

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 22nd January 2008 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor D Brown (Chair), Councillor Wharton (Vice Chair) and Councillors Matthews and Van Colle.

Councillors V Brown, Butt, Dunwell, Farrell, Mendoza and Mistry also attended.

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Colwill.

1. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Van Colle declared Personal and Prejudicial interest in the item Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Controls. Councillor Dunwell declared a Personal interest in the item on the petition at Preston Road /East Lane. Councillors Mendoza and V Brown declared Personal interests in the Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Controls item and Councillor Mendoza declared a Personal interest in the Preston Road /East Lane item.

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting Held on 25th September 2007

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting as stated on page 7 of the minutes was the intended date however the meeting was cancelled due to a lack of business.

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting of the Highways Committee held on 25th September 2007 be received and approved as an accurate record.

3. Matters Arising

None.

4. Deputations

None.

5. Order of Business

The Chair explained that due to the number of residents present to hear certain items, the item relating to the petition regarding Preston Road and East Lane would be taken last.

6. Clarendon Garden 20mph Zone and Experimental Gated Closure

Mrs Dima Khozm, representing residents of Clarendon Gardens addressed the Committee advising them of a petition containing over 130 signatures regarding the gated closure on Clarendon Gardens. She expressed the view that speed tables would be more appropriate than speed humps on

Llanover Road, Pembroke Road, Castleton Avenue and Wembley Hill Road. Mrs Khozm advised that these would need to be in place before the gate was removed in order to make the roads safer for residents. Mrs Khozm also expressed the view that removing the gate would contribute to the amount of pollution in the area and suggested that as many as 700 cars would be travelling down the road every hour. Mrs Khozm also expressed concern about the number of personal injuries suffered on the road in the year prior to the gate being put in and advised that a 20 mph zone would not suffice to stop reckless driving and road rage in the area.

Dr M K Turner (Chair of Governors at Wembley Primary School and Resident) spoke about the impact of the gated closure on road safety around the school. He began by introducing the Committee to 'Strider' the mascot for the walk to school campaign. He explained that over 165 children had to cross East Lane to get to Wembley Primary School and he noted that this figure was likely to increase as the school would be expanding. Dr Turner also expressed the view that the consultation process preceding the implementation of the gated closure was flawed as several groups were not included such as Wembley Primary School and the Council's Accident Prevention Unit.

Mrs Ayaan Nooh also spoke as a resident of Clarendon Gardens with regard to the gated closure. She made several suggestions to the Committee of measures that could be considered to help alleviate traffic problems in the area. For example it was suggested that the yellow boxes on East Lane could be of an increased size so as to allow an easier flow of traffic from Pembroke Road, Rosslyn Crescent and Castleton Road. Mrs Nooh also recommended the use of speed tables instead of speed humps, explaining that these would help lessen noise pollution. The resident also suggested that consideration be given to how narrow Clarendon Gardens was and as such the parking situation should be reviewed. Mrs Nooh also highlighted a particular problem at the corner of Clarendon Gardens and Pembroke Road noting that a bottleneck was often created due to cars mounting the pavement. Mrs Nooh further suggested that the Council should commit to reviewing the success of the traffic measures within six months.

Following this, Tony Royden a local resident, spoke to the Committee against the gated closure of Clarendon Gardens. He provided the Committee with statistics relating to personal injuries suffered in Clarendon Gardens and the surrounding roads before and after the gated closure was in place. He used the statistics to demonstrate a view that the gated closure had not contributed significantly to personal safety in the area. For example he noted there were three personal injury accidents on Clarendon Gardens before the gated closure was put in place and he explained that none of these had involved a pedestrian.

Following this, Peter Boddy (Team Leader, Traffic Management) presented the report. He explained the procedure leading up to the implementation of

a 20mph zone and gated closure on Clarendon Gardens. He continued by outlining the consultation processes and highlighted the outcomes. It was noted that as a result of residents feedback, it was being recommended that no further action be taken on with regard to the point of no entry on Clarendon Gardens, the reduction of green time at the junction of Clarendon Gardens and Wembley Hill Road, the extension of the 20 mph zone along St Johns Road and the introduction of a one way system on Llanover Road and Pembroke Road. However, Peter Boddy advised that proposal 3 regarding the introduction of speed restrictions should be implemented as should the introduction of speed tables on Clarendon Gardens.

Peter Boddy consequently addressed the issues raised in the petition. In response to the request for pedestrian controlled crossing facilities he advised that due to the low number of pedestrian casualties in the past five years it was unlikely that a bid for funding to achieve this would be supported. However he noted the proximity of Wembley Primary School to the site and advised that the school could incorporate a request for a crossing in their School Travel Plan. It was noted that in doing so the Council could be supported in seeking funds from Transport for London. With regard to the five way junction at Wembley Hill Road, he acknowledged that improved pedestrian facilities would be desirable, however he noted that due to the low level of accidents over the past 3 years the Council was unlikely achieve success with bidding for TfL funding.

With regard to the speed humps, Peter Boddy suggested that speed tables could be put in place, with the Committee's consent, and it was noted that the cost for this could be covered by the project's contingency fund.

With regard to the suggested extension to the yellow box at the junction between East lane, Pembroke Road and Castleton Avenue, the Committee noted that an initial assessment had shown this to be viable. However with regard to having a yellow box between Clarendon Gardens and Pembroke Road, the Committee were advised that this was impracticable due to the geometry of the area, however it was suggested that give way marking could be used to discourage parking on the corner that resulted in an obstructed view.

There followed questions from the Committee, Councillor Brown asked about the differences in the personal injury statistics provided by the officers and the residents during their address to the committee. Peter Boddy explained that the differences related to the different periods of time for which the statistics were given and also the different areas being covered by the statistics.

Councillor Mendoza (Preston Ward) addressed the Committee and outlined the two main concerns of residents in the area. He explained that residents were concerned about rat running, and he noted that these

concerns were not addressed in the consultation. He suggested that this should be looked at in another six months as part of the review process. The other main concern related to public safety, however he acknowledged that this had been addressed by the suggestion of the school incorporating a request for the pedestrian crossing as part of their travel plan.

Councillor Valerie Brown (Wembley Central Ward) also addressed the Committee and expressed the view that the gated closure had not solved the problem of rat running but had actually created division in the local area. Councillor V Brown asked whether the gated closure would be removed when it expired. In response Peter Boddy confirmed that the gate would be removed on or before the 19th May 2008. Councillor V Brown also asked for clarification on the size of the width restrictions. In response it was explained that the width restrictions would both be the same size and have a clearance of 6'9", he added that this would be sufficient to restrict the type of vehicles that were of concern. Councillor V Brown also asked whether there would be a sign in the car park on Ecclestone Park to confirm that residents with a permit for Zone C could use the car park at no charge. In response it was explained that the affected residents would be written to in order to ensure that they were aware of the arrangements and it was highlighted that traffic wardens had been instructed accordingly.

Committee members further discussed the issues raised. Councillor Van Colle, referred to the suggestion that Wembley Primary School's travel plan should include a request for a pedestrian controlled crossing. In response to questions on this Peter Boddy advised of the timescales involved. It was noted that was being offered on a first come first served basis and therefore could take some time. In response, Councillor Van Colle encouraged officers and the school to pursue this as a matter of priority.

There followed an exchange of views on the consultation process for the proposal of a one way system on Llanover and Pembroke Road. The Chair noted that the views residents of the roads that would be significantly impacted upon were considered more relevant in the consultation process.

Councillor Van Colle continued by proposing that an internal review be carried out after 12 months of the schemes operation. He acknowledged that the possible effect of the traffic lights could not be considered as it was unlikely that they would be in place in time, and urged the school to submit their travel plan as a matter of urgency in order to improve the chances of success. He added that this combination of measures could help to combat rat running in the area. Acknowledging this, Irfan Malik (Assistan Director, Streets and Transportation) advised the Committee that the Department was willing to assist as necessary to expedite this process.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) That the outcome of the recent consultation in the Clarendon Gardens area be noted;

- (ii) that officers proceed with the detailed design and implementation of width restrictions on Clarendon Gardens by the junction of Wembley Hill Road and St Johns Road by the railway bridge;
- (iii) that officers proceed with the detailed design and implementation of the extension of the 20mph zone and introduction of speed tables along Clarendon Gardens;
- (iv) that the Director of Transportation 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 orders for the introduction of the width restrictions, extension of the 20mph zone and removal of the existing experimental gated closure if there are no objections or representations, or he considers the objections or representations are groundless; and
- (v) that officers conduct an internal review of the scheme after 12 months of operation.

7. Wembley Stadium Event Day Parking Controls

The report before Members informed on progress of the review of the Wembley Stadium Protective Parking Scheme (PPS). The report also raised various issues raised by residents and businesses regarding the scheme within or outside the Wembley Stadium protective parking area.

Dr Jerome Cohen (Chairman of Wembley Stadium Residents Advisory Committee) addressed the Committee and began by explaining that the residents association represented those who were affected by living close to the stadium. With regard to recommendations arising from the report, he expressed concern about the permits being offered to places of worship as it would affect the number of people able to park in the area. He asked whether these permits would be solely for use on event days. He also expressed the view that the marked out parking bays were unnecessary and suggested that they be phased out. He requested that the Committee consider issuing limited permits to residents living on the edge of the PPS zone so that they could access the area in close proximity to them on event days. Dr Cohen also asked whether the timing of the scheme could be re-considered and he suggested a two tiered system allowing for different hours of operation depending on whether it was a weekday or weekend event.

Mr Chambers also addressed the Committee and asked whether a permit could be offered free of charge for people over the age of 70. He also referred to the scratch card system and noted that a book of 10 would cost £10 pounds which some pensioners could find to be expensive and asked whether pensioners could be given a book on annual basis so that they could give the day permits to visitors when necessary.

Phil Rankmore (Head of Major Projects) presented the report to the Committee. He highlighted that the stadium had now experienced a full season of events. He informed the Committee that a review of the parking controls had been carried out with reference to the hours of operation. It was noted that the Department had looked at how other stadia operated their parking control systems. However it was also noted that it was difficult to make a direct comparison with football grounds such as the Emirates Stadium as there was less traffic coming into the area and the hours of activity did not vary as much as they did for Wembley Stadium. Members were advised of the recommendations before them relating to this which were to reduce the hours of operation so that they start at 10 am or maintain them as they were. He added that the schemes would need to operate until midnight as this would enable sufficient time to clear traffic after a late running event. It was noted that there would only be a modest cost associated with making a reduction whereas there would be a more substantial cost to implementing a two tiered or other variable scheme as suggested by Dr Cohen. However Phil Rankmore suggested that these other options could be considered in the future. Councillor Mendoza also commented on the hours of operation and suggested that they should start later and finish at 11pm as this would benefit local businesses. There followed an exchange of views on this and Phil Rankmore re-iterated that the Council was not in a financial position to implement a system with differing hours of operation. Irfan Malik also noted that there had not been many complaints from residents about the hours of operation but acknowledged that there had been complaints from local businesses. He expressed the view that a single system with uniform hours of operation was easier for residents to understand. He explained that the scheme worked well but would be continually reviewed.

The Committee also heard of other amendments to the scheme, for example it was highlighted that permits would be offered to residents holding weddings or other similar events. Phil Rankmore responded to requests about scratch cards and visitors permits by noting that one free visitor's permit was offered to all affected residents at the start of the scheme's implementation, and these were valid for the lifetime of the permit holder and car owner's residency. He also noted that a scratch card scheme had not been considered as it was felt difficult to regulate.

Councillor Mendoza also asked about the need for marked out parking bays. Phil Rankmore further explained that officers addressed the need by taking into consideration the need to provide a system that was easy and clear to regulate. Additionally it was considered that having the bays meant that the Council would be better supported when faced with cases being adjudicated. He added that the bays made clear the expectation that cars would not park outside them. Councillor Dunwell also addressed the Committee with regard to this issue and requested a definitive answer to why the trial to phase out bays had not been expanded. He also suggested that a report be put before the Committee on this. Councillor Dunwell also asked about lifespan of the additional permits being provided

in recommendations 2.6 – 2.9 of the report. Councillor Dunwell also sought clarification on references in the report relating to the areas where marked out bays were originally restricted to and he asked members to give consideration to the suggestions that were put forward by Dr Cohen.

Councillor Van Colle also expressed the view that a scheme with variable hours of operation should be considered in the future. He asked whether officers could investigate the possibility of this for the subsequent period and look into the issue of funding. At this point, having declared a prejudicial interest, Councillor Van Colle took no further part in the debate and left the room.

Noting the considerable discussion on the hours of operation, the Chair proposed that the operational hours be reduced to run from 10 am to 12 am instead of from 8am to 12am. The Chair explained that scope for further change was limited because of the funding implications. With regard to the phasing out of the parking bays, the Chair expressed the view that it would not be an effective use of resources to paint over them.

In response to questions about the lifespan of the permits Phil Rankmore explained that that permits were offered for life in the context of their validity, for example for as long as a resident remained at a particular address it was noted that visitor permits were not restricted to particular vehicles therefore the permit was valid for life. In response to further questions it was clarified that there would be a £10 administrative charge for allotment holders seeking an area specific permit.

The Chair requested a recorded vote and it was noted that Councillors Brown, Matthews and Wharton voted in favour of the following:

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the results of the parking surveys carried out in selected areas of the protective scheme as detailed in Appendix C of the report be noted;
- (ii) that the concerns raised by the residents/businesses of the area to date be noted;
- (iii) that a previous petition received from the residents of Dunster Drive, Kingsbury, NW9 in May 2007 objecting to the parking bays during the Wembley Stadium event days be noted;
- (iv) that the boundary of the PPS area remain unchanged;
- (v) that the operational times of the PPS restrictions be reduced to operate from 10.00am to midnight noting that restrictions of 8.00am

to midnight and bus lanes restrictions of 7.00am to Midnight remain on primary and strategic routes within the PPS scheme;

- (vi) that 20 permits be offered to all places of worship within the PPS area at a charge of £10 per permit;
- (vii) that temporary daily permits should be provided and issued to those holding weddings and other similar events at no charge;
- (viii) that 20 permits be offered to schools within the PPS area without off street parking facilities at a charge of £10 per permit;
- (ix) that Allotment holds could also apply to obtain permits which will also be area specific at a charge of £10 per permit; and
- (x) that one additional visitor's permit be offered to each household at a charge £10.00 within the PPS scheme.

8. Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme

Members of the Committee considered a report on the progress of the Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) implementation programme in Brent, since it was last reported in July 2007. The report also informed Members on the receipt of a petition from residents of Swinderby Road objecting to a proposed amendment affecting their road. Mr Henrik Wierzbicki spoke on behalf of the petitioners and outlined their concerns. He informed the Committee that Swinderby Road was currently in CPZ Zone E, and expressed the view that being in this zone had assisted with combating some of the problems residents had experienced beforehand. He informed the Committee that residents had indicated through their petition that they did not want to be included in CPZ Zone C. Reasons for this included concerns about reduced availability of parking, increased levels of litter and the blocking of driveways. He asked Committee members to consider the environmental implications related to the use of Swinderby Road for rat running by those who used it to avoid the congestion on Ealing Road. Mr Wierzbicki also drew Member's attention to a map indicating the limited parking options available. Noting that 57% of the residents on Swinderby Road objected to the increased commuter parking, Mr Wierzbicki urged members not to support the proposed change.

Hossein Amir-Hosseini (Team Leader, Transportation) responded to the points raised by the petitioners. He explained that previously in 2006 a petition was put before the Highways Committee showing that residents were in favour of the change from Zone E to Zone C. He noted however, that only 42% of residents had responded and explained that based on the results the change was recommended. Councillor Wharton commented on the confusion caused by these conflicting petitions and suggested that residents be re-consulted before a decision is taken. Councillor Van Colle concurred noting that Ward Councillors should ensure that all residents

respond to any reconsultation to enable officers to make a fair assessment. Irfan Malik acknowledged this suggestion and re-iterated the importance of a good response rate. However noting that each period of consultation came at a cost to the Council he suggested that this be the last time the proposal be consulted upon.

There followed discussion of the remaining updates in the CPZ progress report. Mr Hosseini highlighted that the CPZ proposals for Chantry Crescent and Chapel Close should be withdrawn. With regard to proposals to extend GB CPZ it was suggested that in view of differences of opinions between residents on Geary Road and Griffin Close, there should be a reconsultation before it was decided whether the extension should include these roads. Members noted that authority could be delegated to officers to make a decision on this once the consultation results were known.

Noting that all of the approved proposals were subject to satisfactory consultation, Members unanimously agreed the proposals.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) That the outcome of the consultation with residents regarding proposals for an extension of the GD CPZ, as detailed in paragraphs 3.5 to 3.6 of the report be noted and that officers not proceed with the CPZ proposals for this area;
- (ii) that the officers proceed with the GB extension after a reconsultation with Geary Road and Griffin Close in the light of other adjacent roads being added to the zone, with the scheme being implemented in one tranche if these roads elect to be included in the zone;
- (iii) that the outcome of the re-consultation with residents of Yewfield Road and Church Road, as detailed in paragraphs 3.10 to 3.11 of the report be noted and that these two streets be included in the approved HY CPZ;
- (iv) that the outcome of the consultation with residents of Haycroft Gardens, as detailed in paragraphs 3.12 to 3.13 of the report be noted and that officers not proceed with the CPZ proposals;
- (v) that the Director of Transportation consider objections and representations during the statutory consultation mentioned within the detail section of this report and that the Director of Transportation report back to members, if there are substantial objections or concerns raised, or implement the schemes;
- (vi) that the petition from residents of Swinderby Road be noted; and
- (vi) that there be a further final consultation with the residents of Swinderby Road with regard to the change of residential parking from Zone E to Zone C.

9. **Petition**

The Committee noted that the following petition had been received containing in excess of 50 signature:-

Preston Road / East Lane Junction

This petition, submitted by Councillor R Dunwell, the QARA Group of Associations (Preston Rd/Broadway Branch) on behalf of local traders and residents, stated that:

“We, the undersigned, traders and residents deplore the fact that the London Borough of Brent’s present proposed “London Bus Priority” scheme for the above junction only partly addresses our concerns as it still is most likely to deprive the traders of livelihood and residents of amenities and convenience. Furthermore, we require that the scheme be redrawn to include a long goods vehicle loading bay and car parking. That there be no metered parking or pay and display. That a “1 or 2 hour free parking regime scheme” be introduced as per elsewhere in Preston Road and on pavement parking to be continued down Preston Road northwards beyond No.19 Preston Road. In addition it is confirmed that Mr R Dunwell is authorised to represent the petitioners on this issue and related matters.”

It was noted that there was a report on the agenda addressing this petition.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 10.

10. **Petition – Preston Road/East Lane Junction**

The report before the Committee informed members of a petition that was received from residents via Councillor R Dunwell, the QARA Group of Associations (Preston Rd/Broadway Branch) requesting variations to the proposed new parking scheme for Preston Road / East Lane. Phil Rankmore presented this report before Members and, noting the late submission of the report, informed Members of the reasons for urgency. It was noted that the petition was received subsequent to a public consultation in October 2007. Phil Rankmore explained that the petition, if accepted, would prevent the proposed scheme from being implemented as it demanded further measures to be designed. It was also noted that there was no funding available for the additional measures and that delay would result in the existing scheme not being built within the financial year, which was the only financial year where funding was available.

Phil Rankmore continued by outlining the report and he highlighted that the junction in question was working to capacity as there was a limited choice

of routes in the area. He explained that the traffic problems were exacerbated by parking issues in the area. Members were consequently informed that the scheme before them proposed a number of improvements. These included the provision of additional parking space that would not inhibit movement. It was also noted that funding provided for a "London Bus Priority" scheme at the Preston Road / East Lane junction.

There followed a response to some of the issues raised in the petition. It was explained that not having 'Pay and Display' would be contrary to the Council's Parking Policy that this be adopted for all new parking areas in the borough.

Councillor Mendoza addressed the Committee with regard to his concerns over the time taken for the proposals before them to be drawn up. He noted that due to the time taken there was no longer the opportunity for any changes to be made.

Following this, Councillor Dunwell addressed the Committee with regard to the petition. He explained that there was not sufficient parking in the area and therefore a need for some improvements. He expressed the view that having 'Pay and Display' Parking in one area would lead to a lack of uniformity along Preston Road. He proposed that there be a one or two hour free parking regime to allow for a continuous arrangement along Preston Road and suggested that the design and implementation of this would be of the same cost or even cheaper than the current proposal. He questioned whether there really was no possibility of accessing funds to design these new measures and suggested that negotiations could be entered into with Transport for London (TfL). He also commented on the length of time it had taken to make these proposals.

There followed a discussion of the issues raised in the petition. Irfan Malik informed the Committee that the design and consultation processes with which Councillor Dunwell had also been involved had take a considerable amount of time. The Committee also heard about the timescales relating to the submission of the petition outlining resident's dissatisfaction with the scheme and it was noted that the petition was not verified as having 50 signatures until January. Members were also reminded that the Executive had taken a decision not to go ahead with any more free parking schemes in the borough and that any proposals for this would be unfair to other areas in Brent. Furthermore, with regard to funding Members heard that the current funding would cease in March and whilst a re-application for funding could be made there were no guarantees that it would be forthcoming.

Councillor Van Colle referred to the petitioners request for a long goods vehicle loading bay on the East Lane/Preston Road corner and noted that he was aware of businesses in the area that could benefit from this. Phil Rankmore explained that the proposed loading bay was on the Broadway

and he explained that it would substantially span the approach to the stop line to the traffic signals. He acknowledged that it was a possibility however consideration would have to be given to loading requirements such as road strengthening and the safety requirements that would be looked at in a safety audit. In response to further concerns about businesses being economically disadvantaged, Phil Rankmore explained that the 'Pay and Display' bays were capable of receiving vehicles for the purpose of loading and unloading and the improved turnover in these bays was likely to correspond with an increased availability of such spaces. In response to questions about the number of 'Pay and Display' bays, the Committee were informed that 13 bays would be marked out.

In response to questions about additional footway parking, Phil Rankmore explained that there were no plans to extend footway parking on Preston Road to the north. He explained that the scheme sought to facilitate bus movement on the junction and that it would not be possible to expand the footway parking at this point in time. Councillor Van Colle asked whether the parking could be extended in consideration of the needs of local businesses. He emphasised the importance of helping the shops in the area remain available to customers travelling by car. In response it was reiterated that it was against the Council's policy to offer new areas of free parking.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the petition be noted;
- (ii) that officers proceed with the scheme as consulted to implementation; and
- (iii) that officers monitor the effectiveness of the scheme and consider any opportunities for further parking and loading facilities in the area.

11. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting of the Highways Committee would take place on Thursday 27th March 2008 at 7.00 pm.

12. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting ended at 9.33 pm.

D BROWN
Chair

