

**Record of Site Meeting re Pinner Road /High Road Harrow Weald
Waiting & Loading Restrictions Monday 19th July 2010 at 2pm**

Attendees

Navin Shah	NS	GLA Member
Bill Stephenson	BS	Harrow Ward Councillor
Sasikala Suresh	SS	Harrow Ward Councillor
Shai Koria	SK	Harrow Glass/ Pinner Road Small Business Group
Andrew Miles	AM	Government Relationship Manager TfL
Lennox Davidson	LD	Responsive Programme Manager TfL
Paul Newman	PN	Team Leader Parking & Sustainable Transport -Harrow
Barry Philips	BP	Team Leader Traffic & Road Safety- Harrow

Apologies

Councillor Omar
David Eaglesham
Andrew Saffrey

The meeting convened outside Harrow Glass premises in Pinner Road. The meeting had been requested by Navin Shah to look at the background and issues surrounding Parking Controls at Pinner Road and High Road Harrow Weald. Introductions were carried out.

Pinner Road

NS explained that he would like to understand the background to the restrictions and the relevant responsibilities of TfL and Harrow Council. The aim was for the shopkeepers to understand the responsibilities of TfL and Harrow Council, as they felt they were being passed between the two organisations.

SK set out the problems that businesses were experiencing in the current economic climate. He circulated a document on behalf of The Pinner Road Small Business Group which set out a number of points.(Copy attached to minutes). The focus was on the effect of loading and waiting restriction on weekend trade. The forthcoming opening of a MetroTesco store on the old "Apollo" site adjacent to The Gardens and the redevelopment of the Travers Perkins site to a Morrison Store, approved at appeal, would only have additional negative effects on local businesses.

NS established that the new Harrow administration had formulated a strategy to deal with supporting local businesses and they were keen that this aspect should be incorporated into the consultation process.

In response to a question from PN It was stated by NS that he did not see this as being part of specific consultation with local people but as part of the consideration by the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel/Portfolio Holder.

AM set out the role of TfL and their involvement in the approval process for changes on Pinner Road. He explained that Pinner Road was a Harrow borough road but central government had established it as part of the Strategic Road Network. The Traffic Management Act had placed a duty on TfL to “assure” any changes that would impact on traffic flows. (Post meeting Note-copies of Statutory Instrument and extract of TMA previously supplied to SK on 15th June 2010) AM gave an example for the reasoning for such powers, i.e. alterations to traffic in one borough moving a problem and having a negative impact in an adjacent borough.

SK suggested that if this was the case then TfL involvement was only needed in the first km or so of the boundary. AM clarified that this was not what legislation called for. He went on to say the normal process was that a borough would submit its proposals for TfL to check. TfL Network Assurance would then give the borough approval or not. In response to a question over who had the final say AM indicated TfL could reject proposals and, although he was not aware it had ever occurred, TfL could require the council to correct something TfL rejected, and therefore in this respect it could be considered TfL had the final say.

PN outlined the approach that had been undertaken, initiated around 5 years ago. Harrow officers had approached TfL to see what TfL would like to see in any changes to traffic/parking to preserve the capacity of the strategic road. The parking controls had not been reviewed for around 30 years and in that period there had been changes to traffic flows, duration of peak periods, Sunday trading etc. It therefore made sense to seek TfL views before embarking on consultation and prevent abortive work.

LD explained that the process for TfL was not only, now known as Forward Planning, but involved many sections of TfL. The process involved would look at impact on general traffic, buses, cycling, and pedestrians. PN confirmed that the whole process had been about trying to seek a balance for all road users. NS asked if the TfL consideration included effect on businesses and his response was that it was holistic.

LD stated that it was normal for a scheme to be reviewed after implementation as it was not always possible to get it 100% correct first time. He understood that such a review was programmed at Pinner Road. PN confirmed the review was programmed to start at the end of 2010 as recommended to the Portfolio Holder by the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) in February 2010.

SK reiterated that the effect on businesses was real and that businesses were already closing and the review could not wait until the end of the year.

In response to a question about how soon TfL could respond to any proposed changes put forward by Harrow he responded that it would be likely to be around 28 days. It was explained that any changes have to go through statutory consultation and there were time, resource and funding implications in making such changes.

At that point it was decided that no further useful progress could be made on site and that some of the attendees could meet back at the Civic Centre to continue the discussion on future action.

NS, BS, AM, LD, PN and BP then proceeded to High Road Harrow Weald

High Road Harrow Weald

The representative from Ishq Restaurant was unavailable to join the meeting.

PN outlined the issues. Since the meeting held at the Civic Centre in December 2008 negotiations had taken place over a period of time to reassure TfL Network Assurance as High Road is part of the Strategic Road Network. A number of surveys had been undertaken but unfortunately this has on a sequential basis which lengthened the timescale. The outcome was that survey data on buses showed that the existing waiting restrictions outside the restaurants could not be changed on weekdays to the requested 6.30pm but 7pm. On weekends the data had supported an earlier finish time of 5.30pm.

PN went on to explain that the changes had not been fully implemented because of utility work by the Gas Board and the reinstatement was immediately visible. This work had been programmed to be completed November 2009. However technical problems had meant the works were extended. Harrow's Network management team had not allowed any further extension beyond the end of June to allow the works at Harrow Weald to be carried out.

The works also included a pedestrian refuge just north of Whitefriars Avenue as part of local safety scheme which was confirmed by BP as part of his programme. This would allow pedestrians on the east side of the High Road to be able to safely access the local shops and restaurants whilst also dealing with opposing vehicle conflict from driver negotiating the bend on the wrong side of the road.

NS asked when the works would be carried out, why the restrictions were different on opposing sides of the High Road and why there were double yellow lines just north of Whitefriars Avenue.. PN responded that the works were due to start on 2nd August and be completed by the start of the new school term. It had not been possible to assure TfL that parking on both sides of the road would allow buses to pass in both directions. The double yellow lines were to protect the approach of the yet to be installed refuge and the adjacent access serving a block of flats.

PN went on to acknowledge that the delays had probably caused confusion for local residents and businesses and that he was arranging for the communication team to issue a leaflet, press release and a plan to remind people of the joint proposals and forthcoming programme.

It was agreed that no further useful progress could be made on site.

NS, BS, PN, and BP travelled to the Civic Centre to continue the meeting with SS and SK

Civic Centre

There was discussion about how quickly changes could be made at Pinner and SK reiterated the effect that this was having on business and that action was required quickly. It was clarified that any changes had to go through the same consultation and advertisement process that had introduced them in the first place.

SK and BS stated that they did not think that the consultation material had made clear the full waiting and loading restrictions that have been implemented. PN agreed to check and send a copy of the consultation material to those present (Post Meeting Note-emailed on 20th July)

In response to a question PN set out the programme of parking reviews agreed by TARSAP in February, that there were 4 large scheme reviews ongoing and that the review at West Harrow was programmed to start after the school holidays. PN & BP both confirmed the programme had no spare capacity but in theory if the review was to be brought forward it would be necessary to swap the reviews of West Harrow and Pinner Road. BS stated that Pinner Road had been approved before West Harrow and PN replied that West Harrow had been implemented on 1st April and Pinner Road on 1st May.

PN also reported that a meeting had recently been held between Brendon Hill, Corporate Director, David Eaglesham Service Manager, Ward councillor and representatives of the West Harrow Action Group. They are expecting their review to start as programmed and any delay would likely have serious impact on the agreed programme.

BS acknowledged that the decision on programming was with TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder and that he would have discussions with Brendon Hill and David Eaglesham on future progress for Pinner Road and if necessary there was the option of “buying” in additional resources.

NS and BS reassured SK that they would follow the matter up with senior officers at the council.

The meeting ended at 4.45 pm

Circulation- All attendees + Councillor Omar, Brendon Hills, John Edwards, Eddie Collier, David Eaglesham,