

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
Thursday, 28th October 2004 at 7.00 pm

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

Councillors Dromey, Fiegel, B M Patel, H B Patel and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

1. **Declarations of Interest**

None declared

2. **Deputations**

None

3. **Petitions**

(a) ***The Barn Hill Residents' Association© Parking Restriction Petition***

The Committee received a petition from Barn Hill Residents' Association© requesting, as detailed in the petition, the introduction of four key elements to Wembley Event Day parking controls designed specifically for the Barn Hill Estate.

Mr Simon Alexander, Chair of the Association, representing the petitioners, described the Barn Hill area as a conservation area of distinctive character. He stated that the traffic barrier used during Event Days for the previous Wembley Stadium had been effective. He explained that his Residents' Association had sought advice from a consultant who had advised that road markings for parking controls were not obligatory. Mr Alexander therefore supported the recommendations not to include road markings for the Barn Hill area because of its' conservation status, adding that the introduction of marked parking bays would have led to undesirable effects such as blocking driveways or residents paving over their front gardens to provide extra parking space. He felt that the recommendations were a positive answer to the issue of Event Day parking and he stated that his Association looked forward to consulting with Brent Council and the Emergency Services regarding future measures.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

(b) ***Barn Hill Residents' Association (represented by the new committee, elected 11th July 2004) Wembley Stadium Parking Petition for Barn Hill Area***

The Committee received a petition from Barn Hill Residents' Association (represented by the new committee elected 11th July 2004) requiring Brent Council to agree to a specific parking scheme and other controls in the Barn Hill area as detailed in the petition to cater for Event Day parking at the new Wembley National Stadium.

Mr Robert Dunwell, speaking on behalf of the petitioners and as the Chairman of the above Association and for the Queensbury Area Group of Associations stated that he welcomed the proposals for no street markings in the Barn Hill area that had been requested by his Association in a series of petitions and letters since 1996. He expressed support for Transportation Unit's decision to alter the recommendations to include the entire Barn Hill area for no road markings. He suggested that the consultation results were based on a misleading questionnaire that was sent to residents and traders. He therefore requested that the entire contents of the petition be noted and that there be a re-consultation of the Wembley National Stadium Event Day Parking Controls using a new method agreed with his Association. He also commented that the meeting should have been better publicised considering the importance of the agenda and that the entire wording of his petition should have been included in the report.

In reply to Mr Dunwell's comments, Phil Rankmore (Director of Transportation) confirmed that the whole of Barn Hill area was subject to the same recommendations.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

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

Members had before them a report informing them of the outcome of the public consultation which was carried out during July/August 2004 for the proposed Wembley National Stadium event day parking controls, and seeking approval to proceed with the statutory consultation on event day parking schemes in the agreed areas, and to implement schemes in readiness for the first events at the Stadium.

Irfan Malik (Assistant Director of Environment) gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Wembley National Stadium Event Day Parking Controls, including details of the consultation undertaken.

Mr Stephen Petzky objected to the proposed scheme on the grounds that any Parking Control scheme infringed on liberties and burdened residents with unnecessary costs. He queried whether there were any guarantees that the proposed charges would remain static and stated his opposition to the possibility of any additional charges being introduced in the future.

Ms Karen Froom introduced herself as a resident of the Preston area and stated that although she welcomed the new Wembley National Stadium, she expressed regret that funding was being used to introduce parking controls despite resident opposition. She felt that the consultation document was misleading and that many residents she had approached were either against any parking control scheme or had not received the questionnaire.

Dr Jerome Cohen of the Wembley Stadium Residents' Advisory Committee stated that he had anticipated that the traffic barrier system that existed during the stadium's previous use would be reintroduced. He expressed his opposition to any Parking Permit scheme and to any road markings, fearing that such a scheme would encourage residents to pave over their front gardens in order to provide parking space. He foresaw problems for Wembley Synagogue visitors if a parking permit scheme was introduced. He also felt that the meeting would have benefited from better publicity and asked that Event Day parking be re-considered because of inadequate consultation.

Mr John Woods stated his support for the recommendations in the report and stressed that the scheme as proposed would benefit all residents of Barn Hill.

Mr Campbell informed the Committee that he was a resident of North Tokyngton. He challenged the view that traffic barriers were seen as becoming increasingly ineffective, stating that this opinion was not shared by his Residents' Association. In stating his preference for a traffic barrier scheme, he stated that if this was not possible that any parking control scheme be implemented with the minimum necessary signage.

Councillor Van Colle, speaking as a member for one of the wards affected by the proposals, enquired if the consultation had been carried out in full knowledge of all the traffic acts. He suggested that residents were happy with the previous parking arrangements on Event Days prior to the closure of the old Wembley Stadium. He felt that the consultation had caused confusion amongst residents and he expressed reservations about implementing a scheme that had yielded a comparatively small percentage of responses to the questionnaire. He supported the recommendations to include the whole of Barn Hill area and suggested that the other areas consulted should benefit from similar proposals. He felt that residents were unhappy that the parking permit scheme proposed would involve charges considering there were none under the previous scheme and he enquired as to why there were 37 as opposed to 30 annual Event Days proposed.

Councillor H B Patel, speaking as a member of one of the wards affected, similarly queried the number of Event Days. With regard to the additional parking permit charge of £10, he enquired about the possibility of this fee being raised in the future. He also raised the issue of traffic barriers being of potential hindrance to the Emergency Services. He enquired if visitor permits would be required on Wembley National Stadium Event Days for those attending short duration, locally organised events. He felt that the proposals represented an unfair anti-car policy, suggesting that Event Day visitors travelling from some distance would prefer arriving by car. He concluded by stating that he felt the consultation was flawed in being unable to obtain the views of the silent majority.

Councillor Fiegel, speaking as a member of one of the wards affected, suggested that the traffic barriers could be managed by community wardens which would have the added advantage of there being no cost involved. He also sought clarification regarding the status of Area 31 in the report which included parts of Northwick Park and Sudbury Court.

Councillor B M Patel, speaking as a member of one of the wards affected, enquired if a traffic barrier scheme was proposed for the Tokyngton area.

During the representations made, the Chair reminded those present that it was a legal requirement that Event Day Parking Controls be put in place and that the proposed Event Day Parking Control Scheme was not a CPZ scheme.

In answer to the queries raised, Mr Rankmore advised Members that the protective parking proposed was designed to have minimum impact on the area, with measures such as reducing the width of white lines and minimum signage being undertaken to ensure this. He stated that the intention was to provide the minimum signage required to effectively enforce the parking controls, although it was important that the enforcement factor was considered especially in areas closer to Wembley National Stadium. In response to Dr Cohen's query, Mr Rankmore highlighted a correction to the report that Preston (Area 9) had also indicated support for the use of traffic barriers. He advised that the parking requirements of Wembley Synagogue were addressed in the report. He also advised the Committee that 3 other conservation areas were being considered for proposals similar to that of Barn Hill, such as relaxation of road markings.

Mr Malik confirmed that the consultation had taken due consideration of all traffic acts and that all statutory authorities such as the Emergency Services had been consulted. Mr Rankmore added that both previous and more recent traffic acts, including one which had given local authorities extra powers, had been taken into account.

With regard to traffic barriers, Mr Rankmore advised the Committee that under the previous scheme that they represented points of closure of roads, were supported by a Traffic Management Order and could be enforced by the Police. However, in the final years of the previous scheme, the Police were no longer able to act as enforcers and there had been a corresponding rise in illegal parking in these areas. It was for this reason that it was considered that traffic barriers' effectiveness was weakening although this could be offset by a permit scheme also being introduced where traffic barriers were operated. He confirmed that traffic barriers were proposed in the Tokyngton area and that damaged ones that had been damaged or missing would be replaced. The Chair added that a traffic barrier scheme could not be functional without being supported by a permit scheme.

Mr Rankmore confirmed that 37 annual events requiring Wembley Event Day Parking Controls were anticipated and that a partnership approach would be undertaken with event organisers for arrangements on these days. He also confirmed that Area 31 in the report would not be included in the Wembley Event Day Parking Control Scheme as residents had indicated not to be included in the consultation. He added that areas outside the proposed scheme would be consulted in later years.

In reply to queries concerning parking permit fees, the Chair confirmed that the first permit per dwelling was free and that subsequent permits would be charged at £10 each and would not be subject to any increase.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the results of the public consultation be noted and it be resolved to proceed with the event day permit parking control schemes for Wembley National Stadium in all consultation areas other than that identified at (iii) below;
- (ii) that the preference expressed by residents in the consultation be acknowledged and the formation of a single residents' protective parking zone, rather than an inner and outer zone, as set out in paragraph 8.14 of the report, be agreed;
- (iii) that it be agreed to exclude the area of Carlton Avenue West from the event day protective parking zone, as it is on the periphery of the consultation area, outside the 30 minute walk area and the majority of the residents are not in favour of a protective parking scheme;
- (iv) that the results of the consultation on the former "barrier" event day schemes be noted and it be agreed officers review the previous schemes, within the current time frames, in order to mitigate the concerns expressed by the Police, Fire Brigade and Ambulance Services;

- (v) that subject to the review, the proposals for barrier schemes as set out in paragraph 8.15 of the report be agreed;
- (vi) that the proposals for the existing controlled parking zones, the unrestricted areas and the conservation and unrestricted areas as set out in paragraphs 8.16, 8.17 and 8.18 of the report be agreed;
- (vii) that officers be instructed to monitor and review all the areas in the event day protective permit parking scheme and to report on their findings 12 months after the scheme is implemented as part of the review;
- (viii) that comments received from the, Fire Brigade, Ambulance services and the Metropolitan Police as summarised in paragraph 8.19 and detailed at Appendix C of the report, be noted;
- (ix) 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.
- (x) that the elements of the proposed event day permit parking control scheme as described in paragraph 8.3 of the report be approved; and
- (xi) that the discussions and comments made by other stakeholders and with the focus groups as in appendix D & E of the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 8.10 pm

L JONES
Chair

Mins200405/Exec/highways/hways28oj