

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

CABINET – 19 May 2011

REFERENCE FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 5 April 2011

Transport Local Implementation Plan

The Committee received a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment which detailed the consultation results on the draft second Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The Chair advised the report would be considered by Cabinet in May and Council in July.

An officer advised that the revised LIP had been made available in the Group Offices and Members' library and that there were strict guidelines that governed the preparation of the document. It was also necessary to meet the Mayor of London's goals. The Council had received positive feedback on the document and the changes made since the original document related mainly to links with the London Sub-Regional Transport Plan. Transport for London (TfL) had not requested any substantial changes. Following consultation, further changes had been made as there had been a significant number of comments on cycling.

In considering the report, Members asked questions and made comments which were responded to as follows:

- A Member stated that if Council and TfL funds were being used it would be helpful to know the percentage split. The officer confirmed that approximately 90% of the funding was TfL and that all the items were included in the budget.
- Another Member expressed concern at the small amount of Council revenue being spent on traffic issues over the next few years and challenged officers stating that there seemed to be insufficient resources. The officer responded that these resources did not include the money being spent on local roads.
- In terms of performance, a Member suggested that more context in some areas would be helpful. The officer advised that, as some of the indicators were new, there was no context.
- A Member challenged the spend on walking studies and was advised that the resource allocated enabled officers to respond to requests from members of the public. Areas were prioritised according to corporate priorities, transport objectives and different schemes. In response to a further question from the Member, the officer advised that all works were the subject of local consultation, including the relevant ward councillors and it was not possible to identify in which quarter expenditure would occur until a proposed works/scheme was finalised.
- A Member questioned the indicative totals in appendix B of the report and, in particular, why the totals in the first and third years were considerably larger.

The officer advised that major schemes relied on bids and that no bid was being submitted in the second year.

- In terms of skills and resources for managing contracts, a Member questioned whether there was a lack in this area. The officer responded that this was a nationwide issue and if a problem arose, a project might require re-phasing. In response to the Member's question in relation to carbon dioxide emissions, the officer advised that the start/stop of cars was problematic for the environment and that every traffic scheme aimed to reduce this occurring. In terms of electronic signs for bus lanes, the officer advised that there were sufficient resources to start the scheme and, if it were successful, resources might require reallocation. The officer acknowledged the Member's comment in relation to the separation of 'killed' from 'seriously injured' in the report but advised that this was often the way TfL required this information.
- In response to a Member's question in relation to additional bus links, the officer confirmed that the consultation had identified that the public would like existing routes to be extended into hospitals and also better links to Ealing. This had now been included in the revised LIP but was a matter for TfL.
- A Member questioned whether school support extended to private schools and the officer confirmed that it did but that some were not willing to produce the required travel plan. Another Member questioned the implications for academies and was advised that the support would work in the same way as for private schools.
- In relation to consultation with the Learning and Physically Disabled Transport Group, the officer confirmed that a meeting had been held and was attended by a cross-section of people with mental health and physical disabilities. Following this, regular future meetings were to be held with this group.
- In response to a Member's question on school travel plans, the officer advised that the plans were available to view on the Council's website and were reviewed annually. The travel plans could be used to address issues such as people parking on school zig zags. The Member challenged the need for a travel plan adviser as, once the plans were in place, it seemed a relatively minor job to keep them updated. The officer stated that this was not a full time post but was extremely valuable and the relevant officer worked on other areas too.
- A Member challenged the size of the budget for the promotion of cycling and indicated that there was a need to consider other options. The officer advised that there was a statutory duty to meet cycling targets and that promotion covered a wide range of issues that could not be addressed in detail in the current report.

The Chair thanked the officer for their attendance and for the responses provided.

RESOLVED: That the Cabinet be requested to take on board the Committee's comments during their consideration of this item.

FOR CONSIDERATION

Background Documents:

Report submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 5 April 2011.

Contact Officer:

Alison Atherton, Senior Professional Democratic Services

Tel: 020 8424 1266

Email: alison.atherton@harrow.gov.uk