2020, be taken as read and signed as a correct record:

Minute 80, Page 21 of the agenda (or page 56 of the minutes), first paragraph to be amended to read:

‘the School Streets Grimsdyke Primary School Scheme SS-01 was poor and would increase traffic flows and congestion and did not interact with other schemes in the area. The consultation was poor and a 20mph zone was required in Hillview Road and a section of Grimsdyke Road plus marking out car parking spaces in Shaftesbury Playing Fields car park if the scheme were to proceed. An officer replied that funding was only available for SS-01 but that he would ascertain if a 20mph could be incorporated but he was not certain that the car parking issue in Shaftesbury Playing Fields car park could be funded from SS-01’.

#### **87. Public Questions**

Public and Councillor questions taken were responded to and any recording placed on the Council’s website. Public questioners 3, 5 and 6 be sent written responses. The time limit of 15 minutes was extended to allow all questions to be taken.

In respect of the answers given to public questioner 4 to the written question and the supplemental question, it was also suggested that the issue of drainage be referred to the Council’s infrastructure team with the local Ward Councillors being involved in this process.

#### **88. Petitions**

A local resident submitted a petition which had been conducted during the consultation period of the Headstone South road closures. The petition requested the Panel to cancel the proposed closures and look at different suggestions. The petition was signed by a number of residents who would be affected by the road closures. The resident read out the terms of reference of the petition as follows:

“The following persons are requesting TARSAP to cancel the proposed closures between Pinner View and Kingsfield Avenue and the closure between Beresford Avenue and Cunningham Park. We suggest you look in to creating a one-way system and implement the 20mph zone.”

The Chair responded accordingly and allowed the resident an opportunity to speak on the terms of the petition, details of which are set out in the recording published on the website.

**RESOLVED:** That the petition be received and referred to the Corporate Director of Community for consideration.

## 89. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rules 48.3, the suspension of Procedure Rule 48.8 in accordance with Procedure Rule 32.1, the following deputations be received in respect of agenda items 10 and 11:

10 - Transportation schemes - review of development and implementation procedure;

11 - Information Report - Parking and Street Space Programme update - 2020/21.

### 1.

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title of Deputation</b>   | Harrow needs to plan strategically for walking and cycling, complete the Streetspace trials and plan permanent walking and cycling improvements   |
| <b>Reason for Deputation</b> | Harrow has lost out on many funding opportunities in recent years because of a lack of strategic planning for walking and cycling. The Streetspace schemes are a positive step and Harrow needs to build on them for long-lasting, borough-wide improvements. |

### 2.

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of Deputation</b>   | Honeypot Lane – Barrier  |
| <b>Reason for Deputation</b> | As a shopkeeper greatly affected adversely by the barrier and we are in great danger of losing our businesses. |

Full details in relation to the deputations, including questions asked and answers given, are referenced, in brief, at Minute 91 and at Appendix 1 to these minutes. The recording of this item/minute can be found by following the link below:

<https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting>

## Recommended Items

### 90. Appointment of Non-Voting Advisers to the Panel for the Municipal Year 2020/21

The Panel received a report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services, which set out nominations for Advisers to the Panel for the 2020/21 Municipal Year.

The Chair advised that nominations had been received from the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association (Mr Anthony Wood), Harrow Cyclists (Dr Anoop Shah), Harrow Association for Disabled People (Mr Nigel Long) and London Living Streets (Mr Jeremy Leach).

The Panel agreed that, pending the decision of the Portfolio Holder, the advisers present be allowed to participate in the meeting that evening.

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

That the nominations for Advisers to the Panel, as set out in paragraph 2.3 of the report, be agreed for the Municipal Year 2020/21.

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

### 91. Transportation schemes - review of development and implementation procedure

Prior to the consideration of the report of the Corporate Director of Community, the Panel received two Deputations (Minute 89 also refers), full details of which were available by following the link at Minute 89 and listening to the audio recording. The scripts prepared by the Deputies is appended to these minutes but it should be noted that that they might have deviated somewhat from their respective script when presenting.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title of Deputation 1</b>   | Harrow needs to plan strategically for walking and cycling, complete the Streetspace trials and plan permanent walking and cycling improvements   |
| <b>Reason for Deputation 1</b> | Harrow has lost out on many funding opportunities in recent years because of a lack of strategic planning for walking and cycling. The Streetspace schemes are a positive step and Harrow needs to build on them for long-lasting, borough-wide improvements. |

In summary, the three representatives of Deputation 1, Health Streets for Harrow, explained why Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) were necessary, the need for greater investments in cycling and walking which would impact positively on mental health, the issues faced by cyclists and the main barriers to cycling which Harrow needed to address. They responded to questions

from two Members in relation to the involvement of the Portfolio Holder of Environment and the need for a strategic plan for cycling and walking and agreed that cycling lessons ought to be provided for in schools, explained how junctions could be made safer for cyclists and thanked the relevant Members for their support and enthusiasm for cycling.

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title of Deputation 2</b>   | Honeypot Lane – Barrier  |
| <b>Reason for Deputation 2</b> | As a shopkeeper greatly affected adversely by the barrier and we are in great danger of losing our businesses. |

In summary, a representative of Deputation 2, appealed to Members to remove the barriers at the top end of Honeypot Lane which had had an adverse impact on businesses there. He could not see the reasons for the barriers as the pavement was 8.5 feet wide and did not meet the criterion for a narrow pavement. There certainly had been no increase in pedestrian numbers there and the footfall had fallen dramatically for which evidence was available. An adviser stated that the Honeypot cycle lane was useful and used by cyclists and that the service road was used by motorists to bypass traffic. Walking and cycling facilities needed to be expanded in the area.

The Deputee responded to questions from Members as follows:

- that no parking was available in the vicinity of the shops and that it could not be argued that the measures provided health and safety benefits. No barriers had been installed in Stanmore where the footfall was greater than at Honeypot Lane;
- that there was a need to reverse the flow in the area to stop traffic by passing the traffic lights at the junction.

A couple of the Members were of the view that there had been lack of cohesion, that the Panel had made a recommendation for the removal of the barrier but that this had not been agreed. The Chair stated that the Panel was an advisory body but that all schemes were reviewed on a monthly basis. He had understood that the figures for the footfall differed.

An officer explained that the footfall was measured on a monthly basis and that consultants were carrying out video surveys. However, no figures were available for the period prior to Covid-19 for comparison but changes were being monitored on a monthly basis in line with government guidance. It was expected that controlled parking would be installed soon on the other side of the service road to provide relief to businesses.

The Chair stated that he would ask the Leader to contact the Deputee and concerns would be conveyed to the Portfolio Holder for Environment.

The Chair thanked the deputees for their presentations.

The Panel then received a report of the Corporate Director of Community, which updated members on a review of how walking and cycling schemes

were promoted and consulted on following the experiences of delivering the Harrow Street Spaces Programme. He provided a detailed explanation, as set out in the report, including why the proposed changes were necessary.

The officer responded to questions from the Panel relating to the Mayor of London's transport policy and stated that:

- the Mayor of London sets transport policy and local authorities were expected to promote and deliver traffic schemes in accordance with their approved Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The delivery of schemes are, however, still subject to consultation with local residents and the determination of whether schemes should be implemented is still with the borough;
- street space schemes were reviewed on a monthly basis and the decision to amend or revoke schemes was within the remit of the Portfolio Holder for Environment. He assured the Panel that this process was effective and residents' concerns were being addressed.

An adviser supported the proposal to develop schemes in advance and stated that a strategic overview of the road network where LTNs could be implemented was required. It was important that a team of engineers was available instead of using consultants who were not always familiar with the borough.

In response to further questions and comments, the officer stated that he would report to the Portfolio Holder on the comments made by the Panel, including on bus lanes.

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

That the finding of the report be noted and that the proposed improvements to the scheme development and implementation procedure highlighted in the report be implemented.

**Reason:** To improve the quality of schemes submitted for bids and to improve the scheme development process in order to deliver higher quality schemes.

## 92. Information Report - Petitions

The Panel received an information report of the Corporate Director of Community, which 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.

Prior to the consideration of the report, the Panel received representations from a back-benching Member who, in brief, spoke about the petition relating to Dennis Lane, Stanmore, which had requested the restriction of the traffic flow there. She stated that:

- officers had misunderstood the terms of the petition and explained that residents of Dennis Lane did not want the road to be closed off;
- residents wanted a point of no entry and an experimental scheme ought to be trialled there.

An officer agreed to speak with a resident of Dennis Lane and to explore the funding position with colleagues within the Community Directorate.

The officer introduced the report in full and made reference to Petition 9 – Honeypot Lane, service road, removal of pedestrian barriers. He reminded the Panel of the Deputation they had received earlier in the meeting in respect of this matter. A Member moved the following motion that the barriers at Honeypot Lane be removed. The motion was duly seconded and, following a vote, it was carried. The Chair expressed his disappointment in light of the fact that the scheme implemented was expected to be reviewed shortly.

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

That the pedestrian barriers at Honeypot Lane service road be removed.

**Reason:** To help businesses.

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

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

[**Note:** Councillors Assad, Lee, Hinkley, Jogia, Patel and Marikar voted in favour of the motion. Councillor Miles voted against the motion.]

## **Resolved Items**

### **93. Information Report - Parking and Street Space Programme update - 2020/21**

Prior to the consideration of the report of the Corporate Director of Community, the Panel received two Deputations (Minutes 89 and 91 also refer), full details of which were available by following the link at Minute 89 and listening to the audio recording. The scripts prepared by the Deputies is appended to these minutes but it should be noted that that they might have deviated somewhat from their respective script when presenting.

The Panel received an information report of the Corporate Director of Community, which provided an update on progress with the 2020/21 traffic and parking management programme of works. An officer introduced the report and updated Members on the current programme of transport schemes and initiatives funded in the 2020/21 programme, details of which were set out in the appendices to his report.

The officer responded to question from Members and undertook to look at the representations received in relation to cycle lanes across South Harrow. He



added that officers were looking to link District Centres via cycle lanes and that Ward Councillors would be involved in the process. He provided tentative timescales.

An adviser praised the Council for its Street Spaces Programme but felt that it had omitted a pedestrian improvement scheme. High quality walking routes that ensured that pedestrians were not intimidated were required. Additionally, a borough wide 20mph zone was required.

A Member enquired how concerns were going to be addressed in respect of the LTNs schemes already implemented. He added that the School Street Space programme had been a good idea but it had been implemented without any enforcement measures being put in place.

The officer replied that officers were listening to all concerns and briefing the Portfolio Holder and the Corporate Director of Community to allow them to take informed decisions. He explained that officers had been under immense pressure to implement the schemes whilst engaging with Ward Councillors. Officers were also closely working with the parking enforcement team.

Another Member stated that whilst she understood the recent increase in Covid-19 cases, she was firmly of the view that the barrier at Honeypt Lane ought to be removed as it was having a detrimental impact on businesses and it was considered to be unnecessary. She was of the same view in relation to the barrier on Kenton Lane. Additionally, officers needed to give consideration to the demography of the borough when implementing road closures. The Chair stated officers were looking to review parking in Honeypt Lane. Another Member highlighted the need for the consultation process to be thorough.

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

**Reason:** To avail the Panel of the progress made on the Programme.

#### **94. Date of Next Meeting**

To note that the next meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel was scheduled to be held virtually on 2 March 2021 at 6.30 pm.

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

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WZ4DjrSv9SA&feature=youtu.be>

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.59 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR JERRY MILES  
Chair

## Deputation of Healthy Streets for Harrow

Harrow Council Transport and Road Safety Advisory Panel

13 OCTOBER 2020

### Addressing agenda Items

10. Transportation schemes - review of development and implementation procedure, and
11. INFORMATION REPORT - Parking and Street Space Programme update - 2020/21

### Title of deputation:

Harrow needs to plan strategically for walking and cycling, complete the Streetspace trials and plan permanent walking and cycling improvements

### Reason for deputation:

Harrow has lost out on many funding opportunities in recent years because of a lack of strategic planning for walking and cycling. The Streetspace schemes are a positive step and Harrow needs to build on them for long-lasting, borough-wide improvements.

### Introduction – VC

Good evening Chair, councillors, advisors, officers and guests. Thank you for having us. I represent Harrow Cyclists and our campaign Healthy Streets for Harrow. My name is Veronica Chamberlain and I am a British Cycling ride leader for women. We hear a lot of fine words from everybody about the importance of cycling and walking. I would suggest to you that this Emperor has no Clothes.

I am joined tonight by EB, resident of Headstone South ward, and TF, governor of Roxeth Primary School who cycles regularly in Harrow. E will speak first, followed by T and then I shall wind up.

EB

My name is E, I'm a Headstone South resident. In early 2019, I delivered a petition to Harrow Council which called for Headstone South to become a Low Traffic Neighbourhood – looks like I'm a bit of a trendsetter considering one of the questions asked earlier was requesting another new LTN.

So - why did I (and indeed do I?) feel that Headstone South needed a low traffic neighbourhood?

I used to live in one before I moved to Harrow, so I know what I'm missing! – put simply, you get much reduced levels of traffic and therefore safer and quieter streets with more pedestrians and cyclists. Absolutely, there is a trade-off – you sacrifice convenience when you drive, to achieve this. Indeed, arguably these schemes only

work because they make driving for short journeys less convenient, otherwise why would anyone ever walk or cycle?

And it's not just me – here are some of the reasons given by other residents to explain why they signed my original petition:

"There's just a crazy number of cars buzzing up and down these roads constantly, primarily to avoid traffic lights on the main roads. It's not safe for my kids to cycle."

"I would love to cycle more but it feels very dangerous and the cars treat you very aggressively."

"The traffic on these minor roads makes them really unpleasant for residents and pedestrians."

So – we want to walk and cycle, we want our kids to walk and cycle, Harrow Council wants us all to walk and cycle but I'll say it again - frankly why would they ever do this when there isn't a welcoming and safe environment for doing so?

However, there is now some good news for the petitioners – some LTN trials are now underway in Harrow. However, many other LTNs are going in across London at the same time which has generated some press and unfortunately also perpetuated misconceptions about these schemes – quite a few were perpetuated in the last instance of this very meeting.

To combat this, I therefore believe what myself and other residents would really like to see from Harrow Council is a greater degree of openness and transparency about these trials.

For example, I was asked by multiple different people what the definition of 'success' was for the Headstone South trial. To find out the answer, I had to submit a formal question to a Council committee, then I had to go and pass on the response to all the people who asked the question individually in different forums. This is a very roundabout way of finding out something so fundamental.

Perhaps instead of this the Council would consider using the consultation website to set out some factual information about these types of schemes, and how they support Harrow's strategic goals (as set out in the LIP) of improving health, reducing congestion, and improving air quality, and why it is so important that the trials are of six months' duration.

If it is Harrow Council's ambition to do more of these trial schemes in the future (and I hope it is), I really feel it is worth the time and effort to put something like this together. Each of the schemes will be unique, but the underlying rationale is unlikely to change.

I'd like to finish by thanking the councillors and officers who have worked so hard to make these trials happen. Myself and the other Headstone South petition signatories are delighted with this opportunity to try out other way of making local journeys, and we look forward to seeing how things progress over the coming weeks and months.

Thank you for your time; I'll now hand over to TF.

TF

It's great that there is the motivation for, and investment in, cycling and walking routes.

My children and I walk, run and cycle for health and practical reasons, to be out in clean air, to exercise, for mental health, leisure, and to commute. It is great that there are cycle lanes in Harrow; that the London Cycle Network passes through; and that there are many considerate drivers and other users.

While it is safer cycling in groups, including with children, than as an individual, children and adults are often learning to navigate the routes and it can be intimidating, even with care and guidance. Cyclists do put their flesh on the line.

In Harrow, cars overtake within inches and too fast, even on quiet roads and even with children. This makes cyclists, especially children and inexperienced cyclists 'wobble'. Cyclists can't accelerate or brake as fast as cars – we have slower response times and we're much slower on hills, even slight inclines. We 'wobble' – out from the kerb and gutter, from potholes, cars, or just because we sometimes wobble.

Cycle lanes can be brilliant, but in Harrow, cars are often on them – parked or moving. Pedestrians are on them, even children on trainer wheels, which is good training for them, but they may be going so slowly that a standard cyclist can't stay upright behind them, or pass. Cycle lanes stop suddenly – they just disappear, leaving you in unexpected conflict with cars and other route users – do you go under a car or crash into a pedestrian? Cycle lanes may well be necessary on main roads but breathing deeply noxious fumes is not ideal. Our lungs benefit from green routes and back roads – it keeps us healthy and is more pleasant. Cycle lanes are important, but if they are not well-planned, they may add very little value.

My children cycle to school and for leisure, as do I, and for work and health benefits. My children have had close scrapes, even under my watchful eye. In London, I have been hit by drivers 'playing chicken' with me and drivers making sudden right-hand turns, damaging me and my bike. One of my brothers was knocked off his bike on a roundabout locally, damaging him and his bike. My other brother came off his bike hitting a blind obstacle in the gutter when his attention was caught by a car. He's an experienced commuter and ended up with a broken elbow and weeks off work. My sister simply doesn't cycle. That's just my siblings and I as experienced London cyclists. Cyclists do put their flesh on the line.

There are many considerate, responsible route users, but cycling is hazardous. For the benefits of cycling to be gained, routes need to be made safer and pleasanter.

As a school governor, we are very aware of parents parking up on kerbs and around the school, putting 'little people' at risk as they are not visible. Children will run on to school or out. Cars are a hazard for cyclists and pedestrians, but parents choose them for safety and comfort. We need to break this link, to make people safer and healthier, walking and cycling.

With what I outline above – would you choose to walk and cycle with your children or recommend it for other vulnerable users?

VC

Since 2013 I have led 297 cycle rides with over 1500 participants for this borough including women of BAME communities, with disabilities using adapted cycles, on e-bikes, young and elderly. They all tell me the key barriers to cycling are driver behaviour and dangerous road design.

Harrow's activities to date have given the illusion of doing something, and spending lots of money, without tackling the real barriers to cycling. The Emperor has no Clothes.

In 2013 Harrow's 'A Vision for Cycling in Harrow' aimed:

"To increase the modal share of cycling in the borough and to make Harrow a safer place to cycle"

No target was used. We respectfully suggest to this Panel that unless you set SMART objectives, you will never achieve them, and nothing will change.

Council plans say we have 41km of cycle lanes. Again, the Emperor has no Clothes. These are not cycle lanes, they are white paint in which cars can park. We have no cycle lanes to modern design standards.

Harrow has lost out on funding opportunities. Twice the Wealdstone Liveable Neighbourhood was turned down. The expertise of Harrow Cyclists was not used. The Goodwill to All junction had funding from the developers of the Kodak site but no cycling improvements. We need a planning policy which prioritises walking and cycling improvements from planning gain funds.

Thousands are being wasted. Imagine your child comes home from school and says, 'Now I have done Bikeability, can I cycle to school?' So do you say 'Oh yes, great idea! Or more likely definitely not, it's too dangerous.' There is no point in teaching children and adults to cycle when there is nowhere to cycle. Even the parks have a bylaw against it.

Harrow Cyclists advised against wasting hundreds of thousands on rebadging exercises called Quietways, sending cyclists down indirect routes; there was no rationale for these routes. Unsurprisingly they are hardly used.

Officers have recently submitted a bid for a cycle route from South Harrow to the Town Centre, without consulting Harrow Cyclists. Surely it would be better to take expert advice.

Looking at Streetspace, which we generally support, Cycle lanes along dual carriageways finish short of the junctions. As part of the review process, they need to be joined up at each end with safe infrastructure at junctions.

The word which infuriates most people concerned with cycling is 'encourage.' It's almost as if, when you spend money on encouraging people to cycle, miraculously driver behaviour will improve and the roads will become safe. Really?

If you ask cyclists what would get more people cycling, it's not fun events in parks or leaflets about school cycling routes. It's safe, direct cycle routes and better driver behaviour. Why would this panel waste its time not addressing the top priorities? Campaigns to 'encourage' cycling are not useful unless you have the right conditions to back them up.

So please, Panel: Give the Emperor some Clothes. Harrow needs a strategic overview of the borough's road network

which roads are the desire lines and need cycle lanes  
which junctions need to be made safe for cycling and walking  
how to minimise cycle wait times  
where low traffic neighbourhoods are needed.

We also need support measures such as

cycle parking at destinations  
cycle hangars in areas of flats  
driver education on safe driving around cyclists

With a strategic plan, officers can engage the community, and implement the plan as funding becomes available.

Chair, thank you for your time and attention.

Good evening.

Thank you for allowing me to address you.

I am appealing to you to remove the barriers from the front of our shops.

They have totally killed business on our parade. For instance, there is nowhere to park. One of my customers received a parking ticket today for parking on the corner. There was nowhere else for him to park. The pavements are 8' 5" wide. There is no footfall along the parade. In your notice to the shops the pamphlet stated that you have noticed a higher footfall. Where did that come from. I and a few other shops have CCTV and there is NO footfall showing.

The barriers were NOT put up to protect the public from COVID **but to make money for the council.**

At the last Tarsap meeting the councillors voted to remove the barriers. Please tell me whose body is the tail wagging and who is making decisions. You do not own businesses that rely on the public and have been barricaded.

We are desperate to have the barriers removed otherwise there are at least 4 shops going to close especially now that the furlough scheme is coming to an end.

On what basis are you making decisions. There is enough space for people to pass one another on the pavement but no parking spaces for people visiting the shops.

I am asking you to please remove the barriers to help the shops survive. Stanmore is very busy but have no barriers and two large car parks. You are supposed to be helping business to survive not kill them off.

Barnet and other areas have now removed their parking barriers. Why can't you.

Our lively hoods are in your hands.