

**MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, 12<sup>th</sup> October 2006 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor D Brown (Chair), Councillor V Brown (Vice Chair) and Councillors Colwill, O'Sullivan (alternate for Van Colle) and Wharton.

Apologies for absence were received Councillor Van Colle.

Councillors Blackman, Butt, Dunwell, Jones, Mendoza, Mistry, H M Patel and Shah 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 2006/2007. Councillor D Brown was proposed and seconded. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED:-

that Councillor D Brown be elected Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2006/2007.

Nominations were invited for the position of Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2006/2007. Councillor V Brown was proposed and seconded. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED:-

that Councillor V Brown be elected Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2006/2007.

**2. Declarations of Interest**

None

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting of the Highways Committee held on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2006 be received and approved as an accurate record.

**4. Matters Arising**

***London Road***

Richard Pearson (Director of Transportation Unit) advised Members that there were insufficient funds to introduce a one way system and traffic calming measures for London Road during this financial year. In addition, Members heard that because of the developments taking place at the St Modwen's site and Copland School, the removal of parking bays necessary

to introduce such a scheme would exacerbate the already limited parking available, whilst a one way system would obstruct traffic, particularly as large vehicles were using the road. He advised Members that the possibility of introducing such a scheme should be reviewed after St Modwen's development was complete, although he added that any reduction in parking bays may be met with opposition from local traders. Members also heard that British Gas had not completed works within the agreed deadline on London Road, despite already being granted 1 extension to the deadline and were being duly penalised £2,000 for each additional day where works took place beyond the extended deadline.

In reply to a query from the Chair, Phil Rankmore (Transportation Unit) confirmed that construction works would not commence at Copland School until the applicant had built an access road to accommodate the lorries and he stressed that consultation on a one way system should not be contemplated until after all construction was complete.

### ***Preston Road***

In reply to a query from Councillor Blackman, Irfan Malik (Assistant Director, Environment and Culture) stated that the free 1 hour parking scheme for Preston Road would not to be introduced at this time because a review of parking schemes in Brent was shortly to take place. Councillor Blackman responded that the free parking scheme had been agreed by the Committee at its' last meeting in March 2006, with a view to the scheme being in place by November 2006. He expressed his dissatisfaction that the scheme would not be introduced despite the decision of the Highways Committee and also that fellow Ward Councillors and petition representatives had not been informed that the scheme would not be implemented.

Councillor Dunwell, the organiser of a petition requesting free parking in Preston Road, stated that he had requested that this scheme simultaneously undergo a consultation with local residents and traders with another scheme to relocate bus stops in the road, and he had understood that such a consultation would take place shortly. He also expressed dissatisfaction that the free parking scheme would not now be introduced despite approval from the Committee and the support of local traders and residents and he sought further explanation as to the reasons for this. He added that free parking schemes already existed elsewhere in Brent, citing schemes in operation on the top half of Preston Road and near Wembley Park tube station. Councillor Dunwell acknowledged the reasons for reviewing parking in Brent, however he stressed that the scheme would not affect the overall parking strategy as it was specifically designed to benefit local traders and their customers and he urged officers to re-consider.

Councillor H B Patel supported the comments made by Councillors Blackman and Dunwell and enquired whether a new schedule for the free parking scheme could be confirmed.

In reply to the issues raised, Irfan Malik apologised to Ward Councillors and petition representatives for information not being provided to them on the latest developments concerning the free parking scheme in Preston Road and he acknowledged the Committee's decision to approve the scheme at its meeting in March 2006. However, he advised Members that he wished to avoid the possibility of the scheme being overridden because of the review, which would then necessitate a re-consultation of the scheme. He explained that it was preferable to implement such a scheme as part of the wider parking strategy once the review had been completed. However, Irfan Malik stated that he would be happy to meet with Ward Councillors and petition representatives to consider this issue and if there was still a wish for such a scheme after these discussions then it may be implemented.

### ***Clarendon Gardens and Manor Drive***

Councillor Blackman sought clarification as to when the Clarendon Gardens and Manor Drive traffic management and road safety scheme would be implemented. In addition, Councillor Mendoza stated that he understood the scheme would be in place by 15<sup>th</sup> November 2006 and he sought confirmation of this.

In reply, Richard Pearson confirmed that the scheme would be implemented before the end of the financial year 2006/2007 and he would contact Members to confirm the anticipated date of completion.

#### **5. Deputations**

None

#### **6. Petitions**

The Committee noted that the following petitions had been received containing in excess of 50 signatures.

##### **(a) Chamberlayne Avenue/Edison Drive Petition**

This petition, submitted by Councillor Mendoza on behalf of residents of Chamberlayne Avenue and Edison Drive, requested the following:-

“To re-instate the fence between Chamberlayne Avenue and Bellway Estate to stop drug dealing, criminal damage to properties and cars and the anti-social behaviour.”

Katri Wilson stated that the petition represented the views of some 202 residents who lived in Chamberlayne Avenue and she explained that anti-social and criminal behaviour had begun 3 years ago after an alleyway connecting it to a new estate in East Lane was opened.

Since the submission of an earlier petition in 2004, the problems experienced had worsened, and Ms Wilson highlighted a number of incidents including burglaries, graffiti, cars being broken into, drug-dealing, speeding mopeds and vandalism. Although the Safer Neighbourhood Team had been alerted to these problems, Ms Wilson asserted that both the police and an independently commissioned Security Risk Assessment had indicated that the alleyway be closed, and she added that introducing kissing gates as suggested by the Transportation Unit would not be a sufficient measure in the long term.

In reply to queries from officers and Councillors, Ms Wilson confirmed that bicycles and motorbikes had been witnessed using the alleyway, although measures to prevent access to such vehicles would not be sufficient due to the incidences of anti-social behaviour and crime that were also occurring.

Decisions relating to this petition were agreed under the Petition from Residents of Chamberlayne Avenue/Edison Drive report.

(b) **Against Wembley Stadium Protective Parking Scheme**

This petition from residents of Dollis Hill Lane stated the following:-

“Petition to Brent Council, Transportation Service Unit not to implement parking in Dollis Hill Lane NW2 under Wembley Stadium Protective Parking as the local residents have already voted no to any parking scheme.”

Members noted that this petition had been received.

Decisions relating to this petition were agreed under the Wembley Event Day Stadium Parking Controls report.

(c) **Request for whole of Swinderby Road to be included in Wembley Central Controlled Parking Zone Scheme**

The petition requested that:

This petition stated the following:-

“As local residents we want to end the CPZ confusion in Swinderby Road. The whole road should be in the same zone and we call on Brent Council to ensure that the whole of Swinderby Road be in the Wembley Central Zone (Monday to Saturday until 6.30pm).”

Councillor Shah, representing the petitioners, stated that 2 separate CPZ schemes currently operated in Swinderby Road, one which was in operation until 9pm, the other until 6.30pm. Residents had

informed him that the 2 schemes had frequently caused confusion and residents had requested that the road come under 1 uniform CPZ scheme with operational times until 6.30pm.

In reply, Hossein Amir-Hosseini (Transportation Unit) advised Members that officers were recommending that informal consultation be undertaken in Swinderby Road with a view to introducing CPZ Zone C to the entire road.

The Chair requested that Ward Councillors also be consulted.

Decisions relating to this petition were agreed under the Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme report.

#### **7. Petition from Residents of Chamberlayne Avenue/Edison Drive**

Phil Rankmore introduced a report responding to a petition received from some residents of Chamberlayne Avenue / Edison Drive regarding the footpath/cyclepath link between Chamberlayne Avenue / Edison Drive and Hirst Crescent. He confirmed that the alleyway was a public highway and that since the petition had been submitted, a user count survey had been conducted during morning and afternoon peak times that had indicated that most users were coming from the direction of Chamberlayne Avenue. However, he acknowledged the need to conduct surveys during evening and night time when there was an increased likelihood of anti-social and criminal activities as had been reported by the petitioners. He advised Members that the footway was opened in order to provide a link to 2 nearby stations. Measures under consideration included introducing a barrier to minimise motorcycle use, or a 'kissing gate' although this could be an inconvenience to pram users. In respect of stopping up the alleyway, Phil Rankmore advised Members that under the Highways Act 1980, Section 118, this would need to be justified in terms of a more suitable alternative route being identified, or it be demonstrated that the alleyway was being insufficiently used. There was therefore little prospect of closing the alleyway through these means. He warned that a proposed stopping up was also likely to be met with opposition from organisations such as the Ramblers Association. He commented that there was a small possibility of closing the alleyway under the Planning Authority's regeneration and development objectives.

In reply to queries from Members, Phil Rankmore clarified that any proposals to stop up public highways could receive objections which would then be referred to the Secretary of State who would order an inquiry.

Councillor Mendoza suggested that the alleyway could be closed up on grounds of public safety as suggested by the police, adding that public safety was also an issue concerning regeneration and therefore all avenues should be explored as to the possibility of closing it under planning considerations. He acknowledged that there could be objections

to the alleyway's closure but felt that the issue needed to be urgently addressed because of the adverse effects on Chamberlayne Avenue residents.

Councillor Blackman stated that the alleyway had long been acknowledged as a problem area by residents and that this was affirmed by the attention the alleyway required from the Safer Neighbourhood Team. He stressed the need to find a solution to this problem and requested that all avenues be looked at into how the footway could be closed and that a report be brought before the Committee in respect of this at its next meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006.

Councillor H M Patel stated that as there was clear opposition to the alleyway from residents, the police and Ward Councillors, that the alleyway could be closed on the grounds that its continued use failed to ensure the safety of all its users as an obligation required under the Highways Authority.

Responding from queries from Members with regard to the possibility of stopping up the alleyway, the Legal Adviser informed the Committee that this could only be exercised under planning powers in the event of a development being built on site and that there were no general powers for its closure. With regard to a suggestion from a Member to a temporary stopping up to investigate if this led to a reduction in crime, the Legal Adviser confirmed that this could only be done to accommodate a special event taking place.

In response to some of the issues raised, Irfan Malik advised Members that he had introduced an Anti-Social Behaviour Team in the area in response to a letter from Councillor Blackman highlighting residents' concerns. Members noted that the Council was working with the police in tackling the problems being experienced in the area and Irfan Malik confirmed that he had received a letter from the Chief Inspector stating that they were not advising closure of the alleyway. He added that other measures to tackle crime and disorder could include improving lighting to the alleyway and introducing bollards. He suggested that officers could investigate the legal possibilities of closing up the alleyway and report back the findings to the next meeting of the Committee, although he reminded Members of the difficulties in pursuing this option. In reply to a query from Councillor Blackman, Irfan Malik confirmed that residents and the Safer Neighbourhood Team would be consulted regarding anti-social and criminal activities in the next report and it was intended to include crime statistics.

Richard Pearson acknowledged the concerns that had been raised and suggested that there could be additional recommendations that all legal avenues be explored to investigate the possibility of the alleyway being closed up.

During debate, Councillor Wharton moved that recommendation (iv) in the report be amended so that a report be considered at the next meeting to additionally include information on crime and anti-social related issues and an investigation into the legal possibilities of stopping up the footpath/cycle path link between Chamberlayne Avenue, Edison Drive and Hirst Crescent. This motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the concerns raised by the petitioners be noted;
- (ii) that the response provided by the Director of Transportation Service Unit be noted;
- (iii) that it be agreed that a user count and consultation be carried out;
- (iv) that a report be brought to the next meeting of the Committee detailing the results of the consultation, and the report also include information on crime and anti-social related issues and an investigation into the legal possibilities of stopping up the footpath/cycle path link between Chamberlayne Avenue, Edison Drive and Hirst Crescent; and
- (v) that the petitioners be advised of the Committee's decision.

**8. Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Controls**

Hossein Amir-Hosseini updated Members on progress with the implementation of the Wembley Stadium Protective Parking Scheme (PPS) and informed them of the receipt of a petition from residents of Dollis Hill Lane objecting to the implementation of the scheme, and of requests received from the Metropolitan Police Service and Royal Mail for Event Day permits.

Councillor Dunwell referred to a petition that had been submitted at the Highways Committee meeting in October 2005 requesting that the Event Day Parking Scheme in the Toley Avenue area be signage only with no marked parking bays and other street markings, stating that the issues raised by the petition remained unsolved. He stated that the Toley Avenue area was adjacent and similar in character to another area, Barnhill, where there were no marked parking bays and therefore it was appropriate that a similar scheme be in place for the Toley Avenue area. Where parking bays had been marked, he suggested that suitable Traffic Management Orders be issued so that the use of parking bays was not enforceable. Councillor Dunwell stressed that residents had been against the use of parking bays since the initial consultation on the PPS in 1999 and he felt that not all the relevant information had been taken into account when decisions on the scheme were being taken. In reply to a query from Members, Councillor Dunwell stated that although the petition was addressing Area 27 as

referred to in the report, its' suggestions could be applied to the whole PPS area.

Councillor Blackman stated that although significant amendments to the PPS would be impractical at this stage, there were a number of alterations which he felt were worth considering. Of particular concern was that parking bays may reduce the parking capacity to insufficient levels and he reiterated Councillor Dunwell's suggestion that Traffic Management Orders be amended so that the use of parking bays or parking across driveways would not be enforceable to PPS permit holders. As a comparison, Councillor Blackman stated that a no road marking scheme was operating successfully in the City of Manchester Stadium Area Event Day parking scheme. He commented that the use of visitor permits being restricted to the road in which it was issued could also be problematic and needed to be addressed. Another issue he felt needed to be reconsidered was the administration charge incurred by drivers who had changed vehicles, even though Wembley Stadium was yet to open. Other considerations included whether it was appropriate that the PPS be in operation for the entire area for all events and the need to ensure signage was clear. Councillor Blackman stressed the importance that the PPS provided enough parking space for residents and visitors and yet still afforded the protection they required.

Councillor Jones commented that she understood that vehicles parking across driveways would only be towed away if enforcement action had been requested.

In reply to the issues raised, Richard Pearson advised Members that the PPS was in an advanced stage of implementation and that many of the markings and signage had already been completed. Members noted that areas with no parking bays were conservation areas and that parking bays were effective in preventing vehicles parking too close to corners and junctions and in helping a safer environment for both drivers and pedestrians. In addition, Richard Pearson stated that residents were often in favour of parking bays during CPZ consultations. He stressed the importance that visitors were aware that they were in a PPS area and marked bays and other road markings would help ensure this. With regard to re-issuing of permits, he advised Members that permits could be extended to be valid for a year from the date of the first event and that the possibility of re-issuing without an administrative charge could be considered. Richard Pearson stated that the suggestions made by Councillors Blackman and Dunwell could be revisited when the PPS was reviewed.

Irfan Malik reiterated that the issues raised could be looked at during the PPS review and suggested that the outer areas within the scheme could be looked at earlier if appropriate. He advised Members that the permit validity could be amended to commence from the date of the first event and that administration charges could also be waived.



During discussion, Members enquired on the number of people consulted on the PPS. Another Member expressed concern that allocating Event Day permits to service providers may affect residents who lived near places such as police stations and Royal Mail offices.

In reply, Phil Rankmore advised Members that approximately 40,000 people in a 1 ½ mile radius of the Stadium had been consulted. One of the areas consulted, Sudbury, had not expressed support for the PPS and therefore was not included in the scheme, whilst all areas included in the PPS had indicated support for parking protection. Members noted that Section 106 Agreement funds would be used to undertake the PPS review after a season of events. Phil Rankmore stated that there would be some flexibility in light of the review's findings, such as the possibility of some areas withdrawing from the PPS and new areas being included. Phil Rankmore advised Members that permits would be issued to service providers after a balanced consideration of their need and the impact on the area. He cited an example concerning police who staffed night events where public transport may not be an option after their shift had finished. Members noted that Wembley Police Station had only requested 30 such permits. Phil Rankmore added that Royal Mail employees would not have such an impact as their shifts were likely to finish well in advance of an event taking place.

The Chair stressed the importance that event day permits for service providers be given sufficient time to be considered and Members agreed to his suggestion that recommendation (iii) be amended so that this issue be reported back to a future meeting of the Committee. Members also agreed to the Chair's suggestion that officers consider points raised by Members and non-Members of the Committee during the PPS review.

#### RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress made on the implementation of the scheme in terms of signage and carriageway marking, as detailed at Items 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 of this report, be noted;
- (ii) that the petition received from residents of Dollis Hill Lane objecting to the scheme be noted but it be agreed to proceed with the officers' suggested course of action in response to the petition as detailed at Item 3.5;
- (iii) that officers be instructed to investigate further the option of allocating Event Day permits to service providers, such as the emergency services and Royal Mail, to establish the criteria and guidelines for permit issue and to report these at a future meeting of this Committee for consideration and approval; and

- (iv) that officers consider the other points raised by Members and Non-Members of the Committee when the scheme is reviewed

## 9. **Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme**

Hossein Amir-Hosseini introduced a report updating Members on progress with the Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) implementation programme in Brent since the report to the last meeting in March 2006, and sought Members' approval for the programme of schemes for the 2006/07 financial year. He advised Members that because the Oman Avenue consultation had resulted in an equal number of residents both for and against its inclusion in CPZ Zone GA, the Committee should decide whether to proceed with its inclusion or re-consult with residents. Members noted a correction to recommendation (v) in the report that a re-consultation was recommended for Northview Crescent only.

Carol Nickles queried why 89 questionnaires had been delivered during the CPZ Zone HW extension consultation carried out in Doyle Gardens when the street contained approximately 190 houses. She requested that each dwelling in Doyle Gardens be re-consulted, commenting that whilst some residents had doubts about being included in CPZ Zone HW, concern had been expressed regarding the street experiencing displacement parking due to nearby streets recent inclusion into a CPZ scheme. Ms Nickles stated that the road was often full between 6pm and 8pm and she suggested that any CPZ scheme should be in operation from 6am to 9pm, Monday to Saturday, with consistent enforcement, if it was to be effective.

In reply to the issues raised, Hossein Amir-Hosseini acknowledged the displacement parking being experienced in Doyle Gardens and he recommended that it be included in CPZ scheme Zone HW. He advised Members that not all dwellings in Doyle Gardens had been consulted as part of the road was already part of a CPZ scheme. In reply to a query from Members, he confirmed that CPZ Zone HW's operational hours were 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday, although the operational hours would be re-considered during a review once the scheme had been in place for at least 6 months.

Members agreed to the Chair's suggestion that there be a re-consultation undertaken with residents of Oman Avenue.

### RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the progress reported be noted and it be agreed that officers proceed with the programme of implementation of CPZs approved for the current financial year as detailed in Item 4.1;
- (ii) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Oman Avenue, as detailed in Items 3.4 to 3.6, be noted and it be agreed that a re-consultation be undertaken with the residents in Oman Avenue, and

subject to majority support for CPZ proposals, agrees that the Director of Transportation be approved to use his Delegated Authority to approve the inclusion of Oman Avenue in Zone GA, subject to satisfactory statutory consultation;

- (iii) that the outcome of the consultation with residents within the Zone GB extension consultation area, as detailed in Items 3.7 to 3.9, be noted and it be agreed to proceed with the extension of the GB CPZ subject to statutory consultation;
- (iv) that the outcome of the consultation with residents within the Zone HW extension consultation area, as detailed in Items 3.10 to 3.13, be noted, and it be agreed to proceed with the extension of the HW CPZ subject to statutory consultation and a re-consultation with residents in All Souls Avenue (part), Diary Close, Harlesden Road (part), Herbert Gardens and Haycroft Gardens;
- (v) that the outcome of the consultation with residents within the Zone NS extension consultation area, as detailed in Items 3.14 to 3.15, be noted, and it be agreed to proceed with the extension of the NS CPZ subject to statutory consultation and a re-consultation with residents in Northview Crescent;
- (vi) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to consider objections and representations to the statutory consultation mentioned within the Detail section of this report and that he report back to Members if there are substantial objections or concerns raised, otherwise he be authorised to implement the schemes; and
- (vii) that a petition received from the residents in Swinderby Road, Wembley requesting for their street to be moved from E Zone to Wembley Central CPZ Zone C, be noted and it be agreed that Officers undertake an informal consultation with the residents in Swinderby Road.

#### 10. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of the Highways Committee would take place on Wednesday, 6<sup>th</sup> December 2006 at 7.00 pm.

#### 11. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm

D BROWN  
Chair