

# APPENDIX F

## STANMORE STAKEHOLDERS MEETING BERNAYS MEMORIAL HALL

FRIDAY 12<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2004  
4.00PM – 6.00PM

Present: Alistair Turk (Project Centre)  
Gordon Walker (Project Centre)  
Paul Ryan (Project Centre)  
Graeme Smith (Project Centre)

-

Councillor M Ashton  
Councillor D Ashton  
Councillor C Bath  
Mr Campioni (Capra)  
Mr B Kregor (Dean Court Residents Association) x 1 guests  
Mrs Lis (Elm Park Residents Association)  
Mrs Gordon (Greensward Properties, Kerry Court)  
Mr Pearleman (Kendle Residents Association Ltd) x 2 guests  
Mrs Noble (Laburnum Court Residents Association, Stanmore, Ltd)  
Mr Bharwaney (Orchard Court Residents Association)  
Ms E Moss (White House Drive Residents Association)  
Mr T Raymond (The Stanmore Society)  
Mr H Garfield (Warren Fields Management Ltd)  
Mrs Mann (The Berneys Management Group)  
Mrs Piazza (Arran Drive)  
Mr Harvey (Arran Drive)  
Mrs Selata (Arran Drive)  
Mr Franks (Arran Drive)  
Mrs Curner (Arran Drive)

**Alistair Turk** opened the meeting with introductions and explained the purpose of the meeting which was a fact-finding exercise to raise and identify parking problems in the Stanmore area. This information would help Project Centre design possible solutions that would be included in a forthcoming public consultation.

**Cllr M Ashton** gave apologies for other Councillors who could not attend due to late notification of the meeting and who would want to be part of this process. Councillors already have letters of complaints of parking problems.

Explanations were given by **Cllr M Ashton** that there were time constraints as this project was funded by TfL and the funding would have to be spent within the time limits or else taken away.

**Alistair Turk** informed the meeting that the funding from TfL this year was to carry out the review and consultation and to report the results of the consultation to the Council only. This was the reason the meeting was being held to make sure the Project Centre would get all the correct information.

## Concerns from stakeholders

Following Alistair Turk's introduction, comments were asked from the floor.

The **Kendle Residents Association** representative stated that parking was disastrous. He also stated that they did not need a meeting as the Council should have records of the correspondence that residents had already sent.

**Alistair Turk** stated that Project Centre had some copies of letters that the Council had received, but wanted to make sure that we were up-to-date with all of the issues. He also stated that we had looked at the letters and had identified a number of key issues, but that this meeting was to re-affirm and hear for ourselves the exact issues so they could be considered as part of the main consultation process.

A number of attendees stated that Project Centre should already know the problems and issues on parking by past correspondence and confirmed that it is impossible to park in the area.

Residents stated that since the Amora redevelopment on London Road it has made parking matters worse.

A number of residents referred to issues with Dennis Lane. It is very narrow with commuters parking there and that it was being used like a car park. They stated that this made it impossible to see traffic when exiting Laburnum Court.

**Cllr M Ashton** stated that it had already been agreed that double yellow lines would be installed in Dennis Lane.

A number of issues were raised regarding Arran Drive

One resident stated that the area near Kelmscot required double yellow lines as vehicles park on both sides of the road and obstruct vehicles travelling down the road.

Arran Drive residents enquired if it would be included in the proposals and if so they would like yellow lines 1 hour in the morning and 1 hour in the afternoon. The problem they have is commuters parking. There are no problems at the weekend. Arran Drive also has access problems where refuse trucks and emergency vehicles cannot get through. **Alistair Turk** stated that it was planned to include Arran Drive as part of the study area.

A resident of Kerry Court (opposite the station) stated they have problems with vehicles parking with drivers sitting in their vehicles, waiting to pick people up, with their engines running. This generally happens in the evening (between 4pm-7pm) when residents return home. She stated that residents often cannot find a space to park.

A discussion was had regarding the fact that many residents have more than one vehicle and there is not enough space on street for vehicles to park. A number of people stated that they have garages but that there aren't enough garages for the amount of properties and this is therefore forcing people to park on the street.

One of the main issues that raised throughout the meeting was the LIDL Car Park

**Cllr M Ashton** stated that nothing should be done before the issue with the LIDL car park was resolved as this would resolve other parking problems. She asked whether Project Centre had been asked to look at the car park as part of this brief.

**Alistair Turk** stated that although PCL was aware of the car park and that much of it was condemned, it was not part of the brief, but that he was aware of leasing issues with LIDL.

Residents stated that there was a lack of existing parking space in the town centre area and that the issue with the LIDL car park was not helping.

A question was asked as to the possibilities of a multi storey being built? **Alistair Turk** stated that there were a number of options open to the Council, but he could not confirm what would be done as he was not party to this, but that funding is often an issue.

**Cllr C Bath** stated that as part of the planning conditions Sainsbury's had put aside £385,000 for the development of the LIDL car park and that this money was ring fenced.

**Alistair Turk** concluded by saying that he wasn't aware of this or any timescales for the development of the car park.

One resident stated that Sainsbury's had even given a list to their staff of roads that they could park in legally.

Residents stated that Council had said that they have no money to patrol the existing restrictions, and that parking enforcement was sporadic.

A question was asked as to whether provisions would be made for visitors (work force) to park when visiting properties? **Alistair Turk** referred to the option of visitor permits or bay suspensions. It was stated that options to residents with regards to the types of available parking like visitor permits are not widely known in the community and should be publicised more.

This led on to a discussion regarding bay suspensions. Project Centre were informed by one of the residents that she had been told that Harrow did not run a suspension scheme. A removal company had tried arranging it and had been told by Harrow that they did not do this. The removals company had stated that they didn't know of any other borough that did not have a suspension policy. **Alistair Turk** also expressed his surprise at this as he also thought most, if not all, London Boroughs had a policy of suspending bays.

A resident complained that they had a problem with vehicles obstructing driveways, and they had contacted the Police who told them that they should contact the Council. When they did so, they were told that the Council could do nothing; it was a Police matter. **Alistair Turk** stated that the Council were correct, as obstruction is still a Police issue. He stated that the Council could only act if a vehicle was parked illegally on a waiting restriction, by issuing a ticket, and if the Council had the provision, they could remove the vehicle to a car pound.

A question was asked as to whether the survey carried out by TMS Consultancy on safety around the Broadway area would be taken into account with any of Project Centres plans? **Alistair Turk** stated that he was not aware of such a report, but would request a copy from Harrow to refer to.

**Mr T Raymond (Stanmore Society)** gave a brief history of the introduction of CPZs in Stanmore. He stated that they were originally set up before there was a parking problem, and that they didn't want the scheme but were told it was going in and its main aim was to make revenue for the council.

**Alistair Turk** and **Cllr M Ashton** discussed the issue of displacement. **Cllr Ashton** stated that in her experience new Controlled Parking Zones may help but may also move parking problems to the next area (displacement).

**Alistair Turk** went on to inform the meeting that there were already issues of vehicle access to streets, times of existing controls, parking around the shopping area, parking around the college area and also problems with commuter parking.

If controls were installed then residents would have to pay for a permit to park during the times of controls. Any design of controls would maximise parking space but allow for the free flow of traffic. He stated that CPZ's were a crude form of parking control, but often effective. It came down to an assessment of the residents need to have prioritised parking against having to pay for this privilege.

**Cllr D Ashton** asked what were the possibilities of highlighting to TfL to make more provisions for parking at the station car park which would alleviate some parking problems? **Alistair Turk** said that they could try. (Note: This would need to be discussed with Harrow Officers). He also pointed out that the stations are not obliged to make more provision.

Residents complained that vehicles used to park all over the place when there was an event on at Wembley Stadium and travel by Underground to the Stadium. There were concerns that the situation would worsen when the new stadium opens, having a proposed smaller car park.

**Alistair Turk** confirmed that the car park was indeed smaller and that it was felt that more people would use public transport to get to the ground. He then went on to explain how other event day schemes worked. (Note: - an event day scheme may need to be considered in the future).

It was asked if controls were implemented, would people park in the un-adopted roads. **Alistair Turk** stated that If residents experience parking problems in un-adopted roads, this would have to be addressed by the residents of the road and would not be under the Councils remit. Possibilities to resolve this could be the resident employing private contractors to enforce the area.

Residents asked whether proposed developments (i.e. Spur Road Development) would be taken into account in any design. **Alistair Turk** stated that they generally would, but that they he had not been informed of any developments.

A number of residents stated that they felt that avenues of information had been kept from Project Centre.

**Cllr C Bath** asked the timescales of this project and stated she felt that if TfL can lay down the rules they could disagree with the outcome of the consultation. **Alistair Turk** said that Harrow at present has not got the funding to implement any new zones. This was supported by **Cllr M Ashton**.

**Alistair Turk** stated that TfL are only funding the review in this financial year. Any changes or extensions would then be subject to a bid for funds to implement the changes in the next financial year.

**Cllr D Ashton** asked if it was possible to see Project Centres brief for this job and if there were any further meetings planned and stressed the importance if Project Centre could find a way to highlight the importance of a multi storey car park. (At the end of the meeting **Alistair Turk** showed **Cllr D Ashton** the brief from Harrow).

It was asked whether Project Centre would be publishing the results of the meeting. **Alistair Turk** stated that he would report back to Harrow on Monday and they would decide the next steps. He stated that PCL had offered to have a meeting with the Members to explain the details of the meeting.

**Alistair Turk** concluded the meeting by stating that the next planned step would be the public consultation in which there would be road shows held for the public to see initial designs. He stated that a leaflet would be sent to all residents within the agreed area. It was stressed that all residents and businesses should complete the consultation document.

**STANMORE FORUM MEETING  
BERNAYS MEMORIAL HALL**

**WEDNESDAY 2<sup>ND</sup> JUNE 2004  
4.00PM – 7.00PM**

Present: Peter Hazzard (Project Centre)  
Paul Ryan (Project Centre)  
Steve Bond (Project Centre)

Councillor M Ashton  
Councillor D Ashton  
Councillor A Pinkus (Belmont)  
Councillor P O'Dell (Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder)  
Councillor R Romain (Canons)  
Councillor J Cowan (Canons)  
Mr M Nekousad (Harrow Borough Council – present in an unofficial capacity)  
Mrs Lis (Elm Park Residents Association)  
Mrs Wiener (St Lawrence Close Residents Association)  
Mr and Mrs Phillips

**Cllr M Ashton** opened the meeting with introductions and explained the purpose of the meeting which was to engage local stakeholders in a discussion on parking problems in the Stanmore area, discuss the consultation materials prepared by The Project Centre and to air any resident concerns. This information would help PCL design possible solutions that would be included in a forthcoming public consultation.

**Cllr M Ashton** gave apologies for other Councillors who could not attend the meeting and who would want to be part of this process. These included Councillors C Bath, C Bednell, M Kara and J Miles.

Explanations were given by **Cllr M Ashton** that there were time constraints as this project was funded by TfL and the funding would have to be spent within the time limits or would no longer be available.

**Mrs Lis** commented that the LIDL car park is the No. 1 issue and could be seen as the problem, and the solution, to the areas parking problems. Money from Sainsburys (£385,000) is available to use but expires in 12-18 months time. She thinks the problems are not being looked at directly.

**Peter Hazzard** accepted that the LIDL carpark was a major issue but pointed out that it is not part of PCL's brief.

**Cllr M Ashton** reiterated that LIDL car park is not in PCL's brief and explained she recognised there are problems in the area and supports the scheme around the station and college.

**Mrs Lis** mentioned that cars from the college used to park at the location of the present Sainsburys car park but are no longer able to.

- **Paul Ryan** explained how the existing P&D bays will become Shared Use bays with provision made for resident and business parking. Explained conditions of use and PCL's approach to bay allocation.

**Cllr Romain** stated he had become aware of a proposal to convert part of the Stanmore Station car park into a storage/shunting area with the loss of spaces for up to 80 cars. Concerned that the overflow from this will affect the areas on the edge of the already saturated zone (e.g Sandymount, Merrion) and increase traffic around the Canons Park station. Realises it is not an issue at this stage but raised concern about timing of the consultation leaflet with regards to this proposal and whether the public will be informed of it.

- **Peter Hazzard** noted that careful wording of such proposals is necessary and stated that PCL would attempt to obtain further information regarding this matter.
- **Cllr M Ashton** commented that since car park closure, business parking has been displaced once already and, having adapted, will do so again.
- **Paul Ryan** stated that disregarding the matter of the car park, parking will be maximised with provision made for business parking. Pointed out that PCL are independent consultants there to represent the views and concerns of the public in an unbiased manner and not there to 'sell anything'.
- **Cllr M Ashton** asked for Cllr O'Dell to explain the latest position regarding the car park.
- **Cllr O'Dell** explained there were numerous leasing issues involved which were taking some time to sort out and that a report was expected soon. He accepted that the car park is a major issue but feels other issues (eg. on-street parking) need to be dealt with also. Noted that there have been complaints from residents in other areas and feels it is an ideal time for a review of the entire area. Expressed interest in the consultation process and hearing public opinion, both positive and negative.
- **Cllr M Ashton** raised concerns over the effect the car park issue will have on the public's response to consultation – they may overreact. If car park issue resolved may end up with more parking restrictions than required. Asked if the consultation process had to include the town centre at this stage and suggested that, if it did, PCL mention the car park issue in the consultation leaflet.

**Paul Ryan** replied that, again, careful wording would be necessary if this was to occur. Also stated that he was quite disappointed at the low turnout and felt an opportunity had been lost. PCL had been hoping to obtain crucial feedback on the initial design drawings which would assist them in preparing a design that would go some way towards dealing with the issues for local residents.

- **Cllr M Ashton** replied that many people are apathetic following lack of progress with regards to the car park, and that the public struggle to see past this issue. She asked if there were any further questions. As none were forthcoming, she thanked those attending and also thanked PCL for the work they had prepared.