

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 16 SEPTEMBER 2010

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Nizam Ismail	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Susan Hall	* Mrs Vina Mithani
	* Ajay Maru	* John Nickolay
	* Jerry Miles	* David Perry
<b>Advisers:</b>	* Mr A Blann	† Mr L Gray
	* Mr E Diamond	* Mr A Wood
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Joyce Nickolay	Minute 24, 25
	Chris Noyce	Minute 24
	Stephen Wright	Minute 22

- \* Denotes Member present
- † Denotes apologies received

### 17. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

### 18. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made.

### 19. Minutes

An Adviser to the Panel stated that the minutes were a detailed and true record of discussion at the previous meeting and a vote of congratulations was offered to the clerk.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

- page 5, paragraph 2, the word 'Road' to be inserted after the word 'Pinner'.

## **20. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put at this meeting.

## **21. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received at this meeting.

## **22. Deputations**

The Panel received the following deputations:

### **1. The Secretary of Pinner and District Business Club requesting half hour free parking in Pinner**

The Chairman stated that this Deputation related to an item on the minutes.

A Representative of Pinner & District Business Club stated that the Residents and Business community of Pinner wished to express their concerns about the detrimental impact high parking charges in Pinner were having on businesses and residents, in comparison with other local High Streets in the area.

A Member of the Panel stated that half an hour free parking, if introduced, would need to be a borough-wide initiative. However, he believed that the costs of such an initiative would be prohibitive. He added that the current parking policy in Harrow was inconsistent and needed to be reviewed and reported back at a future meeting of the Panel.

A Member stated that the shopping parades in Belmont and Hatch End did not have parking charges, and agreed that the costs of extending this scheme borough-wide would be prohibitive.

A Member of the Panel stated that approximately 68% of Harrow's total parking revenue came from one hour off-street parking charges, the loss of which would impact negatively on other Council Services.

An Adviser to the Panel requested information on the costs of introducing half hour free parking throughout the borough. An officer undertook to provide further information and revenue figures for parking across the borough to the next meeting of the Panel due to take place in November 2010.

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, stated that Marks and Spencer were offering to refund car parking charges to customers in Pinner. He added that numerous shops and businesses in Pinner had closed recently and that parking charges were a contributing factor to this. He stated that a Council-led, borough-wide initiative was required to tackle this problem.

The Chairman stated that a petition on the same subject as the deputation had been presented at Council on 8 July 2010, and would be considered at the next ordinary meeting of Council in November and the results reported back to a future meeting of the Panel.

**2. Clinicians of Bacon Lane Surgery requesting changes to the proposed prohibited parking times in the area surrounding Bacon Lane.**

A Representative of the Clinicians from Bacon Lane Surgery requested changes to the proposed parking times in the area surrounding Bacon Lane to 1.00-2.00 pm to enable clinicians to drive to visit housebound patients between clinics and when emergency call outs are required. This would enable clinicians to drive to work and so have their car at their disposal to undertake home visits. He stated that the alternative would be for clinicians to commute by other means, which would significantly reduce the availability of resources available to undertake home visits, which may impact on the weekly number of home visits the practice is able to offer. He also requested that the Council grant the Surgery two free and permanently allocated Doctor Parking Spaces.

A Member of the Panel asked if two additional parking spaces or special parking permits could be made available to staff at the Surgery. Following questions from Members of the Panel, the lead depute stated that the Surgery had been offered two additional business permits but these only covered vehicles owned by the business and not by staff.

An officer stated that there were 25 parking bays in the immediate vicinity of the Surgery, with a total of 40 in the local area. An officer stated that the Surgery was eligible to purchase a further two business permits and they would need to write to the Council to request these.

An adviser to the Panel stated that staff at the Surgery provided a necessary and vital service to the community and the request for two additional spaces should be granted. An adviser to the Panel agreed that those carrying out essential jobs in the community should not be penalised.

A Member stated that further consultation had been undertaken following representations from residents in the Bacon Lane area. Residents had requested that parking be available from 12.00-2.00 pm in the vicinity of the Surgery, as it was possible that Barnet Council would introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) on their side of

Bacon Lane, which would impact on both the Surgery and the school run. She stated that the CPZ had been introduced for the convenience of residents, adding that the population of Harrow was over 220,000 people, and increasing numbers of residents were car owners. In such circumstances, the Council had to take proactive measures whilst continuing to respond to residents' needs.

An officer explained that there was provision in the parking permit scheme for health workers on-call in Harrow, but this permit did not permit health workers to park outside their work premises.

The Chairman stated that it would take some time to resolve this situation and asked that a more detailed response be provided at the next meeting.

**3. Bacon Lane Surgery Patients' Committee requesting changes to the proposed prohibited parking times in the area surrounding Bacon Lane.**

A Representative of Bacon Lane Surgery Patients' Committee expressed his disappointment at the fact that the recent consultation regarding proposed parking restrictions in the vicinity of Bacon Lane did not take into consideration over a hundred responses from patients at the Surgery. He stated that the consultation results were not, therefore, an accurate reflection of public opinion. He added that the Surgery should not be considered a business premises, because its ethos was different from that of a business and requested that parking time limits should be extended for patients at the Surgery if their appointments overran.

**4. Residents of Waverley Road requesting improvements to the double yellow lines planned for 169-200 Waverley Road.**

Two residents of Waverley Road stated that it was a safe and quiet road with no recorded accidents on it. They added that most of the properties on the road had narrow frontages and requested that the double yellow lines planned for the above section of Waverley Road be confined to the inner bend of the road only.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that 'tracking' involved creating a computer simulation that calculated how much space was required by, for example, an emergency vehicle when negotiating a road. The simulation showed how much unused road space remained under different conditions, for example, during light or heavy traffic flow, or with the inclusion of double yellow lines.

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, stated that the roads in question were essentially quiet roads used mainly for access. Placing double yellow lines on the inside of the bend would clear sightlines but would not affect the outside bend and may encourage drivers to speed. He suggested that the scheme ought to be

implemented in two stages, starting with the implementation of double yellow lines to the inside bend, and monitoring the situation.

A Member, who was not a member of the Panel, stated that the proposals contained in the deputation had merit and supported the previous Member's suggestion of introducing double yellow lines to only one side of the road.

A Member of the Panel stated that the Rayners Lane scheme had not reached the statutory consultation stage yet, and the discussions above would be taken into consideration as part of the consultation.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) information and revenue figures for parking in the borough be provided at the next meeting of the Panel in November 2010;
- (2) information about parking permits for staff at Bacon Lane Surgery be provided at the next meeting of the Panel in November 2010;
- (3) the deputations be noted.

**23. Information Report - Petitions relating to (1) Taunton Way, Stanmore (2) Eastcote Road/Kingsley Road Roxeth Park Entrance, Harrow (3) Canons Corner, Edgware (4) Pinner Road, Harrow (5) Kynaston Wood, Harrow Weald**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment setting out details of the petitions received since the last meeting of the Panel, including investigations and findings where these had been undertaken.

**Taunton Way – request for traffic measures**

Officers reported that this was a busy, narrow road, containing many natural bends. Officers had received many complaints about this road from residents, although there were already some traffic calming measures in place.

The Chairman suggested that the report relating to Taunton Way be forwarded to the lead signatory of the petition.

**Eastcote Road/Kingsley Road – Roxeth Park entrance, request for safety measures**

An officer reported that officers had reviewed the site and were proposing to introduce new road markings in light of the concerns raised by the petitioners.

**Canons Corner – request for parking for shops**

A Member requested that if a re-consultation was agreed then the consultation area should be smaller.

An officer reported that a video survey had been carried out at Canons Corner and a scheme of improvements would be proposed at a future meeting of the Panel.

### **Pinner Road – request to remove parking controls**

An officer stated that there had been a site meeting with Councillors, representatives of Pinner Road Shops and Transport for London (TfL). The intention was to carry out a review, but this would not be possible until early 2011, as the current programme was very busy.

A Member of the panel stated that the involvement of TfL and the Strategic Road Network (SRN) had become an issue only when parking restrictions had been extended to weekends. He asked if TfL was prepared to allow the relaxation of parking restrictions. He also asked if it would be possible to negotiate with traders for the introduction of parking bays in their forecourts.

An adviser to the Panel thanked officers for their response to the petition. He stated that he had witnessed numerous examples of double parking and disregard for double yellow lines in the Pinner Road area and requested that parking enforcement officers provide further information about this at the next meeting of the Panel.

### **Kynaston Wood, Harrow Weald – footway parking issues**

An officer reported that parking enforcement in this area was a relatively recent phenomenon and recommended that a footway parking exemption scheme in Kynaston Wood should not be taken forward.

A Panel Member said it was a matter of regret that agreement had not been reached for the provision of parking bays along the Pinner Road frontage since that should address the problems being raised by the traders. Such action in Alexandra Avenue was proving successful for the Rayners Lane shopping centre and he recommended further consideration for Pinner Road.

Officers undertook to include this in the programme review.

### **RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the report relating to Taunton Way be forwarded to the lead signatory to the petition for information;
- (2) information about parking enforcement in the vicinity of Pinner Road be provided at the next meeting of the Panel in November 2010;
- (3) the petitions be noted.

## RECOMMENDED ITEMS

### 24. **Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone - Results of Statutory Consultation**

The Panel received the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment detailing the results of the Statutory Consultation on the proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Burnt Oak Broadway area, associated parking restrictions at junctions and bends and proposed one way traffic for Park Way.

The Panel received two Deputations, the first from the Bacon Lane Clinicians Group and the second from the Bacon Lane Patients' Committee, both requesting changes to the proposed prohibited parking times in the area surrounding Bacon Lane.

Minor amendments to page 48 item 2.35, were tabled at the meeting.

An officer stated that the map at appendix A showed that the consultation area covered a much wider area than the intended CPZ area. This had been done to consult as many residents and businesses in the area as possible. He added that the main proposals of the CPZ were supported by local residents, and the residents of Bacon Lane were particularly in favour of Pay and Display parking bays in the environs of Bacon Lane.

An officer explained that with the introduction of parking controls, a balance had to be reached between the requirements for free access by emergency services and between providing adequate parking for residents, visitors and businesses. The scheme introduced was supported by many residents and served the majority of the community.

The officer added that following representations from staff and patients from Bacon Lane Surgery, officers had looked into the availability of parking, including the needs of Blue Badge holders parking in the vicinity of the Surgery. The proposed CPZ therefore included:

- junction protection measures;
- one-way traffic flow in Park Way, which was a narrow road;
- double yellow lines and loading restrictions on one side of Park Way and parking restrictions on the other side of the road during the working day, which would allow loading and unloading to service the adjacent business premises.

The officer added that all these measures had been supported by the majority of local residents. With regard to the 100 submissions made by the Bacon Lane Patients' Group, these were made in the form of standard letters forwarded to Councillor Susan Hall. However, because these letters were submitted prior to the launch of the statutory consultation, they did not meet the criteria for statutory objections, and therefore they were not formally

reflected in the consultation results. However, they were taken into consideration as comments and shown at Appendix H of the report.

The officer stated that other issues such as parking in the vicinity of the new Krishna-Avanti school would be reviewed at a later date as part of a follow-up review because the school was not fully occupied.

Following questions from Members, an officer stated that:

- officers had taken measures to accommodate the needs of Bacon Lane Surgery and that the residents of Bacon Lane had been heavily in favour of the CPZ;
- the area behind Bacon Lane Surgery shown on the map at appendix A was in fact a footpath and too narrow to accommodate vehicles;
- Park Way could not accommodate a contra-flow cycle lane as the road was too narrow and the needs of businesses, motorists and traffic flows in the area needed to be balanced.

An adviser to the Panel stated that uncontrolled parking was available approximately 200 yards from the Surgery in The Chase, and asked for this message to be conveyed to the Surgery.

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

- (1) a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) – Zone X be introduced in the roads and extents as shown in Appendix J, with operational hours of Monday to Friday 10.00 am-11.00 am and 2.00 pm-3.00 pm and that residents and businesses within the new CPZ be informed of the details of how to obtain resident, business or visitor permits;
- (2) short term pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of two hours with no return within four hours be provided in Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as shown in Appendix J;
- (3) short term shared pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of two hours with no return within four hours be provided in Bacon Lane and Vancouver Road as shown in Appendix J;
- (4) long term shared pay and display parking bays with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm Monday to Saturday inclusive with maximum stay of four hours with no return within five hours be provided in Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, The Chase and Northolme Gardens and Vancouver Road as shown in Appendix J;



- (5) charges for the pay and display bays listed at (2), (3) and (4) above be 50 pence per half hour, or part half hour;
- (6) loading bays, to enable delivery vehicles to service local businesses at no charge, be introduced in Burnt Oak Broadway service road, Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands as shown in Appendix J;
- (7) one-way traffic be introduced in Park Way as shown in Appendix J;
- (8) single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm be introduced in sections of Bacon Lane, Columbia Avenue, Park Way, The Chase and Stag Lane as shown in Appendix J;
- (9) double yellow lines, no waiting at “anytime,” be introduced at junctions, bends and pinch points as shown in Appendix J;
- (10) loading restrictions at “anytime” be introduced at junctions and pinch points shown in Appendix J;
- (11) proposed double yellow lines across the entrances to rear garages of No 105 The Chase and No 2 Northolme Gardens as shown in Appendix A be amended to single yellow line waiting restrictions with operational hours of 8.00 am to 6.30 pm;
- (12) the pay and display bays in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be amended to accommodate a street trader’s pitch to be provided outside No 67 Burnt Oak Broadway;
- (13) the pay and display bays outside Nos 97 and 99 Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be amended to accommodate the relocated informal pedestrian crossing;
- (14) the two proposed loading bays in the Burnt Oak Broadway service road as shown in Appendix A be relocated to better serve businesses following their detailed comments;
- (15) the proposed pay and display parking bays in the unnamed access road between 197 and 199 Burnt Oak Broadway as shown in Appendix A be removed and replaced by double yellow lines to facilitate access for large commercial vehicles;
- (16) objections to the proposals at Appendix C be set aside excepting those objections accommodated by the revised proposals listed at (12), (13), (14) and (15) above, and that each objector is written to with details of how to obtain a copy of this report;
- (17) officers be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the scheme shown at Appendix J, subject to all recommendations of the Panel;
- (18) all objectors, residents and businesses at addresses within the consultation area be informed of the decision;

- (19) after a period of 6-12 months from the implementation of the scheme, a review be carried out, as detailed in the report, subject to the availability of funding and recommendation of the February 2011 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in Burnt Oak Broadway.

## **25. Rayners Lane Controlled Parking Zone Review - Proposed Extension Consultation Results**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment setting out the findings of the public consultation on a possible extension to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) L in Rayners Lane and recommending the roads and area for which parking controls should be introduced based on resident responses subject to statutory consultation.

The Panel received a Deputation from residents of Waverley Road requesting amendments to the double yellow lines planned for 169-200 Waverley Road.

An officer explained that the existing CPZ L had not been reviewed for a number of years, adding that officers had undertaken substantial amounts of consultation with residents and businesses in the area, including holding an exhibition about the CPZ at the Zoroastrian Centre in Rayners Lane. However, response rates from residents in some sections of some streets had been low and these areas had been re-consulted. He added that during the consultation officers had received a request from residents for Oxley Avenue to be removed from the existing CPZ. In addition, requests for parking controls in Imperial Close had been received. Therefore, both these streets were added to the consultation. However, due to tight timescales, it had not been possible to include the results in the report.

An officer stated that Oxley Road showed no majority support with 40 responses received, 9 showing support for the removal of controls and 31 not supporting the proposals. Imperial Close showed no majority support for proposals to implement parking controls, 49 responses were received with 14 supporting parking controls and 35 against the proposal for parking controls. As there was no majority support for change in either of these roads, officers recommended that no changes be progressed.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, stated that she had received representations from residents against the implementation of double yellow lines in the island between Newquay Crescent and Lynton Road, and asked for some parking be allowed on sections of the island. The Member asked for a reduction in the size of the island to be considered. Officers agreed to review the parking on the island and if feasible, make the necessary revisions to the plans prior to the statutory consultation. The Member was pleased with the proposals for double yellow lines around the island at Waverley Road/Yeading Avenue, which was not heavily parked anyway.

Another Member, who was not a Member of the Panel asked if the sightlines could be considered when reviewing the Newquay Crescent island parking.

A Member asked if the double yellow lines could be extended along Kings Road from the junction with Capthorne Avenue opposite the H10 bus stop which had already been asked for by the Ward Councillors at a meeting with an Officer. The Officers said the views of the H9 and H10 operators would be sought on this matter and also a similar situation opposite a H10 bus stop north of the junction of Kings Road with Malvern Avenue.

The Officers agreed to consider further proposals for double yellow lines at other locations in or near to the area of the Rayners Lane CPZ which had been tabled separately by a Panel Member and other Members.

An adviser to the Panel stated that if restrictions were implemented on the southern kerb line in Village Way there would be a parking ban on Village Way only until 6.30 pm, and that evening parking caused delays to buses in the area.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, stated that the traffic island on Newquay Crescent had heavy parking and sightlines were obscured into Lynton Way during working hours and this may affect residents on the south side of Village Way.

An officer stated that the single yellow lines on the H9 bus service on Kings Avenue near the junction of Capthorne Avenue would be investigated, but that to date, no complaints had been received from bus operators.

An officer stated that following re-consultation in Ovesdon Avenue the responses showed that 13 residents were in support of parking controls and 12 were not. Consequently officers would review whether Ovesdon Avenue be included in the CPZ as the margin in favour was very narrow.

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

- (1) the Rayners Lane CPZ L be extended into the following roads:
  - Alfriston Avenue;
  - Capthorne Avenue – Between Lynton Road and Alexandra Avenue;
  - Downs Avenue – Between Village Way and The Glen;
  - Hillcroft Avenue – Between Central Avenue and Downs Avenue;
  - Kings Road - between Drake Road and Ovesdon Avenue;
  - South Close;
  - Ovesdon Avenue;
  - The Avenue - between Hillcroft Avenue and Church Avenue;
  - Village Way – Between Cannon Lane and South Close;
  - West Avenue – Between Village Way and Hillcroft Avenue;
  - Warden Avenue – between Kings Road and Torbay Road.
  
- (2) no waiting “at any time” restrictions (double yellow lines) be introduced at all locations within the consultation area, including those roads within

the recommended CPZ area and those outside this area as detailed on plans 1 to 17 inclusive at Appendix H, plus other locations as necessary, following recommendations for consideration tabled by Members;

- (3) that officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design of the parking controls in accordance with Appendices C and H, notify all consultees of the consultation results and decision and how they could make final statutory objections to the advertised proposals, to undertake statutory consultation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertise traffic regulation orders and implement the scheme, subject to consideration of any objections;
- (4) the Service Manager - Traffic and Highway Network Management, be authorised to determine any objections received to the scheme as a result of the statutory consultation or otherwise in consultation with the Portfolio Holder;
- (5) all consultees be advised of the results of the statutory consultation and the details of the scheme to be implemented.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in Rayners Lane.

## **26. Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone Review - Consultation Results**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment setting out the findings of a public consultation on a possible extension of the Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) B & H in Stanmore and various parking changes within the existing CPZs. It also recommended the roads for which parking controls were to be amended, introduced or removed, based on residents' responses and should be progressed to statutory consultation and implementation.

An officer stated that there had been consultation on parking controls in Green Lanes following petitions reported to the February 2010 meeting of the Panel. Restrictions between 8.00 am and 6.30 pm Monday-Saturday had been proposed. This measure had been supported by residents in the southern end of Green Lanes but rejected by residents living in the northern end of Green Lanes, and supported by only half of those residents of Culverlands Close who had responded. He added that officers had attended a residents' meeting but there had been no clear support for the proposed measures or any other parking controls. Further consultation would be carried out later that week on proposals for a one way section on Green Lane north of Culverlands Close. Any parking measures regarding Green Lane and Culverlands Close would be on hold until the results of this consultation were compiled.

The officer added that the report's recommendation be modified to include 21-29 Rees Drive following two deputations presented at the February 2010 meeting of the Panel, and the amendment, as tabled by Members, be added to the resolution below.

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

- (1) Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone changes, following statutory consultation, be implemented into the following roads as shown in the plans at Appendix E:
  - (a) to remove the following roads from the Controlled Parking Zone while maintaining no waiting at any time restrictions at junctions, bends and narrowings as shown on the plans.
    - Berry Hill
    - Linden Close
    - Partridge Close
    - Rees Drive, Nos 21-29
  - (b) to include the following roads in the Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone B:
    - Spring Lake
    - Stanmore Hill (from Hill Close to Green Lane)
  - (c) to implement no waiting at any time (double yellow line) restrictions in the following roads:
    - Copley Road (from No 3 to No 33)
    - Du Cros Drive (from Pembroke Lodge to No 1)
    - Glebe Road and Glebe Court (from No 22 to No 28, from No 29 to No 37 and the whole of Glebe Court)
    - Gleneagles (from the junction of Gleneagles and Gordon Avenue to existing double yellow lines at the junction of Rosedale Close and Gordon Avenue)
    - Morecambe Gardens (from No 5 covering the turning head)
    - Sunningdale Close (with the junction of Gordon Avenue)
  - (d) to convert sections of double yellow lines to single yellow lines (hours of control 3.00 – 4.00 pm Monday-Friday) in:-
    - Rectory Lane - for a distance 4 metres either side of the path leading to St Johns Church, and for a distance 8 metres west of the junction with Old Church Lane to a distance 17 metres west of Old Church Lane.
- (2) officers carry out further consultation with local residents in respect of parking controls in Green Lane and Culverlands Close and submit a further report to a future Panel meeting.

- (3) officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design of the parking controls in accordance with Appendix B, notify all consultees of the consultation results and decision and how they can make final statutory objections to the advertised proposals, undertake statutory consultation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, advertise the traffic regulation orders, and implement the scheme, subject to consideration of any objections;
- (4) the Service Manager, Traffic and Highway Network Management, be authorised to determine any objections to the scheme received as a result of the statutory consultation or otherwise in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in Stanmore.

## **27. South Harrow Controlled Parking Zone Review - Consultation Results**

The Panel received the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment setting out the findings of a public consultation on a possible extension of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) M in South Harrow and possible loading bay facilities in Northolt Road, and recommending the roads/area for which parking controls should be progressed to statutory consultation and implementation, based on business and resident responses.

An officer reported that the South Harrow CPZ had been extended a few years previously and a petition had been received from residents of Corbins Lane requesting the inclusion of the road in the CPZ and requesting loading restrictions in Northolt Road. However, there had been no majority support for parking controls in Stoud Gate immediately adjacent to Northolt Park Station.

In response to a question, an officer stated that the two loading bays in Northolt Road would only have loading restrictions until 7.00 pm.

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

- (1) the South Harrow Controlled Parking Zone proposals be extended and implemented into the following roads:
  - Corbins Lane;
  - Leathsail Road.
- (2) the loading bay proposal be implemented in Northolt Road, outside No. 391.
- (3) officers be authorised to make minor amendments and finalise the detailed design of the parking controls in accordance with Appendix B, notify all consultees of the consultation results and decision and how they can make final statutory objections to the advertised proposals, undertake statutory consultation under the Road Traffic Regulation Act

1984, advertise traffic regulation orders and implement the scheme, subject to consideration of any objections.

- (4) the Service Manager, Traffic and Highway Network Management, be authorised to determine any objections to the scheme received as a result of the statutory consultation or otherwise in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in South Harrow.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **28. Information Report - Transportation Schemes - Decision Making Process**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment clarifying the decision making processes required for approving and delivering transportation schemes and confirming a decision making process to be used for future schemes.

An officer explained that the existing decision making processes in use would not be affected and that an additional officer decision making process would be introduced. This would allow improved delivery of schemes where routine or operational decisions, that were non contentious, could be made by officers in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder.

Following a suggestion from an adviser to the Panel, it was agreed that there would be regular meetings between officers and members of the London Cycle Campaign Group in Harrow to discuss cycling issues.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) there be regular meetings between officers and members of the London Cycle Campaign Group in Harrow to discuss cycling issues;
- (2) the report be noted.

### **29. Extension of Guillotine**

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D of the Constitution) at 9.59 pm a proposal to extend the length of the meeting until 10.15 pm was moved, seconded and agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the meeting continue until 10.15 pm.

### **30. Information Report - Street Works Management - London Permit Scheme**

The Panel received the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, regarding progress being made to join the Street Works Management, London Permit Scheme. This scheme would enable Harrow to improve the co-ordination and management of street works and activities on the highway network.

An officer stated that the London Permit Scheme, which was already in operation in other boroughs, improved the way street works were managed and permitted officers to better fulfil their Network Management responsibilities. A report would go to Cabinet in November to seek formal approval to join the scheme. The scheme is intended to become operational in 2011/12.

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

### **31. Information Report - Capital Programme Update Traffic and Parking Schemes**

The Panel considered a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment on the Capital Programme Update, Traffic and Parking Schemes. This included schemes funded by Transport for London and schemes included in Harrow's Capital Programme.

An officer reported that following a deputation from Nower Hill School pupils at the July 2010 meeting of the Panel, modifications to signal timings, in conjunction with TfL, had been made to allow smoother traffic flow and a new right-hand turning filter from Pinner Road into Headstone Lane.

The officer stated that:

- works on the High Road, Harrow Weald scheme had been delayed but were due for completion shortly;
- the planning application relating to the Goodwill To All Public House had recently been approved;
- on-street parking provision close to the shopping parade on the north east side of Headstone Gardens was being investigated;
- Honeypot Lane, Local Safety Scheme was awaiting completion of illuminated regulatory signs;
- implementation of a 20 mph zone associated with Stag Lane School and the proposed one way system in Colliers Drive had received approval;
- the Earlsmead School 20 mph zone had also received majority support and would be taken forward. However the Arundel Drive one way proposal had been omitted from the scheme because of no clear majority.

The officer added that there would be another stakeholders' meeting regarding the 'Mollison Way – Streets for People' scheme and workshops were being planned in conjunction with TfL, who support the scheme.



The Chairman stated that funding for this scheme was dependant on the agreement of TfL and on the results of the Government's Funding Review due to be released in November 2010.

An adviser to the Panel stated that the Station Road Flagship Project involved re-routing buses. TfL had not consented to the Council's proposals but did carry out their own consultation which included some of the Council's suggestions, the results of which were due to be released shortly.

With regard to Mass Action, an officer stated that a scheme was proposed in the Streatfield Road service road close to the existing pelican crossing to deal with the high number of pedestrian accidents at that location.

An officer stated that Harrow Council would be providing two electric car charging point at the Civic Centre Visitors Car Park, the installation costs of which would be subsidised by TfL.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that the works in Rayners Lane would be suspended during the Christmas 2010 period; another officer confirmed that a 20 mph zone around Cannon Lane School would be included in the works programme for the following year subject to funding being made available from TfL.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.17 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NIZAM ISMAIL  
Chairman