

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 15th June 2004 at 7.00 pm

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

Councillors Mrs N Blackman, R Blackman, D Brown, Coughlin, Dromey, John, Kansagra, J Long, Lorber, Lyon, Rands, Sayers, Sengupta, and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Nominations were invited for the position of Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2004/2005. Councillor Jones was proposed and seconded. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED:-

that Councillor Jones be elected Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2004/2005

Nominations were then invited for the position of Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2004/2005. Councillor Kagan was proposed and seconded. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED:-

that Councillor Kagan be elected Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2004/2005.

2. Apologies for absence

None.

3. Declarations of Interest

None declared.

4. Minutes of Highways Committee – 20th April 2004

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the Highways Committee held on 20th April 2004 be received and approved as an accurate record.

5. Matters Arising

None

6. **Deputations**

None

7. **Petitions**

(a) **Request for Traffic Calming Measures in Village Way, Neasden**

The Committee received a petition from residents of Neasden, submitted by Sarah Teather MP (Brent East), stating that:

“We, the undersigned, call for the Council to investigate the possibility of traffic calming measures to control the speed of vehicles from the North Circular Road to Village Way and surrounding areas.”

The Chair reminded members that plans for traffic calming measures in Neasden had been agreed in the last financial year and a resolution was passed at the last meeting.

Councillor Lorber asked if any schemes were being considered concerning the flow of traffic off the North Circular Road. He also commented on traffic congestion around Blackbird Hill and that vehicles were using the estate as a short cut. In reply, Barry Phillips (Traffic Management Officer) explained that the programme was part of the Safe Routes to Schools Programme and that the speed reduction measures would help reduce speed and be self-enforcing. He also explained that a new signal arrangement to link-up existing signals on Neasden Lane would be put in place and help to reduce congestion.

Councillor Blackman commented that many residents had highlighted problems concerning vehicles turning off Neasden Lane. Councillor Kansagra also mentioned problems with traffic movement, particularly around the Birchen Grove location. Councillor Kagan suggested that it would be a good idea that officers meet with residents to explain in further detail the scheme proposed. The Chair agreed that the comments made by Councillors Kagan, Blackman and Kansagra should be further investigated.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

(b) **Request for Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme for the lower and middle section of Fleetwood Road**

The Committee received a petition from residents of Fleetwood Road stating that:

“A petition to Brent Council from the residents of the lower section of Fleetwood Road, numbers 1-57 and 2-42 for a Controlled Parking Zone.”

The Chair advised members that there would be a re-consultation of the parking situation in this road in September 2004. **Mr Wood**, representing the petition, stated that Fleetwood Road was becoming a victim of displacement parking from vehicles of nearby Hamilton Road and commuter parking for Dollis Hill Station. He added that sometimes residents were forced to park in nearby Lancaster Gardens and that elderly people could not park near their houses. Furthermore, some vehicles were being parked across people's driveways. The petition he had submitted to Highways Committee had 80 per cent of residents in Fleetwood Road in favour of a CPZ scheme.

In reply to Mr Wood's comments, David Eaglesham (Head of Traffic Management) explained that there would be an informal consultation before September 2004, the results of which would go to Committee. In the event of the majority of residents being in favour of a CPZ scheme, there would follow the necessary legal statutory requirements and the implementation of a CPZ scheme would not be any earlier than January 2005. Mr Wood explained that the residents at the top half of Fleetwood Road might not indicate support for such a scheme and enquired about the possibility of a CPZ scheme only for the section of the road that had shown support for it. In reply, the Chair confirmed that this could be possible. Mr Eaglesham agreed to undertake Councillor Kagan's suggestion that residents of the petition be informed during the informal consultation period starting in September.

Councillor Fox asked if any measures could be undertaken to prevent vehicles being parked in front of residents' driveways. In reply, Phil Rankmore (Director of Transportation), explained that where no yellow line existed that there could be no enforcement, however depending on the results of the consultation, a CPZ scheme could prevent this problem from occurring in the future.

In conclusion, the Chair confirmed that both sections of the road would undergo reviews of the parking situation.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

- (c) **Petition to Brent Council made by the residents of Lewis Crescent, St Raphael's Way/Estate, St Patrick's Church, Drury Way and the surrounding areas**

The Committee received a petition from residents of Lewis Crescent, St Raphael's Way/Estate and the surrounding areas stating that:

"Petition to Brent Council made on behalf of the residents of Lewis Crescent, St Raphael's Way/Estate and the surrounding areas, appealing for action to reduce the excessive local congestion of traffic."

Mr Hegarty, representing the petition, explained that there had a long history of traffic congestion problems in this area and the recent roadworks had exacerbated the problem. He felt that the situation could be improved by the removal of the traffic lights at the IKEA store junction. Many of the problems had been created by vehicles turning off the North Circular at the Stonebridge junction area. He also reported that in some incidences residents were having difficulties in gaining access to the road from their driveways.

Councillor John, speaking as a Ward Councillor for the area, expressed her sympathy for the residents with regards the traffic flow situation. She informed Members of the on-going nature of this problem and commented that sometimes it was almost impossible for many residents to gain access out of St Raphael's Estate. The current corridor access works had worsened the problem and difficulties concerning accessibility near the IKEA store remained. She added that the roads were in need of improvements, especially once Wembley Stadium opened.

In reply, Mr Rankmore acknowledged that this was a complex issue to resolve and noted that there had been delays caused by the works at the bridge. He added that there were a number of structural faults within the bridge that had necessitated works to be undertaken. As the bridge was above a railway line, work could only be undertaken during the night once trains had ceased running, thus lengthening the time required for works to be completed. He advised members that a new traffic management system had been put in place and that once the bridge works had been completed, probably in October 2004, the road would be two-way and there would be an appreciable improvement.

With regard to the North Circular Road junction, he advised members that this particular scheme was being managed by

Transport for London (TfL). Working in conjunction with TfL, a new signals phasing system would be put in place on the eastern side which would also provide better access for pedestrians. Discussions were taking place with IKEA and the nearby Tesco's store regarding access problems and they were hopeful that a scheme could be agreed in the near future. The recent planning application approval of Quintain, the property developers around Wembley Stadium area, had secured some funding from TfL to provide schemes such as a signal phasing system in this area. He added that the Transportation Unit were willing to inspect other areas of the site with residents to discuss other problems being experienced.

Following a request from the Chair, Mr Rankmore confirmed that he would inform residents of the results of a meeting between TfL and Brent Council regarding proposed schemes.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

(d) **Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking: Brent Residents & Traders Parking Options (Wembley Park Station Area) (taken at the meeting at the discretion of the Committee)**

The Committee received a petition submitted by the Queensbury Area Residents' Association Group of Associations on behalf of residents and businesses stating that:

"This current petition follows on from the previously submitted and noted petitions, "Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking: Brent residents and traders parking options (2003 and April 2004); over 2,000 signatures covering Brent areas of about 12,000 households.

Reference the report "Wembley National Stadium Event Day Parking Controls" (Brent Highways Committee Agenda, 15th June 2004 pages 27 to 48) and the respective consultation document/revised consultation document.

"We the undersigned deplore the situation where Brent Council, Members and Departments, are yet again seen to be attempting to introduce a CPZ (Controlled Parking Zone)/CPZ type scheme around the Wembley Stadium Area with no clear real choices of alternatives. (These choices are indicated as being necessary by the above previously mentioned petitions and numerous representations at the Highways Committee).

The so-called "consultative document" and questionnaire falls well short of offering any real clear choices of traffic or parking schemes

to the residents/traders. The document and questionnaire are intrusive, misleading and confusing. (E.g. not even a clear choice to say "No" – to any scheme.) The questionnaire appears to have been purposely constructed so as to lead residents to give a particular answer of the Council's own choosing. (The collator of the answers ie the Council, has too wide a range of options of how they themselves will interpret the responses).

We, the undersigned, require that the Highways Committee (and Brent Council, its councillors and departments) –

1. Reject totally the above referenced consultation document and questionnaire.
2. Approve a motion that a "new" consultation document/questionnaire be quickly produced by Council officers and Mr Robert Dunwell to correct the above flaws and shortly be brought to a special meeting of the Highways Committee for approval.
3. We also authorise Mr Robert Dunwell (Chairman of the QARA Group of Associations) to represent us as our spokesman and overall co-ordinator for this petition and related matters. We also require that Brent Council, its Highways Committee, Brent Councillors and Departments deal with Mr Dunwell in this capacity.

Mr Robert Dunwell, in representing the petition, explained this petition was the third in a series of other petitions regarding Wembley Stadium Event Day parking. In his view, the consultation document was flawed and did not offer sufficient parking options. He commented that he personally had found the consultation document confusing and intrusive. He referred members to the wording of his petition, stating that he believed these offered more options to residents and that these alternatives were worthy of further investigation. In his view, a new consultation document was needed that would be both practical and helpful. He asked that the new consultation document be produced in liaison with his residents' group, the Queensbury Area Residents' Association Group of Associations, in order to obtain the views of a larger amount of residents. He also asked that residents be offered the right to object to any kind of CPZ scheme being put in place before Wembley Stadium opens.

In reply to a query from Councillor Kagan, Mr Dunwell stated that residents knew the full range of options and choices regarding parking options as outlined in his petition. Councillor Kagan commented that in view of the implications of the surrounding area during Wembley Stadium Event Days, it would be unrealistic to maintain a 'do nothing' policy.

In reply to a question from the Chair, Mr Eaglesham confirmed that up to 40,000 properties would be consulted on Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Control proposals.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

- (e) **Queensbury Area Residents' Association (QARA) Group of Associations: Kingsbury (CPZ) controlled parking zone (12th June 2004), organised and submitted by the QARA Group (Kingsbury/Queensbury branch) (taken at the meeting at the discretion of the Committee)**

The Committee received a petition from the QARA Group of Associations (Kingsbury/Queensbury branch) stating that:

"The residents' QARA (Kingsbury) Group petition of 627 signatures (including many from the Valley Farm Area) was presented and noted at the 20th April 2004 Highways Committee and included the rejection of any CPZ (and any such CPZ type suggestion) parking scheme in Kingsbury. Nevertheless, Brent Officers, the Chair of the Highways Committee, Fryent Ward councillors and the VFRA (Valley Farm Residents' Association) representatives have recently agreed upon such a CPZ type scheme. (Ref. Highways Committee Agenda, Tuesday 15th June 2004).

We, the undersigned:-

1. Deplore the situation where deplore the situation where Brent Council, Members and Departments, are yet again seen to be attempting to introduce a "CPZ (controlled parking zone) type short duration parking scheme" around Kingsbury (Valley Drive Area). (As shown and detailed in the London Borough of Brent Highways Committee Agenda (15th June 2004) report "Valley Drive Area, Kingsbury – Proposed "Pilot" scheme of short duration parking controls" pages 69 – 73).
2. Deplore the situation where representatives of the VFRA have yet again apparently gone against the wishes of a large number of Valley Farm Area residents and apparently agreed and condoned a CPZ or CPZ type parking scheme. (These wishes have been clearly expressed in large QARA petitions since 2002 to present.)
3. Require, yet again, that Brent Council, its Highways Committee, Brent Councillors and Departments reject the introduction of the Pilot scheme as per the Valley Drive Area report (pages 69 to 73 of the Highways Committee Agenda, 15th June 2004). Also they should reject "any CPZ /any CPZ

- type scheme in the Kingsbury area (and any such like suggestion).
4. Also authorise Mr Robert Dunwell (Chairman of the QARA Group of Associations) to represent us as our spokesman and overall co-ordinator for this petition and related matters. We also require that Brent Council, its Highways Committee, Brent Councillors and Departments deal with Mr Dunwell in this capacity.
 5. Also endorse and resubmit the QARA Group (Kingsbury (CPZ) petition noted at the 20th April 2004 Highways Committee Meeting.

Mr Robert Dunwell, in representing the petition, stated that two previous petitions had clearly shown residents were against any type of CPZ scheme in the Kingsbury area. At the previous Highways Committee meeting on 20th April 2004 he had submitted a petition addressing the Valley Farm area, citing that 627 signatures had been obtained against the implementation of any CPZ scheme. He felt that the meeting between the Chair, Ward Councillors and residents' associations regarding the proposed scheme was not representative. The residents he had spoken to were clearly against the scheme and he asked the Committee to consider this before making a decision. He referred members to the options offered by his petition.

In reply, the Chair stated that there had been ample consultation with residents leading up to the proposals recommended at this meeting.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

8. Petition – Request for Traffic Calming Measures in Village Way, Neasden

The Committee had before them a report informing them that a petition had been received by the Council from local residents concerning the speed of traffic in Village Way, Neasden.

Mr Phillips advised members that consultation had ended in June 2004 and that 90 per cent of residents were in favour of traffic calming measures, meaning that statutory consultation would now be undertaken before implementation of any scheme.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petition and the issues raised be noted;

- (ii) that the investigations undertaken by officers be noted;
- (iii) that the 20 mph zone proposed for the Village Way area including traffic calming measures and scheduled for completion this financial year, as part of a Safer Routes to School initiative already approved at a previous Highway Committee meeting, be noted.

9. **Wembley National Stadium Event Day Parking Controls**

The Committee had before them a report detailing the outcome of consultations with Ward and Committee members on the consultation document for the proposed Wembley National Stadium event day parking controls, and seeking approval to proceed with public consultations on event day parking schemes.

In introducing the report, Mr Eaglesham advised Members that the construction of the Wembley National Stadium was in the advanced stages. Its opening would have a significant impact on parking in the area. Parking controls were essential to the success of the Stadium and its surrounding residents and there had been a number of meetings to discuss the consultation to be undertaken. As the new National Stadium would be a public transport based venue, it was anticipated that there would be a reduction in traffic congestion. Officers were working on a scheme that would be effective in both reducing excess traffic flow and addressing the parking needs of the area. Members were advised that there were both legal and planning permission aspects that would restrict some options. Concessions from various bodies would minimize the impact. Regarding the actual consultation document, Mr Eaglesham explained that it provided a freedom of expression to either approve or reject various options. With regard to a traffic barrier scheme, he explained that there were various flaws to this particular option. For example, all the emergency services had indicated grave concerns concerning the safety of traffic barriers. He added that a barrier scheme would not necessarily give the required protection to residents during the Wembley Event Days.

Regarding the zoning of such a scheme, he advised members that there were two possible options, either a one all inclusive zone or 2 separate zones, an inner and an outer zone. He explained that it was essential that consultation be undertaken as soon as possible due to the very tight timescale of the impending opening of the National Stadium. A parking scheme needed to be in place before the Stadium opened. Mr Eaglesham added that Ward Councillors had been given one month to consider the consultation papers.

Councillor Blackman, in rejecting the proposed consultation papers, felt that they did not offer the option of no parking control scheme. He suggested that residents and residents associations had not been provided with a wide enough range of options to consider. He commented on the undesirability of the introduction of one scheme for the whole area,

regardless of whether it met opposition in some areas. He asked what action would be taken if all the schemes proposed were rejected by residents. With regards to the traffic barrier scheme, he believed that these had operated effectively in the past. During Event Days, he felt that it was inappropriate that parking restrictions be in force for a 24 hour period when some events only lasted a few hours. He asked why the consultation papers referred to around 30 events a year when he understood that a maximum of 30 events per year had been agreed. He felt that the 1,200 car parking spaces for the new Stadium was too little and stated that he had moved that 6,000 car park spaces be approved at a Planning Committee meeting, although this had been rejected. He sought clarification regarding possible plans to introduce inner and outer zones and the implications in terms of the possible splitting of roads. For example, he asked whether residents could park anywhere in the zone or the road where it was issued. He also asked what type of parking provision would be given on Event Days to those visiting places of worship or attending funerals.

Councillor Rands asked for details regarding what specific areas would be consulted. In his view residents of his Ward, Northwick Park, should be given the opportunity to reject any kind of parking control scheme in the consultation document. He stated that previous history in the ward had indicated overwhelming support against any kind of CPZ scheme. He asked if the whole area consulted would still be subject to a Section 106 agreement if residents indicated opposition to any suggested parking control scheme. He also enquired at what stage a review would be undertaken if a parking control scheme was implemented.

Councillor Van Colle, in commenting on the Conservative Group's response to the consultation papers, explained that many of these were a compilation of the views of various residents' associations and did not necessarily represent the views only of the Conservative Group. He felt that the consultation papers put undue emphasis on CPZ schemes. He suggested that the consultation papers did not afford residents a suitable range of options. He also felt that the boundaries of the 2 zones option for Event Day parking, as it currently stood, was arbitrary and he suggested that it could disadvantage some residents.

Councillor Lorber commented that he believed that the Section 106 agreement compelled the Council to introduce a CPZ scheme. He did not believe that the consultation papers offered a suitable number of options. He enquired as to why the consultation papers asked for residents' views on the visual appearance of possible parking schemes. With regard to Councillor Blackman's comments about parking arrangements during funerals, he also enquired about parking provision for those attending weddings on Event Days.

Councillor Fox commented that there needed to be some type of parking control scheme in place for Event Days. With regard to the possible

creation of an inner and outer zone, he felt that this could be the cause of potential confusion and even disputes amongst residents. Councillor Coughlin felt that the absence of any kind of protective parking scheme could encourage even more traffic in the area and exacerbate parking and traffic congestion problems. He therefore advocated the introduction of some parking control scheme to discourage visitors bringing vehicles to the area and putting undue pressure on parking spaces.

Councillor John stressed that it was very difficult to forecast possible results of a consultation and that to try to provide answers to hypothetical questions, such as a suitable response to residents rejecting any type of parking scheme, was not realistic at this stage. She added that if there was an overwhelming rejection of any parking control scheme, then a significant review would be undertaken. Concerning Councillor Van Colle's comments about possible discontent from residents' associations, she explained that these residents' associations would be consulted about the proposals, and some associations had already been consulted. In her experience, parking control schemes, although often met with initial scepticism from residents, usually resulted in their overall approval. She welcomed the views raised by the Conservative Group and stated that these would be addressed in the consultation. She commented that a sophisticated plan would be in place that would detail how visitors would travel to the Stadium and extensive work would be undertaken to encourage people's final leg of the journey to be completed by public transport.

With regard to the comments made by the Conservative Group concerning previous schemes when the old Wembley Stadium was open, the Chair asked that there be some information on the consultation form detailing some of the problems experienced during its Event Days. In reply to Councillor Blackman's comments regarding what he felt was the lack of parking spaces for Wembley Stadium, she advised Members that the discouragement of car use to such venues was a national as well as a regional policy.

Mr Eaglesham responded to the various comments made by members and Ward Councillors. He explained that the main responses to the consultation papers were from the Conservative Group, although other groups had made some similar comments. The report had identified the main issues raised by those who had seen the draft consultation papers. Concerning Councillor Lorber's comments about seeking residents' views on the visual appearance of parking schemes, Mr Eaglesham explained that this has not specifically been identified as a key issue, but in the event of feedback from the consultation paper indicating that visual appearance was an important factor, that these views would be taken into account. With regard to Councillor Rands' query about what areas were to be consulted, Mr Eaglesham explained that the legal agreement specified a designated area for consultation. Any area outside the scheme would not be consulted until after the Stadium had opened. He explained that the

residents were being asked if they wanted an inner and a separate outer zone or whether they preferred a one all encompassing zone. He added that once the Stadium was open, an area that was within a two-mile radius of it would be consulted. Further to Councillor Rands' query, Mr Eaglesham explained that he was consulting the biggest area allowable under the Section 106 agreement. He agreed to provide a hard copy of the consultation area map to each member. With regard to Councillor Blackman's query about what areas the Event Day parking permit would be valid, Mr Eaglesham replied that the permit holder could park anywhere in the road that the permit was issued for and the same would apply to visitor permits. Concerning Councillor Blackman's queries about parking for visitors to places of worship during Event Days, Mr Eaglesham acknowledged that there were potential difficulties, but stressed that there would be practical difficulties in implementing a 'pay and display' scheme. He suggested that a limited waiting scheme was a possible option. Mr Irfan Malik (Director of Environment) added that due consideration would be given to parking issues for visitors to areas of worship on Event Days.

Councillor Lorber enquired as to whether there would be any timing difference in operation between any proposed inner and outer parking zone. In reply, Mr Eaglesham confirmed that it was likely that there would be no time difference, as this could bring a disadvantage to residents in the inner area. Two zones had been offered as an option because of the large area covered by the Section 106 agreement.

Councillor Lorber then asked if existing CPZ permit holders would need an extra Event Day parking permit. In reply Mr Eaglesham confirmed that these permits would operate as normal and therefore these permit holders would not need an additional Event Day parking permit. He added that an Event Day permit holder would not normally be able to park in a controlled parking zone area other than on Event Days. With regard to Councillor Rands' query about when the scheme would be reviewed, Mr Eaglesham advised members that it would be prudent to undertake such a review once the first few events had taken place.

Councillor Blackman commented on the large number of roads that could be affected and enquired about what information would be made available to residents during the consultation. In reply, Mr Eaglesham confirmed there would be detailed proposals intended to maximise parking for the residents. He advised members that there would be a number of exhibitions detailing proposals that the public would be invited to. In reply to queries from Councillor Blackman, Mr Eaglesham confirmed that plans could be provided on a road by road basis and that these details would be made available to the Ward Councillors affected.

The Chair then moved the following motions:-

- (i) that if possible more space be provided in the consultation document for comments;
- (ii) that information be provided in the consultation document on parking in shopping areas;
- (iii) that the consultation document include more information on previous parking and traffic management arrangements of the old Wembley Stadium.

These motions were put to the vote and all CARRIED.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the outcome of consultations with Ward and Committee members on the draft consultation document for the event day parking control scheme proposals for Wembley National Stadium, be noted;
- (ii) that officers' responses to comments received on the draft consultation, as summarised in items 8.8 to 8.29 of the report and the revised consultation document before Committee be approved and officers be authorised to proceed with public consultations, subject to additional recommendations (iii), (iv) and (v) below;
- (iii) that, if possible, more space be provided in the consultation document for comments;
- (iv) that information be provided in the consultation document on parking in shopping areas;
- (v) that the consultation document include more information on previous parking and traffic management arrangements of the old Wembley Stadium;
- (vi) that the result of the public consultations be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

In reply to a query from Councillor Van Colle, Mr Eaglesham confirmed that the consultation papers would be issued in the first or second week of July 2004 and the consultation would last for a 6 week period.

10. **Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones**

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 of the Committee in April 2004.

In introducing the report, Mr Eaglesham advised members that there had been majority public support for the parking control schemes. Funding for CPZ schemes in 2004/2005 would come primarily from the revenue raised from existing CPZ schemes. The funding required for 2004/2005 was approximately £290,000. Existing schemes would also be subject to review. He referred members to the updates on the various zones in the report. The statutory consultation in respect of the extension of Zone KS to include Brondesbury Park between Sidmouth Road, Willesden High Road, Alverstone, Mount Pleasant and Hanover Roads was set for completion by August 2004. Informal consultations on the extension of Zone GB were scheduled to take place in September 2004 and the results would be reported to a future meeting of the Highways Committee. With regard to Zone GC, subject to there being no substantive objections, implementation was due for September 2004. Ward Councillors reported in a previous Highways Committee meeting of April 2004 that there had been difficulties in bringing the 'pay and display' machines into operation. Mr Eaglesham advised members that these machines were now in place.

Consultation for extension of Zone KL was scheduled to take place in September 2004. A review was currently underway for the Controlled Parking Zone scheme in Harlesden Gardens after objections had been received. The results of this consultation would be reported to the July meeting of this Committee.

Councillor Sayers, speaking in his capacity as a Ward Councillor, informed members that there were still problems with 'pay and display' machines within the Willesden Green Tube Station area and some machines had been vandalised. He suggested a possible alternative could be to introduce voucher systems available from nearby retail outlets such as newsagents. In reply, the Chair advised Members that discussions were underway regarding adoption of measures to tackle 'pay and display' machine vandalism.

With regard to plans regarding Zones GW and MJ, Mr Eaglesham confirmed that these would be subject to consultation that would identify any change in residents' views from previous consultations.

Councillor Lorber, speaking in his capacity as a Ward Councillor for Sudbury, felt that the CPZ scheme for this area substantive and suggested that the operational hours of 10.00 am to 3.00 pm was not appropriate for all. Some residents had indicated a preference for longer CPZ operational hours and he therefore asked if more than one period of operational hours could be considered for the Sudbury Zone. In reply, Mr Eaglesham

confirmed that the consultation results indicated consistent support for operational hours 10.00 am to 3.00 pm throughout the Sudbury Zone area and that no part of the area had identified support for longer operational hours. Councillor Lorber stated that Sudbury Crescent, which as a result of the consultation was due to have its CPZ operational hours reduced, would result in the return of displacement parking that had been prevented by the existing longer CPZ operational hours. Mr Eaglesham replied that this road would be subject to statutory consultation which would give residents the opportunity to comment on this particular problem. He also advised Councillor Lorber that the possible implications involving of shortening the operational hours in this street would be explained to residents in the statutory consultation.

Councillor J Long enquired about whose responsibility it was to remove parking meters that had been knocked over, thus blocking parts of the pavement. In reply, Mr Malik advised members that once machines had been vandalised they were the responsibility of the Police. Councillor J Long asked that since Melrose Avenue straddled both MW and MJ zones, that residents of this road be given the option to park in one or other of these zones. With regard to Ashford Road, she felt that there was a need for both residents' only parking bays and dual purpose parking bays. Mr Eaglesham acknowledged the comments made by Councillors Sayers, Lorber and J Long.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress on the Controlled Parking Zones programme funded by Transport for London Capital funds (associated with the Mayor's Congestion Charging Scheme for Central London 2003/2004) and the Transportation Service Unit revenue budget be noted;
- (ii) that the amalgamation of CPZ Zone MC with Zone GM, as detailed in item 8.14 of the report, be approved, subject to satisfactory consultation;
- (iii) that the revised programme of CPZ implementation and informal consultation, as detailed in items 8.23 to 8.25 of the report, be approved.

11. Valley Drive Area, Kingsbury – Proposed 'Pilot' Scheme of Short Duration Parking Controls

Members had before them a report detailing the outcome of consultations with Fryent Ward Councillors, the Chair of this Committee and representatives of the Valley Farm Residents' Association (VFRA) on a proposed pilot scheme of short duration parking controls for the Valley Drive area of Kingsbury.

Mr Frank Ashleigh, Chairman of the VFRA, in supporting the scheme, sought reassurance that signage would specifically state that the scheme would be operational in for one hour each day and would not be called a CPZ scheme. As only one parking attendant would be available to enforce the scheme, he suggested that there be two separate hours of enforcement for different parts of the area. He suggested that Valley Drive and one other shorter road be operational during an afternoon hour and the three other roads be operational in a morning hour. He also indicated that the permit fee should be £25.00 per vehicle per year.

In reply, Mr Eaglesham advised Members that there had been discussions between residents and councillors regarding the signage required. Because the scheme identified that certain vehicles could park down a particular street, the signage on the vehicle would have to correlate with that signage of the street in which the vehicle would be permitted to park. He suggested that the scheme need not be called a CPZ scheme. He would advise Mr Ashleigh on the exact details of the wording of the scheme and the parking permit. Councillor Sengupta added that as this was a pilot scheme there would be opportunity for review. Mr Eaglesham advised Members that the statutory consultation would commence at the end of July 2004 and that the scheme could be implemented before the end of the year. The Chair confirmed that the fee for the parking permits would be £25.00 for the first six months.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (ii) that a pilot scheme of parking for the Valley Drive area, as shown in appendix A, and detailed in paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 of the report, be approved;
- (iii) that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Committee following a review of the pilot scheme.

12. **Walking Schemes Programme 2004/2005**

The Committee received a report informing them of the Walking Schemes programme for the financial year 2004 and seeking approval for officers to proceed with all aspects of scheme development, public consultation, statutory consultation and implementation in order to ensure the delivery of the programme within the 2004/05 financial year.

Mr Phillips asked Members to note the comments made in the report and in particular to the schemes on South Way, Wembley Hill Road, Manor Farm Road and East Lane.

Mr Robert Dunwell addressed the Committee, stating that although he had no objection to the scheme in principle, that he had concerns regarding

the fact that the scheme would not need to return to this Committee for any future decision-making, feeling that this would set a too large a precedent. In reply, the Chair stated it was felt that officers could be entrusted to implement the scheme fairly. Councillor Kagan added that there was already a significant amount of delegation to officers in other schemes and therefore this scheme would not set such a precedent.

Councillor Blackman expressed support for the schemes at South Way and Manor Farm Road. He expressed surprise that as Ward Councillor he was not consulted regarding the scheme in East Lane. In reply, Mr Phillips explained that attempt to identify the reasons as to why Councillor Blackman was not consulted about this scheme. With regard to Mr Dunwell's comments, Mr Phillips explained that where a scheme consultation was inconclusive or where major objections were received to a proposal, then a report would go before this Committee

Councillor Lorber expressed surprise that a zebra crossing, as opposed to a pelican crossing, had been proposed for Manor Road, as he had understood that a pelican crossing was the safest option. In reply, Mr Eaglesham stated that both zebra and pelican types of pedestrian crossing schemes were safe, however a pelican crossing was generally appropriate where vehicles were travelling faster or traffic volumes were higher. Mr Phillips added that East Lane vehicles had been identified as travelling at slower than 35 mph and because speeds recorded were higher in Manor Road, a raised zebra platform had been proposed.

Mr Malik advised members that Brent had a lower accident rate than any other London borough. The schemes for Manor Road and East Lane could be reviewed if necessary.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the programme of walking schemes detailed in the report and the scheme development work undertaken so far be noted;
- (ii) that the public consultation strategy to be adopted for the schemes in the programme as detailed in the report be noted;
- (iii) that it be agreed to implement the schemes detailed in the report subject to any necessary statutory consultation;
- (iv) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with any necessary statutory consultation, to consider any objections or representations and either to refer objections or comments back to this Committee where he thinks appropriate or to implement the order if there are no objections or representations, or he considers the objections or representations are groundless or insignificant.

13 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place on Tuesday, 27th July, 2004.

14. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm.

L JONES
CHAIR