

**MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, 10<sup>th</sup> February 2004 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Jones (Chair), Councillor Kagan (Vice Chair) and Councillors Beswick, R S Patel & Thomas.

Councillors Gillani, Gladbaum, J Long, Sayers, Shaw and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

**1. Declarations of Interest**

None.

**2. Minutes of Highways Committee – 17<sup>th</sup> December 2003**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the Highways Committee held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2003 be received and approved as an accurate record.

**3. Matters Arising**

Satnam Sahota (Principal Traffic Engineer, Transportation Unit), in reply to Councillor Beswick's request for an update on Event Day Parking, informed the Committee that a Public Relations Consultancy had been hired to carry out consultation to be presented to Councillors on its completion. The Chair confirmed in reply to Councillor Van Colle, that Councillors would be given one month's consultation before going to public consultation. Councillor R S Patel enquired about progress concerning investigation of Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) schemes in the Valley Farm Area. In reply, Mr Sahota confirmed that consultation was under way and a report would be produced at the next Committee meeting.

Councillor Sayers raised his concern of an apparent lack of enforcement of illegal parking in Ashford Road and Hassop Road. He stated that a number of parking meters had been vandalised and that a possible solution would be to make parking permits available from local newsagents. Councillor J Long stated that problems in Ashford Road and Hassop Road were being caused by the fact that the parking bays were for shared use and that there should be an allocation of residents only parking bays.

In reply, Phil Rankmore (Director of Transportation Unit) said talks had taken place with StreetCare and the Police to address the vandalising of parking meters. Problems had been aggravated by delays caused in re-connecting the electricity supply of parking meters and the use of solar-powered parking meters was under consideration. He would investigate Councillor Sayers suggestion of making parking permits available at newsagents. Mr Sahota added that the main issue would be to seek outlets that would be able to accommodate reliable availability of permits.

The Chair requested that a separate report for Hassop Road be produced. In reply, Mr Rankmore confirmed the production of such a report but stressed that input would also be required from other agencies. He explained that the Hassop Road CPZ scheme had been a pilot project and because there had also been a re-numbering of street numbers that therefore a review was necessary. Councillor J Long suggested that site meetings take place from the outset of the review to facilitate the prompt production of an accurate final report.

Mr Sahota, replying to a query from Councillor R S Patel, informed Committee that enforcement issues in the Sudbury Town area CPZ were being taken up with Enforcement Managers.

4. **Deputations**

None.

5. **Petitions**

***Harrow Road – Request for Review of Operational Hours of Bus Lane***

The Committee received a petition from residents and businesses of Harrow Road requesting:

- “(a) urgently to withhold experimental bus lane until next Committee meeting due 10<sup>th</sup> February 2004
- (b) To implement bus lane pm only
- (c) To review parking restrictions and provide parking facilities.”

Mr Sahota informed the Committee that the concerns raised by the petition had been noted and that a decision had been made to implement operational hours of the proposed bus lane at pm hours only between Scrubbs Lane and Kenmont Close, subject to review in light of any problems identified. The Chair added that loading bays would be provided for affected businesses.

Speaking on behalf of the petition, **Mr Nissim Tricot** thanks officers and Committee for the consultation undertaken. **Ms Sheila Harris**, in support of the petition, similarly thanked officers and Committee and asked if parking provision would be available in time for implementation of bus lane operational hours. In reply, Mr Sahota explained that every effort would be made to ensure that such work could be undertaken in time.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petition be noted;
- (ii) that the proposed operational hours of the bus lane between Scrubbs Lane and Kenmont Close be 4 pm to 7 pm, Monday to Saturday;
- (iii) that inset loading bays be provided opposite numbers 831 to 859 Harrow Road.

6. **Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme**

The Committee received a report informing them of the progress with the programme of implementation of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) in Brent since the report to the last meeting in December 2003, and on the receipt of a petition from residents of Zone HW (Harlesden) objecting to the CPZ.

A **resident** of Chamberlayne Road addressed the Committee regarding parking and traffic issues. She explained that residents from other streets where a CPZ scheme had been implemented were parking their vehicles in Chamberlayne Road. Furthermore, the road was being used by market traders and for vehicle sales. A petition had been submitted requesting a CPZ scheme be implemented from 8.30 am to 6 pm. She asked that if a CPZ was not possible, that a single yellow line be marked. She also added that vehicles were exceeding the 30 miles per hour speed limit.

In reply, Mr Sahota stated that the petition would go to the meeting of the 20<sup>th</sup> April 2004 as it was submitted too late to be considered at this meeting and that a safety scheme was under consideration to address speeding. Mr Rankmore stated that StreetCare had authority to remove unroadworthy vehicles. Similarly, if trading was proven to have taken place, Trading Standards would have power to take action. Where private sales of vehicles had taken place there were no powers of enforcement for removal. Concerning controlled parking, he explained that a yellow line would only be used where unsafe parking had been determined, which did not apply to Chamberlayne Road. He stated that residents had been warned of the possibility of displacement parking from vehicles of other streets where the CPZ scheme had been implemented. Councillor Shaw then requested that a decision be taken at this meeting. In reply, the Chair stated that this was not possible as the Committee was bound by its procedures and protocol. In answer to the Chair's query, Mr Sahota explained that during consultation, a CPZ scheme had been rejected by Chamberlayne Road residents.

**Ms Susan Bell**, speaking on behalf of residents of Whitmore Gardens, explained to Committee that during initial consultation a CPZ scheme had not received majority support, however residents had not realised that

consultation was undertaken on a street by street basis. The implementation of a CPZ scheme in surrounding streets had led to displacement parking occurring in Whitmore Gardens. She asked that there be a review of Whitmore Gardens and that a petition had been submitted in support of the introduction of a CPZ scheme. In reply, Mr Sahota said that a re-consultation could be undertaken, consisting of 1 month informal consultation before going to Committee, followed by up to 6 months statutory consultation.

Before the next speaker addressed the Committee, the Chair declared an interest in the item and vacated the Chair. Councillor Kagan, as Vice Chair, resumed as the acting Chair. **Mr Justin Murphy**, representing the Tula Group of Companies Ltd in Villiers Road stated that the CPZ scheme about to be implemented restricted his company to 3 parking units. He explained that his company was a large business and asked that Committee re-consider offering more parking units and to postpone the implementation of the current scheme. In reply, Mr Sahota stated that all businesses were currently restricted to 3 parking units but policy could be reviewed. The acting Chair confirmed that a decision could not be made until a policy review. Mr Murphy stated that the current allocation of parking units represented 4 per cent of the total staff and commented that at least 12 parking spaces would be required. Mr Rankmore then suggested that a meeting with the Tula Group and officers take place to review the existing configuration of the premises. He explained that an earlier review of parking permits taken up by residents could be undertaken to consider whether some could be offered to businesses. Assistance could also be given to employees to undertake Green Travel commuting. Mr Murphy replied that he welcomed the dialogue offered and the opportunity to participate in consultation.

Councillor Jones then resumed her role as Chair. **Ms Lola Nolan-Bennett** requested that residents be re-consulted regarding the implementation of a CPZ scheme in Palermo Road. She informed Committee that a petition submitted in December 2003 had been over-ruled on the basis of an earlier consultation in 2002. She stated that a second petition had been submitted that clearly showed residents of Palermo Road were against the implementation of a CPZ scheme. She added that ticket inspectors were now targeting vehicles parked on a verge in the road which had always previously been used without any problems. Replying to Ms Nolan-Bennett's comments, Mr Sahota explained that 2 separate consultations had shown conclusively that there was majority support for the proposed CPZ scheme in Palermo Road. Ms Nolan-Bennett replied that she had not seen any consultation papers concerning the CPZ scheme. Mr Sahota stated that consultation papers had been sent using the post office and the address book as reference. The Chair then stated that residents could complain regarding the issuing of parking tickets on vehicles parked on the verge. Regarding the CPZ scheme, she explained that consultation had concluded that it be implemented some time ago, although every CPZ scheme was subject to review. **Mr Peter Miles**, who owned a garage in

Palermo Road, reiterated Ms Nolan-Bennett's comments concerning residents' opposition to the CPZ scheme. He had submitted the second petition but had not realised it was too late to be considered at this meeting. He stated that he believed the implementation of the CPZ scheme could affect the 3 businesses located in Palermo Road and possibly result in job losses. His business would have its capacity to work on client's cars reduced because they would be unable to park cars on the roadside and his employees would also lose parking spaces.

The Chair stated that consultation had shown 69 per cent of residents being in favour of the CPZ scheme in Palermo Road but asked if the decision could be deferred or to implement the scheme in Palermo Road after other roads in the HW zone. In reply, Mr Sahota informed the Committee that neither deferral nor delay of implementation would be possible due to the funding conditions imposed. The Chair requested that Members and officers investigate ways to help Mr Miles, Ms Nolan-Bennett and residents and businesses by visiting Palermo Road before implementation. Councillor Thomas also suggested that the verge commented on by Ms Nolan-Bennett be investigated. Mr Sahota confirmed that such a visit could be undertaken and it was agreed to arrange a meeting.

**Mr Chambers** asked Committee to consider some ideas regarding the CPZ scheme zone HW. He explained to Committee that he believed that Harlesden Gardens and Crown Hill Road included under the approved HW zone, should also allow parking for H Zone permit holders and he circulated details of the proposals to Members. He also informed Committee that a single yellow line on a road next to a nearby school had not yet appeared. The Committee welcomed Mr Chambers proposals and Councillor Beswick suggested that officers meet with Mr Chambers and other residents to discuss these ideas. In reply, Mr Sahota agreed to investigate the CPZ suggestions and the single yellow line issue raised by Mr Chambers and that a report on the feasibility of dual zone CPZ permits would be put before a future Committee meeting. He added that residents in Crown Hill Road already had the option of choosing either H or HW parking permits.

**Mr Robert Dunwell** of Queensbury Area Residents' Association (QARA) spoke to Committee concerning the approval of the CPZ scheme Zone QA. He stated that he had asked the Committee to consider the statutory objection at the Highways Committee meeting of 16<sup>th</sup> October 2003. He stated that the Committee had not taken the opportunity to contact him regarding evidence he held that he claimed contained evidence of malpractice and serious allegations during the consultation process. As a result of the evidence not being considered by the Committee, he claimed that various courses of action could now be taken by QARA.

In reply, Councillor Kagan stated that the evidence presented at the meeting of the 16<sup>th</sup> October 2003 was never submitted to the Committee.

She informed Mr Dunwell that the evidence would need to be submitted before Committee could investigate the claims. The Legal Adviser confirmed that Committee were under no obligation to contact the objector and that the objector must formally submit the evidence to Committee. In reply, Mr Dunwell requested future clarification of this issue.

**Ms Carol Reeman**, a resident of Langton Road, requested a deferral of the proposed CPZ scheme zone GM. She raised concerns regarding a petition that had been in circulation requesting operational hours 10 am to 9 pm. She claimed some people who had signed it had not fully understood what it was requesting and had since asked for their names to be removed. She also requested clarification concerning the areas to be reviewed and stated that residents of Langton Road wished to remain part of CPZ scheme zone GM but with reduced hours. In reply, the Chair confirmed that her road would be included under a new CPZ scheme zone GA. Mr Sahota added that each CPZ scheme could only have one hours of operation.

Councillor Sayers informed the Committee of details of the petition requesting operational hours 10 am to 9 pm. The petition had received over 100 signatures and he understood that some signatures were made on behalf of residents. Consultation had indicated support for operational hours 10 am to 9 pm, but support for operational hours 10 am to 3 pm were evident in Langton Road, Newton Road and Wotton Road. With regards to Olive Road, most residents had supported operational hours 10 am to 9 pm. Mr Sahota stated that the petition would require further investigation.

Councillor J Long stated that the consultation showed that most streets would benefit from 10 am to 9 pm operational hours, although 10 am to 3 pm would be sufficient for some streets. She believed that consultation should concentrate on asking residents about operational times of CPZ schemes as opposed to whether they wanted a CPZ. The Chair commented that it would be beneficial if Councillors could see the consultation forms for comments before they were distributed to the public. Mr Sahota confirmed that a re-consultation of CPZ scheme zone GA operational times would be undertaken at the request of the Chair.

**Mr Eric Pollack** raised his concerns in light of the 10 am to 9 pm petition for re-assurance that the section of Olive Road not currently proposed as part of a CPZ scheme would not be included in the future, which was confirmed by the Chair.

Committee discussed CPZ zone MW and unanimously agreed to an amendment that this zone also be subject to re-consultation. In reply to a query from Councillor Sayers, the Chair confirmed that Zone MC would proceed with statutory consultation.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress on the Controlled Parking Zones programme funded by Capital funds from Transport for London (associated with the Mayor's Congestion Charging Scheme for Central London and the Borough Spending Plan) and the Transportation Services Unit revenue budget be noted,
- (ii) that the objection received from CPZ Zone HW to the Public Notice as part of the Traffic Management Order making process be noted and the Director of Transportation's decision to overrule the objection as detailed in item 8.17 of the report and to proceed with the implementation of the CPZ, be endorsed,
- (iii) that CPZ Zones GA and MW be subject to re-consultation.

**7. TfL Capital Approved Programme 2004/05**

TfL have confirmed Brent's allocation for 2004/05, on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2003, approving the programme and allocating £5,129m plus other funds through sub-regional partnerships. The report before members set out the details of the programme and funding received.

Councillor Beswick stated that the Committee had noted the work undertaken so far and thanked officers for the progress made.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the approved allocation be noted;
- (ii) that the Director of Transportation be instructed, subject to compliance with the Council's standing orders and financial regulations, and regular reports back to the Committee on progress, to prioritise the schemes set out in the report and ensure their delivery.

**8. Stadium Access Corridor Project**

The Committee received a report updating them on progress to date in relation to Section 1 of the Stadium Access Corridor (SAC) project and the associated application for planning permission and promotion of a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO). The Committee had before them a report requesting that the Head of Transportation Services be authorised to promote orders for the diversion to the public footpath in the River Brent Open Space, to rationalise the existing highways affected by the SAC scheme and to close and alter certain private means of access along the route of the SAC.

Mr Rankmore informed Committee that the re-configuration of some industrial passages would result in them either being slightly re-positioned or maintaining their original position. The works would also entail re-alignment of the footpath leading from Great Central Way to the River Brent Open Space. He confirmed in reply to a query from the Chair that the works were scheduled for completion in September 2005, before the opening of the Stadium.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress made to date on the development of the Stadium Access Corridor project be noted;
- (ii) that the Director of Transportation Services be authorised to promote orders for the stopping up and/or diversion of highways required for the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1 to be carried out;
- (iii) that the Director of Transportation Services be authorised to promote Orders under Section 248 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and (if required) Section 125 of the Highways Act 1980 required for any or all of the following:
  - (a) the stopping up of highways and the diversion of highways affected by the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1;
  - (b) the stopping up of private means of access to premises adjoining or adjacent to the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1;
  - (c) the provision of new means of access to premises from the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1 or highways connecting to the Stadium Access Corridor;
- (iv) that the Director of Transportation Services be authorised to enter into discussions with affected parties to seek to agree to the stopping up of private accesses along the route of the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1 pursuant to the power available to the Council under Section 127 of the Highways Act 1980;
- (v) that the Director of Transportation Services be authorised to consider the provision of new means of access to the Stadium Access Corridor Section 1 under the powers available to the Council pursuant to Section 129 of the Highways Act 1980;
- (vi) that the availability of compensation to persons affected by the closure of accesses pursuant to the proposed Orders be noted;



- (vii) that the Director of Transportation Services in consultation with the Borough Solicitor be authorised to take all necessary steps in respect of the Orders including but not limited to –
  - (1) the publication of requisite notices
  - (2) consideration of any objections and representations received
  - (3) if necessary, the instruction of Counsel and experts to provide evidence and prepare the case for the Orders in any inquiry into the making of the Orders which may be arranged
  - (4) making arrangements for any inquiry into the Orders (if such inquiry is necessary)
  - (5) the submission of the Orders to the Mayor of London
  - (6) making the order if (a) no objections are received or (b) the objections which are received are in his opinion not substantive and the Mayor of London decides that in the special circumstances of the case a public inquiry is unnecessary. (viii) Unless paragraph vii (6) above applies, to report back to the Committee for the making of the Orders pursuant to this report;
- (viii) upon the making of such Orders, the Director of Transportation be authorised to take all necessary steps to carry out the actions and works authorised by the Orders made.

#### **9. Dates of Future Meetings**

The meeting of the Committee scheduled for Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2004 has been cancelled. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place at 7.00 pm at Tuesday, 20<sup>th</sup> April 2004.

#### **10. Any Other Urgent Business**

Mr Rankmore informed the Committee that a Transport Passenger Forum was due to commence in March 2004. In responses to queries from Committee, he confirmed that the Forum had liaison body status and that funding was contained within the Transportation Unit budget.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm.

L JONES  
Chair

Mins2003'04/Exec/highways/hways10fj