

# TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

## 8 FEBRUARY 2012

<b>Chairman:</b>	* Councillor Nizam Ismail	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Manji Kara (1)	* Mrs Vina Mithani
	* Ajay Maru	* John Nickolay
	* Jerry Miles	* David Perry
<b>Advisers:</b>	* Mr A Blann	* Mr A Wood
	* Mr L Gray	
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Jean Lammiman	Minute 109
	Joyce Nickolay	Minute 109
	Victoria Silver	Minute 112
	Simon Williams	Minute 109

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

### 102. 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

### 103. Declarations of Interest

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

### 104. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 November 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### 105. Public Questions

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following public questions were received:

**Questioner:** Tony Allen, Chairman, Hatch End Association

**Question:** Relating to the draft consultation leaflet on the Parking Review in Hatch End Broadway:

“Is it not possible to consider an additional option to those proposed in the draft consultation leaflet, namely one of free parking combined with a restriction in the middle of the day, and are the car parking rates as shown in the draft the actual proposed rates?”

**Answer  
(provided by the  
Chairman):**

Thank you for your question.

By way of background, a public consultation on changes to the way parking charges are set was carried out in the Summer of 2011. The proposal set the general principle of simplifying parking charges and making them more easily understood by the public as well as helping Harrow’s shopping centres remain viable. This principle involves introducing four charging bands for on and off street parking based on the types of commercial centres defined in the Local Development Framework which is the Council’s main Spatial Strategy for the borough. The proposed structure for charges was agreed by Cabinet on 18 October 2011.

The proposed parking charges for 2012/13 are subject to further consideration of some aspects of the system, including measures to support local businesses. However, Cabinet will consider a report on fees and charges on 9 February 2012 which recommends existing parking charges be revised upwards by 4% overall as an interim measure to assist in delivering policy objectives and support for restructuring charges to zone based charging within 2012/13. The interim changes to existing charges

proposed from April accord with the system agreed by Cabinet and will also apply to any new parking schemes being introduced.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety agreed that a public consultation at Hatch End be undertaken, as proposed in the programme agreed by this Panel in February 2011. The parking charges contained in the draft Hatch End consultation document are commensurate with the charges in the new structure for this type of local shopping area.

For these reasons it is not possible to presently consider including a free period of parking at Hatch End but should an option including some element of free parking be agreed during 2012/13, then this would be applied at the relevant time to any scheme of paid parking implemented at Hatch End.

**Supplemental question:** What would the council do if the consultation of residents and traders demonstrated that the majority of those consulted were against the proposed parking charges and restrictions.

**Answer (provided by the Chairman):** Any changes implemented would be as part of a borough-wide review and following appropriate consultation of relevant stakeholders.

**Questioner:** Peter Jacques, Co-Chairman, Hatch End Traders Association (HETA)

**Question:** "If part of the Council's remit is to assist in the economic viability of the businesses and traders in the area of The Broadway, Hatch End, why would the Council introduce further parking restrictions contrary to their wishes. We the HETA have a petition signed by 90% of the businesses to request that the Broadway is left alone as it is felt that further restrictions would diminish and denigrate what business is left."

**Answer (provided by the Chairman):** Thank you for your question.  
The background is that this Panel established a programme of parking reviews in February 2011 and asked officers to carry out consultation on the possible introduction of parking charges, both on and off street, in Hatch End during 2011/12. The parking charges proposed (10p for 20 minutes on-street and 20p per hour off-street, which have been chosen for the purposes of consultation) can help to

stimulate the turnover of parking spaces and therefore help local businesses, whilst covering the cost of introducing controls similar to other areas in the borough.

The Council also carried out a parking review consultation in the summer of 2011 on the structure of parking charges borough-wide in order to simplify them and make them more easily understood by the public, as well as helping Harrow's shopping centres remain viable. Although Cabinet in October 2011 approved the proposal to introduce four charging bands for on and off street parking based on the types of commercial centres, it was decided that the full implementation of this system of charging should be delayed until October 2012 to allow further consideration of some aspects of the system, including measures to support local businesses. The changes are expected to be agreed during 2012/13 and will be the subject of statutory consultation. The parking charges chosen for consultation at Hatch End are commensurate with general discussions on charges for this type of commercial area, but those which are finally agreed by Cabinet will be applied.

The Council values the work that organisations like the Hatch End Traders' Association have to play, and the Council will continue to engage with the Association in respect of ongoing work. The purpose of the public consultation at Hatch End is to see what each local business, residents and other stakeholders have to say. Whilst there is value in considering petitions, in this case, the businesses have not had the opportunity to make comments on the specific proposals under consideration. The Council is committed to public consultation and this is why officers have been asked to proceed with this aspect at Hatch End. This gives all stakeholders, including businesses the opportunity to make their own particular views known, based upon the proposals and their own individual circumstances. In this way, the Council can have a greater understanding of the related issues.

The results of the public consultation at Hatch End will be reported back to a future meeting of this Panel where Councillors will be able to consider the matter in more detail.

It should be stressed that when this Panel considers the matter, it will make its recommendations to the

Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety. Whatever elements of the proposals that are recommended to proceed, will also be the subject of statutory consultation before anything is implemented.

**Supplemental question:** Would the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety be able to meet with HETA members before October 2012.

**Answer (provided by the Chairman):** Please note that any changes to parking charges in the borough during 2012/13 will be the subject of a statutory consultation. Please email the Portfolio Holder directly to set up a meeting.

## 106. Petitions

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petitions which were referred to the Community and Environment Directorate for consideration:

### (1) The Pavement in Village Way, Rayners Lane

Councillor Joyce Nickolay presented a petition on behalf of local residents relating to the pavement in Village Way, Rayners Lane. The terms of the petition were as follows:

‘We, residents of Rayners Lane, wish to bring to the attention of the Council the poor state of the pavement on the North Side of Village Way.

Particularly between West Avenue and Central Avenue, buses and heavy vehicles have repeatedly had to run over the pavement subjecting it to much damage.

This section of the pavement slopes significantly towards the road and is dangerous when covered with ice and snow.

Furthermore, it is evident that the utility companies have added to the unevenness when replacing the surface.

We request that the Council deals with this section by complete replacement.’

### (2) Parking regulations and facilities in Hatch End

Mr Peter Jacques, a local resident, presented a petition relating to parking regulations and facilities in Hatch End. The terms of the petition were as follows:

‘We the business traders of Hatch End would like the current parking regulations and facilities to remain exactly as they are, to sustain the economic vibrancy of this secondary shopping area.’

## 107. Deputations

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 50 (Part 4D of the Constitution), the following deputation be received:

1. Parking Proposals on 843-909 Honeypot Lane, HA7 1AR Parade (Agenda item 8)

The depute, a trader from Honeypot Lane Parade, made the following points:

- traders from Honeypot Lane Parade, most of whom had signed the deputation, would prefer a one-hour parking restriction in the mornings between 11.00 am to 12.00 noon, as this would discourage commuter parking;
- the traders were opposed to parking restrictions in the parade at any other time of day, as this would jeopardise their businesses by discouraging shoppers;
- would traders be provided with parking permits for the hours of restriction.

The Chairman responded that he was familiar with the Honeypot Lane Shopping Parade and its associated parking problems. In his view, the deputees' request for a parking restriction between the hours of 11.00 am to 12.00 noon would have the reverse effect, whereas a restriction between 2.00-3.00 pm would deter all day commuter parking, whilst allowing shoppers access to the parade. He added that at this time there was no provision for parking permits for traders during the hours of the restriction, however, officers would give this issue consideration.

## RECOMMENDED ITEMS

### 108. Road Safety Plan

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, which provided an update on the Council's Road Safety Plan and provided detailed information on Harrow's road safety record.

An officer stated that:

- the Road Safety Plan had been reviewed following the adoption of Harrow's second Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP2);
- the Plan included all the road safety policies and information on how these were put into practice;
- there was a three year programme of implementation;

- Harrow had a good road safety record in comparison to other London boroughs, for example, there had been a 33% reduction in road accidents involving children.

Following comments from advisers to the Panel, an officer stated that Transport for London (TfL) had recognised the danger posed by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) to cyclists and undertook to advise haulage contractors in the borough of the dangers posed to cyclists by larger vehicles particularly when carrying out turning manoeuvres. He also and undertook to add an additional section to the report to demonstrate Harrow's contribution to this initiative. He added that TfL were planning to launch a safety campaign in central London during the summer of 2012, and officers had requested that the HGV being used as part of the safety campaign be brought to Harrow to demonstrate the dangers posed to cyclists by large vehicles.

The officer added that Harrow had run an awareness campaign targeted at drivers of HGVs at the end of 2011, which would be run again in 2012 and be funded by Harrow's TfL road safety budget. The officer invited the adviser representing cyclists' interests to contribute to the road safety campaign in 2012/13. He stated that TfL would be funding a similar safety campaign aimed at pedestrians.

A Member stated that road safety had been an under resourced area for a number of years and commended officers on their work in this area. He emphasised the importance of road safety and raising awareness amongst road users and pedestrians.

Following questions from members of the Panel, an officer advised that:

- every school in Harrow was visited once a year to offer road safety advice;
- the mobile speed activated signs referred to in the report were being trialled at the time and were therefore sometimes moved from one location to another;
- Speed Activated Signs (SASs) had proved effective in reducing vehicle speeds;
- some SASs had yet to be erected, although the poles for these had been installed in some locations.

An adviser to the Panel commended officers on the report and suggested it be made widely available on the Council's website, to the public and other interested parties.

An adviser to the Panel stated that he had noticed increased deterioration in warning signs and in road markings maintenance throughout the borough. This was a health and safety issue and should be addressed.

A Member of the Panel stated that funds available in the neighbourhood investment scheme had been used to refurbish signage and road markings in Marlborough Ward, and suggested that other Wards could tap into this budget. He also suggested that the road safety report be made available as part of the 'My Account' pages on the Council's website.

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

That the report be adopted, subject to reference being made to the danger posed by HGVs to cyclists.

**Reason for Decision:** A Road Safety Plan was an effective way to show that Harrow was discharging its duty under the Road Traffic Act 1988. The Act required authorities to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety. A local road safety plan was a vital part of the evidence to show how this was being done in Harrow.

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

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, which provided information about parking management schemes in Harrow, details of requests and representations received and recommendations for priorities for new schemes in 2012/13.

An officer stated that:

- the costs of the schemes detailed in the report were estimates as the actual costs of each scheme was dependant on the views of the public;
- officers were anticipating a reduction in the overall budget available for the review of parking schemes in the future, and a proportion of this budget would need to be set aside for the Local Safety Parking Scheme. However, there were potential Section 106 (S106) funds available to supplement this;
- because the Capital Allocation could not fund every request for a review of a parking scheme, officers were recommending a prioritisation of the funding available. Although the automatic review of a parking scheme, which normally took place between six to twelve months after implementation had become the norm in recent years, these automatic reviews had significant implications in terms of cost and staff time. Therefore, officers were proposing that, in the future, reviews only take place for those schemes where there was significant public demand.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that historically, S106 funds were only released after completion of a project or if the Council could demonstrate the existence of issues that would cause the funding to be released. In the future, traffic officers would be working more closely with planning officers in this area.



A back benching Member stated that with regard to the review of parking in Uxbridge Road, Hatch End, the report stated that the local residents' association had indicated that views on this issue were split. The Member stated that in her view, views were not split fifty-fifty, but that some residents continued to have concerns. The proposed parking controls in The Broadway had aroused strong feeling among residents, many of whom did not want it to extend into residential areas. Most of the traders in Hatch End had signed the petition and the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise had visited them recently to discuss the matter. Another business in Hatch End had closed down recently, and many of the remaining businesses were struggling financially. She requested that both the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Enterprise and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety meet with the traders to discuss ways forward. She added that, she held regular street surgeries in Hatch End. At one such surgery, one of the largest traders in Hatch End had indicated that it had incurred considerable losses due to the parking restrictions on Sundays.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that scheme reviews were normally carried out between six to twelve months after implementation of a scheme. The scheme at Hatch End was subject to consultation due for implementation in 2012/13.

A back benching Member stated that the Rayners Lane scheme had caused parking to be polarised in the areas just outside the CPZ, where there was displaced parking causing obstruction.

Following comments from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that:

- the public consultation in Central Avenue showed no clear majority support for a CPZ. However, residents had subsequently presented a petition to the Panel requesting a CPZ. In the areas of Raynton Close/Trescoe Gardens/Newlyn Gardens residents had requested revisions to the yellow lines proposed. The Panel had subsequently agreed to a re-consultation of these streets, which was expected to be carried out in April 2012. Officers had made recommendations and met on site with representatives of residents to discuss revisions to the recommendation and written to residents informing them of these;
- the CPZ in South Harrow would be implemented shortly. The West Harrow scheme was due to be consulted on shortly, the results of which would be reported to the June meeting of the Panel. The scheme would be implemented during the Summer of 2012, subject to statutory consultation results and agreement by the Panel and Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

A Member requested that if any additional funds were identified in 2012/13, then the proposed scheme in Pinner should be given priority.

An adviser to the Panel stated that the current trend of permanent day-long occupation of parking spaces was proving detrimental to traders and that the proposed CPZ in Hatch End would benefit both traders and residents.

Members of the Panel stated that they did not wish the current practice of automatically reviewing parking schemes six to twelve months after implementation to be abandoned by officers and requests reported to the following Panel meeting, as proposed. Following further discussion, Members agreed the following amendment to paragraph 1 of the recommendation:

‘the practice of automatically reviewing parking schemes after six to twelve months be replaced with a pragmatic approach and that any issues following scheme implementation be considered at the next Panel meeting.’

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

That

- (1) the practice of automatically reviewing parking schemes after six to twelve months be replaced with a pragmatic approach and that any issues arising following scheme implementation be considered at the next meeting of the Panel;
- (2) the priority list of parking management schemes for 2012/13 as shown in Appendix B of the report, be agreed, subject to confirmation of funding by Cabinet on 9 February 2012;
- (3) officers be authorised to carry out scheme design and consultation on the schemes in Appendix B of the report;
- (4) officers be authorised to implement the schemes in Appendix B of the report, subject to a further report and receiving the Panel’s recommendation to proceed.

**Reason for Decision:** To prioritise the Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes Programme for 2012/13.

#### **110. Burnt Oak Broadway Controlled Parking Zone Review**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment which set out the results of the public consultation following a review of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) introduced in the Burnt Oak Broadway area in April 2011. An officer stated that the report made a number of recommendations which had been formulated on the basis of the results of the consultation.

The officer added that the scheme had originally been planned to include a review of parking around Krishna Avanti School. However a recent further planning application for this site had meant this was not practical and a further consultation would be carried out in this area once the implications of the recent planning application were known. There were Section 106 monies available to fund this.

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

That

- (1) the following be taken forward to statutory consultation:
  - (a) the Chase – from Columbia Avenue to Oakleigh Avenue now be included in the CPZ;
  - (b) Columbia Avenue – between Burnt Oak Broadway and Vancouver Road – the two existing south westerly Pay and Display (P&D) parking bays be converted to Shared Use P&D / Resident Permit parking bays;
  - (c) Oakleigh Avenue and The Highlands – at their junction with Burnt Oak Broadway – remove the existing loading bays, install double yellow lines and convert the existing P&D bays to allow morning peak time loading while retaining P&D for shoppers etc;
- (2) Axholme Avenue, Broomgrove Gardens, Orchard Grove – extend the existing double yellow lines by 5 metres on the southwestern side of each road at its junction with Oakleigh Avenue;
- (3) Camrose Avenue – extend the existing double yellow line on southeast side by approximately 10 metres northeast;
- (4) the results of the statutory consultation be presented to the Portfolio Holder for his consideration;
- (5) residents within the consultation areas be informed of this decision;
- (6) officers be authorised to make minor amendments where required for technical or practical reasons;
- (7) further consultation on possible parking controls around the Krishna Avanti School take place when the implications of the recent planning approval is known and the S106 agreement is in place.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in the existing Burnt Oak Broadway area as well as the surrounding roads as detailed in the report. To respond to residents' requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

## **111. Canons Park Controlled Parking Proposals**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, which set out the results of the public consultation of the Canons Park Station area wide parking review. An officer stated that the proposals contained in the report were, subject to approval, due to be taken to statutory consultation. He added that some of the area covered by the report had extended beyond the scope originally anticipated by officers.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that:

- one-hour controls in the pay and display bays set out in paragraph C of the recommendation permitted shoppers, residents and permit holders to park there;
- at a previous Panel meeting, Members of the Panel had agreed to a resident's suggestion to introduce pay and display, disabled and residents parking bays on Whitchurch Lane to deal with the displaced parking from the Hitchin Lane development;
- the people on Station Parade requesting residents permits referred to in the report were those residents living in the properties above the shops;
- residents' representatives from the Canons Park Residents' Association had advised that they wanted extended double yellow lines in the small area in Wychwood Avenue beyond the junction of Howberry Road however the adjacent residents response did not support this.

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

That

- (1) the following be taken forward to statutory consultation:
  - (a) Donnefield Avenue (Area 1 on plan in Appendix D) – permit bays be introduced with hours of operation between 8:00 to 18:30;
  - (b) Torbridge Close (Area 2 on plan in Appendix D) – permit bays be introduced with hours of operation between 14:00 to 15:00;
  - (c) Station Parade (Area 3 on Plan in Appendix D) – at the front of the parade in the service road, single yellow lines be controlled for two hours during the day, between 10:00 to 11:00 and 14:00 to 15:00, with a number of joint permit and pay and display bays provided with hours of operation between 08:00 to 18:30. At the rear of station parade, double yellow lines be introduced on the bends and through narrow sections and a single yellow line be introduced through the remainder, with control times of 12:00 to 13:00;
  - (d) Cheyneys Avenue between the junction of Cloyster Wood to the northern property boundary of 118 Cheyneys Avenue, (Area 4 on plan in Appendix D) – single yellow lines be introduced with control times between 14:00 to 15:00;

- (e) Du Cros Drive (Area 5 on plan in Appendix D) – single yellow line be introduced with a one hour control in the afternoon between 15:00 to 16:00;
  - (f) Buckingham Road between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens, (Area 6 on plan in Appendix D) – a combination of double yellow and single yellow line controls be introduced with control times between 14:00 and 15:00;
  - (g) Buckingham Gardens, (Area 6 on plan in Appendix D) – single yellow lines be introduced with control times between 14:00 and 15:00;
  - (h) Parr Road, (Area 7 on plan in Appendix D) – single yellow lines be introduced on one side of the carriageway between 08:30 to 18:00;
  - (i) Bromefield/Bush Grove/Maychurch Close, (Area 8 on Plan in Appendix D) - single yellow lines be introduced between 14:00 to 15:00;
  - (j) Bramble Close, (Area 9 on plan in Appendix D) – single yellow lines be introduced between 14:00 to 15:00;
  - (k) shopping parade on Honeypot Lane, (Area 11 on plan in Appendix D) - single yellow lines be introduced between 14:00 to 15:00;
- (2) throughout the area consulted, double yellow lines be introduced 10 metres back from junctions, in turning heads, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends in accordance with guidance from the Highway Code and computer simulation of vehicle swept paths;
  - (3) a second consultation take place to clarify the views of residents from Buckingham Road between Whitchurch Avenue and Whitchurch Lane and proceed to statutory consultation. The consultation boundary be defined as Area 10 on plan in Appendix D;
  - (4) disabled parking facilities be incorporated into the detailed design proposals at Station Parade, local shops on Honeypot Lane and at entrances to Canons Park itself;
  - (5) residents throughout the consultation area be informed of the outcome of the public consultation.

**Reason for Decision:** To control parking in the area surrounding Canons Park Station as well as the surrounding roads. To respond to resident requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and in order to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

- 112. INFORMATION REPORT: PETITIONS RELATING TO (1) Honeypot Lane & Winchester Road: Traffic Safety Proposals; (2) Kingshill Avenue Area: Proposed yellow line waiting restrictions; (3) Buckingham Road, Edgware: request to resolve parking problems; (4) Shaftesbury Circle: Opposing proposed waiting restrictions; (5) Argyle Road, North Harrow: Objection to parking bays; (6) Fallowfield, Stanmore: Objection to proposed waiting restrictions; (7) Nelson Road, West Street and adjacent terra**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment outlining petitions that had been received since the meeting of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel on 23 November, including details of the Council's investigations where these had been undertaken.

An officer made the following points about the petitions listed below:

### **Honeypot Lane and Winchester Road – Traffic Safety Proposals**

- three petitions were received in relation to Malvern Gardens and Winchester Road as part of the Honeypot Lane LSS an analysis of the results of the public consultation had proved inconclusive;
- residents in Malvern Gardens had been concerned about displaced parking in roads surrounding Winchester Road.
- Members had voiced concern about changes to the hours of operation of the bus lane at the November Panel meeting, and it was decided not to amend these but it was agreed that the bus lane be shortened by 80 metres. Additional signage and a pedestrian refuge were introduced following discussions with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety to improve pedestrian access in the area.

A back benching Member stated the following with regard to parking controls and lack of adequate parking on Winchester Road:

- there was a general trend in increased car ownership and car use both locally and nationally, which impacted on Harrow residents;
- there was a significant amount of anti-social parking on Winchester Road whereby cars were being parked on both sides of the road, in disabled spaces and on kerbs, blocking driveways, and causing other access problems, for example, bins not being collected;
- some of the overspill parking was caused by Brent residents;
- residents from Winchester Road had submitted a petition and organised a public meeting about parking problems on their street, which had been attended by traffic officers;

- the Police had advised that any parking scheme implemented would cause further displaced parking.

The Member added that she would welcome suggestions from Members and officers about any innovative parking schemes, awareness campaigns that targeted behavioural change, or additional signage that would help alleviate parking problems in this area.

An officer advised that:

- this was a borough-wide as well as nation-wide problem. He added that there were two main issues. Firstly, obstruction of access and secondly management of demand, which could be done through controlled parking measures such as double yellow lines;
- demand management would require a study of demand for and availability of parking in a particular area. If parking issues in an area related purely to access, then these could be addressed under a separate programme of works which dealt with access and safety issues;
- in his experience, awareness campaigns had limited impact in areas with severe parking pressures.

The officer made the following additional points with regard to the petitions listed below:

#### **Kingshill Avenue Area – Proposed double yellow line waiting restrictions**

- £100k was available from TfL to progress the scheme;
- public and statutory consultations had received a good level of response which showed that the majority of residents were in favour of the double yellow lines. These would contribute to improved visibility and accessibility in the area.

#### **Buckingham Road, Edgware - Request for action on parking problems**

- there had been public consultation to seek the views of petitioners', residents' and businesses as part of the Canons Park Station area review, undertaken in 2011. This would go to statutory consultation shortly and further details of this were provided in the report under agenda item 12.

#### **Shaftesbury Circle – opposing proposed waiting restrictions**

- following discussions with residents, it was agreed that the double yellow lines were not required in the service roads and were therefore removed, but would be implemented on the corners.

### **Argyle Road, North Harrow - objection to parking bays**

- funding was available from the Greater London Authority and would be used to implement parking bays to assist traders in North Harrow;
- following local consultation, objections had been received against the central islands and the proposals relating to Northumberland and Cambridge Roads had been abandoned. The scheme was agreed following consultation with the relevant Ward Councillors and the scheme would be operational from March 2012.

### **Fallowfield, Stanmore – objection to waiting restrictions proposed as part of the Local Safety Parking Programme; Nelson Road, West Street and adjacent terraces - Objection to proposed waiting restrictions; Localised Safety Parking Programme on Harrow on the Hill**

- petitions objecting to the implementation of parking restrictions in these streets had been received;
- officers had carried out a site visit on Fallowfield and were logging the responses to the statutory consultation regarding the proposed scheme and expected to reach a compromise solution;
- a petition had been submitted to Cabinet objecting to the proposed parking restrictions on Harrow on the Hill. The petition, along with other objections to the restrictions would be discussed with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

A back benching Member stated that:

- the petition relating to Harrow on the Hill had 80 signatures from residents and traders on the roads affected by the proposed waiting restrictions. A previous petition about the same issue had 26 signatures;
- traders on London Road had told him of their concerns relating to loss of business due to the restrictions;
- there was also concern about displaced parking from the Nelson Road area;
- many residents had not been aware of the parking proposals until he had informed them of these. He fully endorsed the suggestion of a meeting attended by the relevant Ward Councillors, the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety and officers to discuss ways forward.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that:



- the Harrow on the Hill petition did not name specific streets and was signed by residents and traders from the area;
- a meeting between the relevant Ward Councillor was being planned pending agreement from the Portfolio Holder prior to any final decision being taken.

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

**113. INFORMATION REPORT: Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme Update**

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director Community and Environment, which provided an update on the progress made with delivering the 2011/12 programme of traffic and parking schemes.

It was noted that the Stanmore Hill scheme was 60% complete and the Mollison Way scheme would be officially opened on 1 March 2012.

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

**114. Any Other Business**

Vote of Thanks

The Chairman stated that this was the last meeting of the Panel for the 2011/12 Municipal Year and he expressed his appreciation to Members, Advisers and officers for their hard work in supporting the work of the Panel.

On behalf of the Panel, the Vice-Chairman offered his best wishes to the Chairman on his Mayorship for 2012/13.

**115. Termination of Meeting**

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D) of the Constitution.

**RESOLVED:** At 9.59 pm to continue until 10.10 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.05 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR NIZAM ISMAIL  
Chairman