

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 2 FEBRUARY 2011

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Nizam Ismail	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Manji Kara (1) * Ajay Maru * Jerry Miles	* Mrs Vina Mithani * John Nickolay * David Perry
<b>Advisers:</b>	† Mr A Blann † Mr E Diamond	* Mr L Gray * Mr A Wood
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Mrs Lurline Champagnie OBE John Cowan Janet Mote Christopher Noyce	Minute 53, 54  Minute 53 Minute 54 Minute 51

- \* Denotes Member present
- (1) Denotes category of Reserve Members
- † Denotes apologies received

#### 47. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Susan Hall

Reserve Member

Councillor Manji Kara

#### 48. **Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 7 & 8 – Information Report: Petitions Relating to (1) North Harrow Signals (2) Streatfield Road, Queensbury (3) Pinner Green Traffic Lights (4) 496-504 Northolt Road (5) Cornwall Road; Controlled Parking Zones And Parking Schemes - Annual Review

Councillor Lurline Champagnie, OBE, who was not a Member of the Panel, declared a personal interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Pinner ward. She would remain in the room to listen to the discussion and backbench on these items.

Agenda Item 7 – Information Report: Petitions Relating to (1) North Harrow Signals (2) Streatfield Road, Queensbury (3) Pinner Green Traffic Lights (4) 496-504 Northolt Road (5) Cornwall Road

Councillor Janet Mote, who was not a Member of the Panel, declared a personal interest in that she was Ward Councilor for Headstone North. She would remain in the room to listen to the discussion and backbench on this item.

Councillor Nizam Ismail declared a personal interest in that he was Ward Councillor for Queensbury. He would remain in the room to take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

#### 49. **Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2010, be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 34: Declarations of interest

Agenda Items 7(b) & 8(1): References from Council and Other Committees; Petitions Relating to (1) Antoneys Close (2) Whistler Gardens (3) Marsh Lane

Councillor Lurline Champagnie, OBE, declared a personal interest in that she was a Ward Councillor for Pinner Ward. She would remain in the room to listen to the discussion and backbench on these items.

#### 50. **Public Questions**

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

#### 51. **Petitions**

The following petitions were presented at the meeting:

- (1) The Chairman read out a petition, on behalf of Harrow residents, containing 849 signatures in response to recent public consultation in Hatch End. The terms of the petition were as follows:

“The most important point is that this scheme includes the removal of the traffic lights at the Pelican Crossing. Local residents will be affected if this scheme goes ahead for some of the following reasons:

1. Local traffic access to and from the Uxbridge Road will be seriously affected at Wellington Road, Grimsdyke Road and Cornwall Road because of the intention to remove the traffic lights which currently stems the traffic and allows a gap so that the vehicles on the above roads can enter or leave the Uxbridge Road.
2. The proposal is to replace the Pelican Light Crossing with a Zebra crossing with “half-way island” in the centre of the road. There would be no traffic lights. The proposal is probably unsuitable for the safety of children and elderly people on such a very busy road, with many heavy vehicles passing, at this the main crossing point for the principal shops such as the chemist, post office, restaurants, Tesco etc.

The undersigned hereby agree that it is essential to keep the Pelican Crossing and Traffic Lights.”

- (2) Councillor Manji Kara presented a petition on behalf of the Traders of Honeypot Lane Parade south of the junction with Wemborough Road. The terms of the petition were as follows:

“Parking in Honeypot Lane parade has been an issue over many years, as you may be aware of.

We as traders have lost over 50% trade due to commuters parking their cars and travelling to town from Canons Park station.

It would be a great help if the council could put some form of restriction that would prevent the commuters from parking in this parade, eg:

- \* Yellow lines
- \* Parking meters
- \* 1 hour restrictions

We as traders and general public who come to shop here would be much appreciative if something could be done.

We look forward to hearing from you.”

- (3) A resident of Central Avenue, Rayners Lane, presented a petition on behalf of residents of Central Avenue. The terms of the petition were as follows:

“In the light of the decision by neighbouring roads to adopt the CPZ scheme it has become clear that this road is likely to attract displaced parking to the detriment of our convenience and the access of emergency vehicles. As a result, and despite whatever vote we may

have cast before, we the undersigned now wish to adopt the Controlled Parking Zone scheme.”

- (4) A resident of Green Lane, Stanmore, presented a petition on behalf of residents of Green Lane and surrounding streets. The terms of the petition were as follows:

“As you know the officers of your traffic management and planning department have carried out two consultations with the residents of green lane recently.

Both of these have been rejected. This is the second petition signed by the residents of Green Lane.

The first petition was to strongly reject the second consultation, this was in response to information that the first consultation was statistically close.

This petition as you may see is widely signed by a majority of residents and houses in Green Lane, wherever those houses are located, literally from the top to the bottom of the road.

As you will understand, some houses are not signatories due to the fact they have had several visits, but we have been unable to find someone in, the houses are empty or recognisably on the rental market, however, by far the majority of residents have signed.

Here are our issues in brief, these have been discussed in detail with the officers of the Traffic management department.

1. We do not have a parking problem (particularly with residents and their vehicles).
2. We do have extreme problems with the road being a ‘rat run’ with more and larger Commercial vehicles using Green Lane more frequently.
3. We have a traffic standstill three times a day, with aggressive behaviour, shouting, horn blowing.
4. We believe we have put forward the best solution for Green Lane and Stanmore Broadway.

We have had wide-ranging discussions with the officers of the traffic management department. They are well aware of all the issues, this issue simply comes down to whose rights are more important, the residents? Or non-residents who use the road as a shortcut.”

With regard to the Petition from residents of Central Avenue, Rayners Lane, a Member stated that a similar request had been made by the residents of Ovesden Avenue, whereby it had been possible to give Ovesden Avenue a further opportunity to respond to whether residents wished to be in a

Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme due to the initial results. He suggested that a request for the inclusion of Central Avenue in the Rayners Lane CPZ, be forwarded to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, for approval.

A Member who was not a Member of the Panel stated that Central Avenue was a relatively quiet street and would be subject to increased displaced parking from surrounding streets which were included in the Rayners Lane CPZ and requested that it be included in the CPZ for this reason.

An officer explained that it would prove extremely difficult to include Central Avenue in the impending statutory consultation on extension of the Rayners Lane CPZ, for the following reasons:

1. Central Avenue could not be included in the CPZ on the basis of the petition alone, as there was a statutory requirement for officers to re-consult these residents and that this process could take up to three months. The recommendations of the Panel required ratification by the Portfolio Holder for Community and Environment before they could be enacted.
2. traffic orders relating to the Rayners Lane CPZ had already been drafted and were shortly due to go to press;
3. any amendment to the CPZ would mean delay for the entire scheme and many residents in Rayners Lane were anxious for its speedy implementation.

The officer stated that Central Avenue could be included as a separate scheme at a later date.

With regard to the petition relating to Green Lane, an officer stated that Traffic officers had had wide-ranging discussions with the residents of Green Lane and had gathered background information and data from traffic surveys which they would be evaluating. They would look into the proposals set out in the petition and report back to the next meeting of the Panel.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) the residents of Central Avenue in Rayners Lane be re-consulted and the street be included in a separate CPZ scheme to be progressed as soon as practical;
- (2) the petitions be received and noted.

## **52. Deputations**

The Panel received the following deputation:

A resident of Streatfield Road, Harrow, requested that restrictions be placed on the size and weight of lorries using Streatfield Road. The depute made the following points:

- the number of heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) using Streatfield Road had been a frequent cause for complaint by local residents over a number of years;
- requested that traffic officers investigate the feasibility of introducing width restrictions on Streatfield Road;
- requested that traffic officers use cameras located on smart cars to identify those drivers who regularly contravened the weight and size restrictions on HGVs;
- that these restrictions be enforced more robustly by the Enforcement team.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, the depute responded that:

- lorries used Streatfield Road throughout the day, particularly at the following times: lunchtimes, late afternoon, between 12.00-1.00 am and 4.00-7.00 am;
- the flow of HGV traffic along Streatfield Road was in both directions.

An officer stated that:

- enforcement of the ban had previously been the responsibility of the Police, but was now the council's responsibility;
- the investigation being carried out by traffic officers was not yet complete;
- there were two separate areas of restriction, weight and vehicle emissions, and it was important not to confuse the two;
- weight restrictions were difficult to enforce, as it was difficult to differentiate between those vehicles with legitimate business in the area (access) and those without.

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

## **RECOMMENDED ITEMS**

### **53. Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes - Annual Review**

The Panel considered a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment which provided information about the general principle of developing and implementing controlled parking zones and parking schemes in Harrow. The report reviewed progress made in 2010/11, and provided details of requests and representations received and assessed and recommended priorities for new schemes and review in 2011/12.

An officer stated that funding for Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) came from Harrow's Capital Programme, which was due to be finalised shortly. He added that the recent introduction of quality assurance measures had made the process of developing and implementing CPZs more robust. He drew Panel Members' attention to the proposed list of schemes detailed in Appendix D of the report. He explained that following the initial informal consultation stage, all CPZ proposals went to statutory consultation. Generally after 6-12 months the scheme was referred back to residents and businesses for further comment as part of a review. He stated that:

- the Rayners Lane and South Harrow Phase 2 Review were shortly due to go to statutory consultation;
- implementation of any changes as part of the West Harrow Station Zone W Review had been delayed and that the local Residents' Group was due to report back to officers at the end of February 2011; this will be followed by general public consultation.
- Hatch End - plans for introducing charging at the Grimsdyke Car Park and service roads were on hold as part of a comprehensive parking review across the borough and would be consulted on shortly;
- Canons Park – officers had received the highest number of letters and requests for controls from local residents and the review had been delayed because of prioritisation of other schemes;
- Stanmore – officers were looking at the possibility of implementing changes in the vicinity of the underground station to help alleviate the increased volume of parking especially on Wembley stadium event days;
- Burnt Oak Broadway – this scheme had been brought forward as Barnet Council were due to implement a CPZ on adjacent streets in Barnet; implementation is imminent;
- there was Section 106 money available for the introduction of parking controls in the vicinity of Krishna-Avanti school;
- the Uxbridge Road traffic and congestion relief scheme was funded separately by Transport for London (TfL);
- the Rayners Lane scheme would, following statutory consultation, be implemented in April/May 2011.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, stated that Hitchin Lane was a private road in a new development off Whitchurch Lane. Cars pulling out of Hitchin Lane had obstructed views due to vehicles parked on Whitchurch Lane and that this had led to a number of near accidents recently. He stated that although this street was included in the works programme for 2011/12, it should be brought forward to 2011 for reasons of health and safety and requested the implementation of parking restrictions after 6.30 pm.

A Member of the Panel agreed that sightlines were obscured by the bus stop and parked vehicles on Whitchurch Lane and suggested that changing the single yellow lines to double yellow lines would be a solution. An officer responded that Hitchin Lane was considered for the Problem Streets Programme as this was a localised parking issue and it was necessary to prioritise schemes due to funding constraints and had not met the necessary criteria. He added that this street would be included as part of the Canons Park Area Review and section 106 funds could be used for this purpose. This would be a cost effective measure as the review was funded jointly by Section 106 and Harrow's Capital programme.

A Member of the Panel put forward a proposal, which was seconded, proposing that

"I propose that Marlborough Hill be also included when the Controlled Parking Review of Rosslyn Crescent was carried out in the programme for 2011/12."

He stated that charging for parking at the Civic Centre car park had a knock-on effect on residents' parking in surrounding streets. He added that the introduction of one-hour parking restrictions would help to alleviate the problem, adding that the close proximity of Marlborough Hill and Rosslyn Crescent would allow the use of Section 106 monies for both streets.

An officer stated that traffic officers would be willing to review this situation. However, the Section 106 funds had been specifically allocated for Rosslyn Crescent and therefore Marlborough Hill would need to be funded from an alternative source. He added that officers would look into the feasibility of including both Whitchurch Lane and Marlborough Hill under future schemes and further information on this matter would be made available at the Panel meeting on 22 June 2011.

Following questions from Members, an officer reported that the proposal to remove Rees Drive/Partridge Close from the Stanmore CPZ would be going to statutory consultation, and officers would be meeting with a representative of residents to discuss the programme for changes in the next few days.

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

- (1) the priority list of schemes as shown at **Appendix C**, to the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, form the controlled parking zone programme for 2011/12, subject to confirmation of funding, be agreed;
- (2) officers be authorised to carry out scheme design and consultation on the schemes detailed in **Appendix C**, to the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment;
- (3) officers be authorised to implement the schemes detailed in **Appendix C**, to the report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment.



**Reason for Decision:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes programme for 2011/12.

**RESOLVED:** That officers investigate the feasibility of including Marlborough Hill and Whitchurch Lane in future parking schemes, and officers provide further information on this matter at the Panel meeting on 22 June 2011.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

**54. Information Report: Petitions relating to (1) North Harrow Signals (2) Streatfield Road, Queensbury(3) Pinner Green Traffic Lights (4) 496-504 Northolt Road (5) Cornwall Road, Harrow**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment which set out details of the petitions received since the last meeting of the Panel. The report provided details of the Council's consultations and investigations, where these had been undertaken.

### **North Harrow Signals – request for safe crossing point and changes to the phasing of the traffic lights**

This petition requested improvements to pedestrian facilities at the North Harrow traffic signals. An officer explained that all London traffic lights were controlled by Transport for London (TfL) and that any suggestions for changes to the timings of traffic lights had to be referred to them. Following receipt of a petition about this crossing in 2004, an independent study had been commissioned which stated that any change to the lights at this junction would cause delays to both pedestrians and drivers. This would have an adverse impact on the Network Management and displace traffic to surrounding areas, and TfL would not support any increased delays to the Network. He added that the accident rate at this crossing was deemed acceptable.

### **Streatfield Road – request to reduce the weight and size of lorries using the road**

An officer stated that Streatfield Road was a local distributor road. The ban on heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) was difficult to enforce as it was difficult to distinguish between those lorries that had legitimate business in the area and those using the road as a thoroughfare. London Councils had introduced an 18 tonne overnight lorry ban and carried out surveillance visits at night at different locations in the city. Officers were undertaking traffic surveys of Streatfield Road, which would help them to understand the HGV composition and pattern of traffic flows and allow London Councils to best direct enforcement activity. This would be followed by discussions with the Councils enforcement team and the practicality of using smart cars with cameras that could be used to observe HGVs in the area. He added that although it might be theoretically possible to introduce a width restriction which would allow access to buses and emergency vehicles, this measure may simply displace the problem to surrounding streets. Officers would be liaising with the residents of Streatfield Road to discuss possible ways forward.

### **Pinner Green Traffic Lights – request for safety improvement**

Officers had met on site with the petitioner. The main concern was with motorists speeding and queue jumping at the traffic lights. Police had been alerted to the high incidence of bad driver behaviour at these traffic lights. Officers were looking into the possibility of introducing arrows in the road to help drivers turning right and left, as part of the Uxbridge Road scheme, which would begin at the end of February 2011.

### **No 496-504 Northolt Road – objection to “No Entry” in service road**

Officers became alerted to the fact that No Entry signs had been installed on Northolt Road in error, following receipt of a petition protesting against their installation. The signs had since been removed.

### **Cornwall Road – request for Residents’ Parking**

This road was due to be considered as part of the Pinner Road CPZ Review. Officers would be meeting with the relevant Ward Councillors and issuing consultation documents to residents.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (1) officers liaise with the residents of Streatfield Road;
- (2) the report be noted.

## **55. INFORMATION REPORT: Capital Programme Update: Traffic and Parking Schemes**

The Panel considered a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, which provided an update on progress on delivery in 2010/11 of transport schemes and initiatives on the Capital Programme. This included schemes funded by Transport for London and those schemes included in Harrow’s Capital Programme. Officers particularly drew Panel members’ attention to Appendix A of the report which set out Harrow’s own programme of parking and traffic schemes.

Following questions from Panel members, an officer reported that:

- the Northolt Road local safety scheme had received favourable responses from residents and works orders had been issued;
- members of the Hatch End Residents’ Association had stated that they felt that the Consultation area had not been wide enough. An officer would be meeting with Ward councillors for further discussions and advised that the funding available needed to be used before the end of March 2011.

The following amendments to the report were agreed:

- Page 67, line 6, under the heading of 'Details: Bus stop accessibility works' – the words Belmont Road, Peel Road be deleted;
- Pages 68-69, under the heading of 'Programmed Completion', 2010 be amended to 2011 throughout.
- Page 69 under the heading 'The Ridgeway' the bus service H22 should be replaced by H11.

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

## **56. Any Other Urgent Business**

### (i) Dual use Cycle/Pedestrian paths

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following item was submitted late to the agenda to provide clarification on the consultation process regarding proposals to designate certain footways in Harrow as dual use, for both pedestrians and cyclists. An adviser to the Panel was concerned that this proposal would be implemented without adequate consultation.

Officers confirmed that this scheme was being funded by TfL and that all relevant stakeholders would be consulted, and the matter surrounding the general principle of dual use of pedestrian paths would be reported and discussed at a future meeting of the Panel.

### (ii) Vote of Thanks

The Chairman stated that this was the last meeting of the Panel for the Municipal Year 2010/11 and he expressed his appreciation to Members, Advisers and officers for their hard work.

The Representative of the Harrow Public Transport Users' Association offered his thanks to the Chairman and members of the Panel.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NIZAM ISMAIL  
Chairman