

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
Thursday, 27th January 2005 at 7.00 pm

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

Councillors Farrell, Gladbaum, J Long and Lorber also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Beswick asked whether as a resident within Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) HS mentioned in the report in item 5 on the agenda, he should declare a personal interest. The Legal Adviser confirmed that this did not constitute a personal interest, so Councillor Beswick took part in discussion and voted on this item.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 7th December 2004

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of meeting of the Highways Committee held on 7th December 2004 be received and approved as an accurate record.

3. Matters Arising

None

4. Deputations

None

5. Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme

The Committee received a report informing them of the progress with the programme of implementation of CPZs in Brent since the report to the last meeting of the Committee in December 2004. The report also addressed a petition from residents of ST Zone, Sudbury who were opposed to the changes to the operational times of the scheme. Satnam Sahota (Acting Head of Traffic Management) advised Members that the petitioners had wished the operational hours to be retained, however he recommended that the petition be overruled and that authorisation be given to proceed with for the making of a traffic order to introduce reduced operational times.

Councillor Lorber, speaking as Ward Councillor with regard to the area affected by the ST zone petition, asked if there was any possibility of accommodating the petitioners. Noting that many of the petitioners were from Elton Road, he commented that these residents had experienced problems caused by vehicles of the clients from a nearby car stereo fitting business being parked down this road and causing blockages . He asked

if separate CPZ operational hours from the rest of the ST zone could be arranged for this road.

During discussion of this issue, Councillor Fox commented that different operational times for 1 CPZ scheme zone could lead to confusion. Councillor Beswick suggested that all the roads included in the petition could be amalgamated to create a new zone. Mr Sahota agreed with Councillor Fox's comments concerning different operational times and advised Members that a re-consultation of the whole ST zone could be undertaken.

The Chair moved an amendment to recommendation (ii) that any decision on the operational times for the roads included in the petition be deferred, pending further consideration. This was put to the vote and declared carried.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress on the Controlled Parking Zones be noted; and
- (ii) that the petition received from the residents of part of the ST Zone opposing the changes of the operational times of the ST Zone be noted and that any decision be deferred, pending further consideration of the operational times in the petitioners' roads.

6. **Local Cycle Network+ A5 Corridor**

Members had before them a report detailing progress made on the Local Cycle Network (LCN)+ A5 cycle route. The report sought approval for officers to proceed with all aspects of scheme development, public consultation, statutory consultation and implementation to ensure the delivery of the project.

Phil Rankmore (Director of Transportation) advised Members that all routes had been extensively consulted upon and that although the proposed Western Alternative route was longer, it involved less traffic and cycling groups had indicated their support for this route. He added that the Western Alternative route was a low cost scheme as expenditure was only necessary for signage.

In reply to a query from Councillor Fox, Mr Rankmore advised Members that due consideration would be given to signs and markings to ensure pedestrian safety in the Gladstone Park area of the Western Alternative route.

Councillor Beswick felt that the scheme had taken worthy consideration of cyclists.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the development work that had been undertaken on the LCN+ A5 corridor be noted and officers be instructed to proceed with the work necessary to implement cycle facilities on the LCN+ A5 corridor;
- (ii) that officers be instructed to seek approval from Transport for London (TfL) to include the Western Alternative in the Borough's Local Cycle Network;
- (iii) that the public consultation strategy be adopted for the individual schemes that form the programme be noted; and
- (iv) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with any necessary consultation, public/statutory, and to consider any objections or representation 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.

7. **Furness Road – Streets for People Scheme**

The Committee received a report detailing the results of consultations carried out in December 2004 on the proposed Furness Road area "Streets for People" scheme, which sought approval to proceed with the scheme as detailed in paragraph 3.2 of the report.

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the details of the scheme and the recommendation to not proceed with additional proposals at the Leghorn Road junction with Furness Road as set out in the report.

Councillor Gladbaum, speaking as Ward Councillor for the area affected by these proposals, stated that there had been significant resident opposition to additional proposals for Leghorn Road junction and Furness Road. However, she welcomed the recommendation not to proceed with these additional proposals. She expressed concerns about the low consultation response for this scheme and suggested that attempts should be made to generate more interest from residents to the consultation documents.

Councillor Fox commented that the consultation response rate for the proposals was relatively high compared to other consultations and suggested that consultations tended to receive higher returns where there were opposition to schemes. The Chair advised Councillor Gladbaum that efforts were being made to ensure that the consultation documents received greater attention from residents.

Mr Rankmore advised Members that the planning database was used to obtain the addresses that the consultation papers were sent to. He stated that mail may occasionally have been returned by Royal Mail where the database had not been updated and that otherwise it was assumed that the consultation papers had been delivered to residents. He added that alternative solutions were being investigated regarding the Leghorn Road junction with Furness Road.

In reply to a query from the Chair, Mr Sahota confirmed that public notices of the proposals had been displayed.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the scheme development work undertaken to date by officers be noted;
- (ii) that the results of the public consultation undertaken in December 2004 with local residents of the Furness Road area be noted, and the elements of the scheme as detailed in item 3.2 of the report be approved; and
- (iii) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with any necessary statutory consultations, to consider any objections or representations and either to refer these back to this Committee or to implement the orders for the proposed scheme if there are no objections or representations or he considers these to be groundless or insignificant.

8. **London Bus Priority Network (LBPN) Progress Report**

The Committee received a report informing them of the progress of the LBPN programme for 2004/05 and seeking approval for officers to proceed with the implementation of the schemes detailed in the report.

Mr Sahota drew Members' attention to the schemes proposed as outlined in the report. He advised Members that consultation had been carried out in October 2004 and the results had concluded that schemes 11a and 11b involving bus route number 182 had not received the support of Watford Road residents, although the Police had indicated their approval. He therefore recommended that schemes 11a and 11b be deferred subject to further consultation with residents and Ward Councillors.

Mr Keith Belgrave, speaking on behalf of residents of Watford Road, confirmed that a petition had been submitted to Transportation Unit against the schemes 11a and 11b proposals. He circulated copies of a document to Members that highlighted the petitioners' concerns. He suggested that the proposed bus lane for bus route number 182 would not ease traffic congestion because the problem was caused by a pelican crossing and width restriction in the section of Watford Road just north of Sudbury and

Harrow Road Station. He drew Members' attention to a photograph in the circulated document showing bus route number 18 buses parked in a bus lane in a different section of the road, suggesting that the buses for route number 182 would use the proposed bus lane for the same purpose. He requested that the schemes 11a and 11b be deferred and that a site visit be undertaken with residents and councillors.

Councillor Lorber, speaking as Ward Councillor for Sudbury, echoed Mr Belgrave's concerns regarding route number 18 buses parking in bus lanes and the narrowing of the road by the pelican crossing contributing to traffic congestion. He stated that buses often blocked Harrow Road and contributed to large tailbacks and that this also happened in the westbound side of the road. In his view, the consultation undertaken was inadequate, stating that some residents had only very recently heard that this item was being considered at this meeting. He felt that schemes 11a and 11b as originally proposed would still not prevent buses coming to a halt along Watford Road, thus the schemes' objectives would not be met. He also requested that a site visit with local residents be arranged.

In reply to the comments made by Mr Belgrave and Councillor Lorber, Mr Sahota advised Members that schemes 11a and 11b had originally been proposed after a series of bus route tests and discussions with bus drivers. However, because of the concerns raised by the petitioners, he recommended that any decision on these schemes be deferred for further discussion with Ward Councillors and the local residents' association.

Members indicated their agreement with the issues raised by Mr Belgrave and Councillor Lorber and the Chair added that these comments would be taken into consideration during any future discussions on this issue.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress reported by officers on the LBPN programme be noted;
- (ii) that the outcome of informal public consultation on schemes on Bus Routes 182, 52 and 266 be noted and the following schemes be approved for implementation, as detailed in the report:

Route 182	Schemes 13, 15 & 16 (as amended in item 3.12)
Route 52:	Scheme 2
Route 266	Scheme 12

- (iii) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with the necessary statutory consultations in respect of the above schemes, to consider any objections or representations and either refer these back to this Committee or implement the orders if there are no

objections or representations or be considers these to be groundless or insignificant; and

- (iv) that the objections to schemes 11a & 11b, on Route 182 be noted and a decision on these schemes be deferred pending further discussions with Ward Councillors and the local residents' association.

Councillor R S Patel did not vote on any of these recommendations as he was not present for the entire duration of consideration of this item.

9. **Section 106 Schemes 2004/2005**

The Committee received a report detailing proposed road safety measures in Harlesden Road, Doyle Gardens, Townsend Lane and Harrow Road to be funded from developer contributions (Planning Section 106 Agreements) to be progressed in the 2005/06 financial year. Malcolm Keen (Transportation Unit Officer) drew Members' attention to the various schemes as set out in the report.

Councillor Farrell, speaking as a Ward Member for an area affected by some of the proposals, praised the schemes proposed for Townsend Lane as she felt that traffic calming measures were a priority in this area and requested that this issue continue to be addressed in any future proposals. She expressed her wish that the width restriction measures for Townsend Lane be implemented shortly. She also felt that the implementation of waiting restrictions for sections of Townsend Lane and Wood Lane should be made a priority.

The Chair advised Councillor Farrell that because of the distribution of funding, that the implementation of traffic calming measures was phased at various stages and therefore some schemes, such as the width restriction measures, would likely to be implemented at a later stage. Mr Keen confirmed that the waiting restrictions measures mentioned by Councillor Farrell were at the first stage of implementation and would shortly be undertaken. In answer to queries from Members, Mr Sahota confirmed that the phasing of the proposed width restrictions for Townsend Lane would undergo further consideration before clarification on this measure would be made.

Members agreed an amendment to recommendation (ii) to read "phased implementation."

- (i) that the programme of schemes detailed in the report and the scheme development work undertaken so far be noted;
- (ii) that officers be authorised to proceed with the detailed design, consultation and phased implementation of the schemes detailed at Item 3 subject to satisfactory consultation;

- (iii) that the public consultation strategy to be adopted for the schemes in the programme as detailed in the report be approved; and
- (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 back to this committee where he thinks appropriate or to implement the order if there are no objections, or he considers the objections or representations are groundless or insignificant.

10. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Highways Committee would take place on Tuesday, 22nd March 2005.

11. Any Other Urgent Business

None

The meeting ended at 7.55 pm

L JONES
Chair