

**REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety
Advisory Panel**

Date of Meeting: 15 July 2010

Subject: INFORMATION REPORT

Petitions relating to:

1. Roxeth Hill / Lower Road - request for pedestrian crossing facilities
2. George V / Pinner Road - alterations to the traffic lights for safety reasons
3. Headstone Lane - requests for minor extensions to double yellow lines
4. Roxeth Hill - enforcement of weight and speed limit
5. Chestnut Avenue, Edgware - request to remove CPZ
6. High Road, Harrow Weald – request for loading and parking facilities
7. Eastcote Lane, South Harrow- request to introduce CPZ

Responsible Officer: Brendon Hills - Corporate Director
Community and Environment

Exempt: No

Enclosures:

- Appendix A** - Roxeth Hill plan of location
- Appendix B** - Metropolitan Police speed survey (Dec 2009)
- Appendix C** - Chestnut Avenue-Plan of parking restrictions implemented 1st May 2010
- Appendix D** - Chestnut Avenue-Summary of statutory objections
- Appendix E** – Minutes of meeting between Harrow council officers and representatives of businesses from High Road, Harrow Weald

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last meeting of TARSAP and provides details of the Council's investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Roxeth Hill / Lower Road – request for pedestrian crossing facilities (referred from Cabinet 11th Feb)

- 2.1 A 106 signature petition was presented to Cabinet on 11th February 2010 by a parent of a child at Roxeth First and Middle School. The 106 signatures were from parents/carers of children who attend Roxeth First and Middle School.
- 2.2 Cabinet referred the petition to this Panel for consideration. The petition is in two parts. The first part had 4 points reported in the 11th February 2010 Cabinet minutes and is signed by the organiser of the

petition. The second part focuses on concerns about pedestrians crossing at the junction at the western end of Roxeth Hill. It is this part which has the petition signatures.

2.3 The first part in addition to the pedestrian crossing concerns states:-

“It is not safe for children having to walk up a very narrow and busy road without having any metal barriers to shield them from the constant flow of traffic on Ashbourne Avenue as they go to and from school.”

2.4 The second part is stated in the following terms:-

“Demand for a safe intersection crossing for the Roxeth First and Middle School children and their parents and carers. As a concerned parent, I am appalled at the dangerous intersection near my children’s school which we must cross daily at much risk to our safety. I was told that the council does not have the necessary funds to rectify this situation however I feel for the sake of the many children who attend the nearby schools as well as the people living in the area of this extremely dangerous intersection, that Harrow Council is very much obliged to spend whatever it costs to immediately improve and make safe the street crossing where five streets converge; Roxeth Hill, Middle Road, Northolt Road, Shaftesbury Avenue, Ashbourne Avenue. There is inadequate crossing marking and on several of the streets there are no street light indicators/crossing indicators for pedestrians whatsoever! This is unacceptable!! We therefore demand an immediate response on the part of the local council to this gravely dangerous situation to ourselves and our children.”

2.5 An officer met with the organiser of the petition in Roxeth Hill to discuss the concerns raised. The discussions involved the narrow width of the northern footway between the junction and Roxeth School, the absence of guard-railing and the lack of dedicated crossing facilities at the junction between Roxeth Hill and Northolt Road/Lower Road which was the main problem.

2.6 The northern footway of Roxeth Hill is relatively narrow and is 1.1 metres at its narrowest point. There is little scope for widening the footway as the carriageway is also narrow and the footway is constrained by the buildings at the back of the footway. Implementing guard-railing would not be practical as this would further narrow the footway and make the existing situation worse. The southern footway is wider but for those pedestrians crossing Lower Road this route would also involve crossing and re-crossing Roxeth Hill.

2.7 A plan showing the layout of the junctions and the crossing positions is shown in **Appendix A**.

2.8 Roxeth Hill (A4006) is a borough distributor road as is Shaftesbury Avenue. Northolt Road/Lower Road (A312) is part of London’s Strategic Road Network (SRN).

- 2.9 The Northolt Road, Lower Road, Shaftesbury Avenue and Roxeth Hill staggered junction had traffic signal control introduced some years ago and this has improved the pedestrian crossing facilities and includes a staggered green man crossing facility in Northolt Road to the south of its junction with Shaftesbury Avenue as a part of the signalised junction. However, the main points where people cross are at the western end of Roxeth Hill and the southern end of Lower Road where there are uncontrolled small pedestrian refuges.
- 2.10 There are two further roads which join this staggered junction, Middle Road and Ashbourne Avenue but neither of these is signal controlled because traffic is restricted to exiting the junction only.
- 2.11 There have been complaints over the years about additional delays to traffic since the signalisation of the junction. The last major review of signal timings in 2004 generally made improvements and reduced queue lengths although the junction still operates near to maximum capacity during the am and pm peak periods. There is therefore no spare capacity which might have enabled an all red pedestrian phase to be included in the signals timings and maintain the same level of traffic delay. Therefore pedestrians crossing each of the four major arms of the junction have to cross in two stages crossing each direction of traffic separately. There is guard-railing positioned on the median strip between the Roxeth Hill and Shaftesbury Avenue junctions to prevent pedestrians crossing the middle of the junction which would be more dangerous.
- 2.12 For pedestrians crossing the eastern side of the Lower Road arm and the southern side of the Roxeth Hill arm of the junction this is relatively straightforward as they can make judgements on the signals controlling traffic approaching the junction which are visible to them.
- 2.13 For pedestrians crossing the west side of Lower Road and north side of Roxeth Hill on the opposite sides of these arms where traffic exits the junction, it is more difficult because traffic can come from different directions and the signals controlling this traffic are unsighted. In the case of Roxeth Hill, traffic coming from Lower Road approaches around a blind corner with limited visibility. To cross the north side of Roxeth Hill there is a period of 9 seconds in each signal cycle where pedestrians can cross without conflicting with vehicular traffic, however, the only indication for pedestrians is a right turning aspect at the start of the period. To cross the western side of the Lower Road arm there is an 8 second inter-green period (the period in between green periods on different traffic phases), when pedestrians can cross but there is no indication when conflicting vehicular traffic is stopped to enable them to do this.
- 2.14 A further hazard posed to pedestrians is the small size of the refuge islands which are only 1.4 metres wide in Roxeth Hill and between 2.2 and 1.4 meters wide for Lower Road. In Roxeth Hill this refuge also has a sharp (45⁰) change in crossing direction. At either end of the school day significant numbers of primary age children,

parents/carers and secondary school students are using these two crossing points and can result in the refuge islands being overcrowded.

- 2.15 The Roxeth Hill crossing point is also used by classes of primary school children going to and from a swimming pool on the Hill.
- 2.16 Achieving staggered green man crossing facilities across the Roxeth Hill and Lower Road would clearly be of benefit to pedestrians, however there are several reasons why this is not achievable. Introducing green man phases within a traffic signal phasing cycle would require inter-green periods which would significantly extend the cycle time. This would reduce the capacity for traffic through this junction causing significant additional delays and would affect the A312 which is part of the SRN.
- 2.17 In order to create a staggered controlled pedestrian crossing facility, an adequately sized refuge island would be necessary. Although on first inspection some of the lane widths might appear generous, they are necessary to accommodate the turning movements of larger vehicles. Computer simulated vehicle tracking runs show that the carriageway lane widths cannot be reduced. The extent of the public highway and in some instances building lines also prevent the possibility of carriageway widening. The size of vehicles which need to be accommodated on this part of the highway network is larger as these are major classified roads.
- 2.18 An analysis of collisions leading to personal injuries show there were 5 vehicle only collisions within the last 3 years of available data and one pedestrian casualty. This is regarded as a comparatively good safety record for this type of junction and location and compares well with similar locations in London. The pedestrian injured was a nine year old child who in the incident details is described as running out into the path of an approaching vehicle in crossing Shaftesbury Avenue during the school holidays.
- 2.19 It would appear that although there are evident traffic hazards for pedestrians, these are well understood and reasonable care is taken in crossing by parents/carers accompanying younger children or by unaccompanied secondary school students. Traffic speeds at the junction, particularly those turning were comparatively low and enable drivers and pedestrians to react to any hazardous situations and take appropriate action.
- 2.20 In conclusion although the facilities for pedestrians at this junction are far from ideal, achieving any significant improvement at this junction is not practicable or cost effective. Also the risk posed to pedestrians as indicated by our current assessment of traffic casualties does not justify giving priority for any improvement measures here.

George V Avenue / Pinner Road – request to alter the traffic lights (referred from Cabinet 18th Mar)

- 2.21 A petition was presented to Cabinet on 18th March by a local resident which contained 1,247 signatures. Cabinet referred the petition directly to this Panel for consideration.
- 2.22 The petition requested safety alterations to traffic lights at the junction of George V Avenue/Headstone Lane/Pinner Road. The petition states:-
- 2.23 *“We the undersigned believe that the traffic lights at the junction of George V Avenue , Headstone Lane and Pinner Road require safety alterations for cars and pedestrians in a attempt to reduce the number of accidents and rephase to improve traffic flow.”*
- 2.24 TfL has developed a traffic model with split phasing for the junction to incorporate right turn filters to deal with the disproportionately high number of right turn accidents and to reduce delays and queuing at the junction. The modelling has been checked and verified but is also subject to an internal safety audit because this is primarily a road safety scheme.
- 2.25 As this junction is on the strategic road network the TfL Network Assurance Team (NAT) also need to give their approval, and details of the scheme have been sent to them.
- 2.26 The implementation of this scheme would involve relatively minor civil engineering works by the Council. The main changes would be to introduce right turn traffic signal heads and revise the phasing and signal timings and this work will be undertaken by the TfL signals contractors in June/July. The scheme is intended to reduce the high proportion of right turn incidents at the junction.
- 2.27 The Progress report regarding the annual programme of traffic and parking schemes also on the agenda provides further information about this scheme.

Headstone Lane – request for double yellow lines in side roads (referred from Cabinet 18th Mar)

- 2.28 A petition was presented to Cabinet on 18th March by a local resident which contained 415 signatures. The petitioners are residents of Elmcroft Crescent, Greenfield Way, Hillview Gardens, Holmdene Avenue, Manor Way and Priory Way. Cabinet referred the petition directly to this Panel for consideration.
- 2.29 The petition requests that minor extensions to the existing double yellow lines be made to improve safety particularly exiting onto Headstone Lane from side roads and entry from Headstone Lane into side roads. The petition states:-
- “We the undersigned believe that exiting our roads onto Headstone Lane presents a serious road safety hazard and request the extension of double yellow lines”*

- 2.30 This request will be reviewed as a part of the annual “problem streets” programme where requests for minor localised parking control schemes are assessed and prioritised schemes are implemented. Progress with this works programme is updated at each meeting as a part of the regular progress report on traffic and parking schemes.

Roxeth Hill – request for enforcement of weight and speed limits (referred from Cabinet 18th Mar)

- 2.31 A petition was presented to Cabinet on 18th March by a local councillor which contained 56 signatures. Cabinet referred the petition directly to this Panel for consideration.
- 2.32 The petition requests enforcement of the weight limit ban and the speed limit along Roxeth Hill. The petition states:-

“We the undersigned residents of Roxeth Hill, Harrow urge Harrow Council / Police to take prompt action to curtail the illegal passage of overweight vehicles over Harrow hill and to enforce the legal speed limit on all vehicles using this road at all times day and night.”

- 2.33 The number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) using this area is a longstanding complaint of residents. It has been explained to residents that although Roxeth Hill lies within one of the borough’s lorry ban areas, HGVs are entitled to use the roads for access to addresses within that zone and only HGV through traffic is actually prohibited.
- 2.34 The enforcement of the weight limit restriction (lorry ban), has recently been transferred from the Metropolitan Police to the Council, and currently undertaking enforcement action is proving difficult. A classified traffic survey is being arranged which will provide data on traffic speeds, flows and into various categories of vehicles, which will allow us to assess the current volume of HGV traffic.
- 2.35 The Police carry out periodic speed enforcement in Roxeth Hill using a mobile enforcement unit following the council’s previous request for action to be taken. **Appendix B** is attached which shows the results of a recent speed survey carried out on Roxeth Hill by the Metropolitan Police. The results of the speed survey do not highlight any significant problems in the area.

Chestnut Avenue, Edgware - request to remove the controlled parking zone

- 2.36 A petition was received on 5th May 2010 with 55 signatures from 24 households in Chestnut Avenue, Edgware. The petition states:-

“We the undersigned residents of Chestnut Avenue, Canons Drive, Edgware would like to object most strongly to the CPZ to be extended to our road for the following reasons:

We see no advantage to parking restrictions. We do not have problems with parking congestion at present apart from perhaps the odd few cars parking at the top of the road (at the junction with Canons Drive)

We feel the presence of poles, markings in the road and parking control notices will devalue our properties and will be extremely unsightly

The parking restrictions will cause significant inconvenience to visitors and tradespersons wishing to visit and the only benefactor will be the local authority wishing to enforce charges on residents who will have to purchase parking permits.”

- 2.37 The parking controls became effective in Chestnut Avenue on 1st May 2010 and were the outcome of a review and possible extension of the Edgware, Canons Drive area CPZ (Zone TB). A plan showing the proposals is shown in **Appendix C**. The proposals consist mainly of single yellow lines operating from 11am to midday Monday to Friday in conjunction with designated permit bays for residents and visitors. Double yellow lines are also provided at junctions, turning head and bends to ensure highway safety at these locations.
- 2.38 The original CPZ (zone TB) has been in operation since 2005 and requests had been received from residents living on the periphery of the zone to deal with displaced parking. In February 2008, the Panel agreed that a consultation should be carried out and this was undertaken in September 2008, with the results reported to the Panel on 26th November 2008.
- 2.39 The results indicated that of the 59% of residents who responded to the council's questionnaire, 9 households supported a CPZ and 11 were against. However, in response to the additional question of whether residents supported a CPZ if one was implemented in an adjacent road the results were equally divided with 10 supporting the CPZ and 10 against.
- 2.40 The Panel recommended that the CPZ in Chestnut Avenue should proceed to statutory consultation which was held in January/ February 2009. However a petition received from residents in Lake View meant the report to the Panel was delayed to enable a further consultation in this road to be carried out.
- 2.41 The results of statutory consultation were reported to the Panel on the 25th November 2009 when it was recommended that the 2 objections should be overruled. A copy of the objections and officers response is included in **Appendix D**. An objection from the London Fire Brigade concerning insufficient room for fire appliances to manoeuvre was resolved by making a slight modification to the design of the proposals.
- 2.42 The Panel's recommendations were agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Community Safety and implemented.

- 2.43 In response to statement 1 of the petition, an analysis of the petition signatories shows that 19 are from 10 households who chose not to respond to the Council's public and statutory consultation and 4 households who originally responded to the consultations and have chosen to change their views on supporting the CPZ. Clearly had members of the Panel received these views at the appropriate times they could have been taken into account when the decision to proceed was made.
- 2.44 There is no evidence to support statement 2 that the CPZ will devalue properties in the road. The signing currently in place is the minimum needed to comply with legislation and the yellow lines installed are 50mm wide primrose colour rather than the normal 100mm to be more environmentally sensitive to the location within a conservation area. It is for residents to decide if the advantages of the CPZ scheme outweigh the disadvantages.
- 2.45 The CPZ hours of operation, Monday to Friday 11am to midday has been considered to be an effective way of removing the all day "commuters" parking whilst causing the minimum inconvenience to residents, their visitors or tradesman. For many people there will be no need to park in the road during the operational hours and therefore no permit would be required.
- 2.46 It should be stressed that the council has responded to those residents who chose to make their views known at the appropriate time. Ensuring compliance through enforcement is required to ensure that these residents' wishes are followed. Any financial surplus raised through enforcement is used to support transport initiatives in accordance with legislation and in Harrow helps to fund the cost of the freedom pass scheme run by London Councils.
- 2.47 There is no programmed review of the parking controls that have been implemented in Chestnut Avenue. If the Panel wishes a review of the CPZ to be undertaken then it will need to be included in the 2011/12 programme to be submitted to the Panel in February 2011 when the annual review of parking requests is considered for the year ahead.

High Road, Harrow Weald – request for parking and loading facilities

- 2.48 A petition was received on 6th June 2010 with 7 signatures from 7 businesses along High Road, Harrow Weald. The petition states:

"We... declare our opposition to the proposed Local Safety Scheme... on the grounds that:

- *It fails to make adequate provision for loading facilities in terms of parking space and loading times*
- *It fails to cater for customers' parking needs in terms of parking space and time*

Extracts from the petition also state that:

- *“the loading times are restrictive and there is no parking provision for shoppers”*
- *“the road in question is not busy, with little congestion at peak times and the whole scheme seems overkill. There is much more traffic in the stretch between Locket Road and Palmerston Road, where the road is of comparable width, yet they still manage to fit loading bays on either side”*
- *“businesses have asked for evening parking for the customers on High Road – please can you substantiate this claim as we are the affected businesses and we are the affected businesses and we are clearly asking for more parking in general, at all times”*

The petitioners suggest that:

Real solutions to tackling said issues may include:

- *Redesigning the scheme with the petitioners needs taken into consideration*
- *Parking bays for shoppers and business loading*
- *Half-recessed parking bays similar to Greenford Road*
- *Utilising local vacant land for a shoppers car park*

- 2.49 High Road, Harrow Weald is part of London’s Strategic Road Network (SRN) and therefore any proposed changes to the highway layout and parking restriction require authorisation by Transport for London’s (TfL) Network Assurance Team (NAT).
- 2.50 In 2008, Navin Shah, London Assembly Member, approached the council on behalf of local businesses who were requesting that the end time of the existing waiting restrictions be reduced from 8pm to 6.30pm. A meeting was subsequently held with representatives of NAT and the local businesses, two of which are signatories of the petition being reported here. The meeting resolved that Harrow Council should look at the request as and when funding and staff resources become available.
- 2.51 Funding for a Local Safety Scheme (LSS) was subsequently confirmed in the 2009-10 financial year and it was decided to investigate these waiting restrictions as part of that scheme. Whilst the main objective of a LSS is casualty reduction a review of the existing waiting restrictions hours of operation was considered appropriate because they have been in place unamended since 1996.,.
- 2.52 A comprehensive analysis was undertaken of this section of road as a part of the scheme. At the junction of High Road and Whitefriars Drive there were two recorded personal injury collisions (PICs) within

the three year period analysed (2006-2008), both involving right-turning vehicles. One collision resulted in serious injury, the other slight. To help reduce the number and severity of collisions in this location, and to assist traffic flow, a right-turning lane is proposed. To ensure this facility can be safely used, the lane will be protected by constructing two new traffic islands. The northern island will accommodate pedestrians to assist them to cross the road and access the shops.

- 2.53 At the junction of High Road with Risingholme Road, there were also two recorded PICs in the same period. One collision resulted in a serious injury, the other slight. The proposed traffic islands mentioned above will also have a speed-reducing effect on traffic and therefore reduce the frequency and severity of accidents at this location.
- 2.54 Officers undertook extensive site observations and traffic surveys to provide statistical evidence to support the curtailing of the existing Monday-Saturday 8am-8pm restriction to Monday-Friday 7am-7pm and Saturday 9am-5.30pm along the western side of the High Road. These times are considered to better reflect the traffic flows in the area, whilst providing opportunities for park earlier in the day to use the local businesses.
- 2.55 The changes to the restrictions above and the proposed traffic islands and turning pocket have been authorised by NAT and therefore Harrow Council are proceeding with the scheme. Earlier this year residents and businesses were advised by letter of the intention to implement the scheme.
- 2.56 The construction of the scheme is currently still in progress, however work in the vicinity of the petitioners' businesses is currently on hold because of gas main renewal works being carried out on behalf of National Grid. This was originally planned to be completed towards the end of 2009 but technical issues and other complications have meant that the completion is now programmed for the end of June 2010.
- 2.57 The scheme was designed initially with the businesses' request to change the waiting restrictions, in mind, however in respect of the other options listed in 2.51 it must be noted that the High Road is a strategic through route and it's primary function is to accommodate through traffic between key destinations. Therefore the scheme needs to minimise congestion in order to satisfy the network management duty placed on local authorities under the Traffic Management Act legislation..
- 2.58 On street parking and loading opportunities cannot be accommodated in the High Road itself but space is available in the side roads in Whitefriars Drive and Risingholme Road. The proposed traffic islands in the scheme will make it easier for shoppers that park in Risingholme Road to be able to cross the High Road and access the shops and restaurants more safely. In addition the majority of shops in this location do have access to rear service yards.

- 2.59 The petition refers to the wide pavement, which could be available for inset parking bays. However, only part of this land is designated as public highway under the control of the Council as highway authority. The vast majority of this land is private forecourt, and any inset parking bays would require the agreement of all frontages to give up their land to facilitate any work.
- 2.60 The cost of providing such bays would be prohibitively expensive on account of the likelihood that underground statutory undertakers services will be present and therefore require protection or diversion before any construction work. Funding for the local safety scheme could not have been used for this purpose exclusively, whether or not the property holders were in agreement, and would not have sufficiently covered the cost of any such work. Appendix E shows notes from the December 2008 meeting where the above issues were raised and discussed.
- 2.61 The petition also refers to the section of High Street, Wealdstone where on-carriageway loading bays are provided. The businesses in the vicinity of these facilities have little or no practical alternative to loading in the main carriageway and this is why bays are provided here. The use of these facilities is strictly controlled operating at Mon-Fri 10am-3pm only, with loading prohibited Mon-Fri 7-10am and 3-8pm and Sat/Sun 8am-6.30pm in order to keep the road clear at busy times. In the case of the petitioners on the High Road loading is possible in the side roads near Whitefriars Drive and in rear service yards.
- 2.62 There is currently provisional funding in 2011/12 to undertake a consultation in the Harrow Weald area regarding parking controls. This is the next opportunity to conduct a wide-ranging review of parking, which may enable additional parking and loading facilities to be considered in the side roads in the area such as Whitefriars Drive and Risingholme Road.
- 2.63 The petition mentions that the council should provide parking on vacant land nearby. There was previously a plot of spare land situated behind Nos. 207-229 High Road, but this land is now being developed into housing. It should be borne in mind though that the construction and maintenance of off-street parking facilities comes at a large capital cost, which would require a large allocation of borough funds to implement and could only be realistically maintained by introducing operational parking charges.

Eastcote Lane South Harrow- Request to introduce a CPZ

- 2.64 A petition has been received from 10 households in Eastcote Lane which are situated between the junction of Roxeth Green/Rayners Lane and Cross Road and are situated immediately outside the South Harrow CPZ Zone M.
- 2.65 The petition highlights that a number of commercial vehicles are parking in the above length of road which is causing residents to

seek alternative parking elsewhere. The petitioners report that this causes difficulties and safety concerns especially for residents with children. They also report that Eastcote Lane is a busy road which causes particular problems at peak times especially if they are required to cross Eastcote Lane.

2.66 The petition states:-

“It is for this reason that controlled parking in this area would address such problems as mentioned and would alleviate the unwanted commercial vehicles from the area. With this in mind we the undersigned residents of Eastcote Lane HA2 9BJ, Area, request parking for permit holders only to be duly set up and implemented along our road as quickly as possible”

2.67 There is, at the time of writing, a public consultation in progress on a possible extension of the South Harrow CPZ but this does not include the above length of road. This section of road did not feature in any requests when this review commenced earlier this year and was not apparent when early consultation took place with ward councillors.

2.68 Officers are arranging to meet with residents to discuss their concerns in more detail and observe the parking patterns. This is with a view to designing a scheme and carrying out public consultation on a possible CPZ extension, assuming that the existing CPZ times of Monday to Saturday 10-11am and 2-3pm are likely to mitigate the reported parking problems.

2.69 Officers also need to ensure that any proposals do not have any significant adverse effects on parking in the locality and it may be necessary to extend the coverage of the parking proposals and consultation area beyond that raised by the petition.

2.70 The aim is to expedite any consultation so that the results can be included with those from the other locations in South Harrow which are in progress so they can be reported to the September meeting of the Panel.

Section 3 – Further Information

3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel of new petitions received. No updates will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

Section 4 – Financial Implications

4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report require further investigation and would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

Section 5 – Corporate Priorities

- 5.1. Any suggested measures in the report accord with our corporate priorities to deliver cleaner and safer streets, build stronger communities and improve support for vulnerable people.

Section 6 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 16/6/2010		

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Paul Newman , Parking and Sustainable Transport Team Leader,
Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622, email:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Barry Philips, Traffic Team Leader, Traffic and Road Safety Team Leader, Tel:
020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

None