

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 23rd July 2008 at 7.00 pm

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Detre.

Councillors Clues, Jones, Joseph, Long and Ms Shaw 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 2008/2009. 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 2008/2009.

Nominations were invited for the position of Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2008/2009. Councillor Wharton was proposed and seconded. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED:-

that Councillor Wharton be elected Vice Chair of the Highways Committee for the Municipal Year 2008/2009.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting Held on 27th March 2008

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting of the Highways Committee held on 27th March 2008 be received and approved as an accurate record.

4. Matters Arising

Clarendon Gardens 20mph Zone and Experimental Gated Closure

Councillor Blackman commented that the width restriction introduced to Clarendon Gardens had been knocked over by vehicles on at least 3 separate occasions, including a Brent Transport Services bus in one incident. He suggested that a more rigid structure be introduced to prevent this from happening and that Brent Transport Services be requested not to travel down this road.

In reply, Peter Boddy (Team Leader, Traffic Management, Transportation Unit) advised Members that more robust measures were being considered and it was anticipated that these would be in place within the next few weeks. Irfan Malik (Assistant Director, [Streets and Transportation], Environment and Culture) advised that it was possible that one of the vehicles concerned was from Brent Community Transport, as opposed to a Brent Transport Services, and the case incident be investigated.

Buses travelling along Staverton Road

Councillor Ms Shaw queried why there had been no response from Transport for London (TfL) in respect of buses travelling down Staverton Road.

In response, the Chair confirmed that TfL were continuing to be lobbied to reduce the number of buses using Staverton Road, and a response from the Mayor of London was also awaited. The Chair confirmed that consultation with regard to introducing a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme in the road was to be undertaken.

5. **Deputations**

None.

6. **Petitions**

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

(a) **Against Speed Cushions in Mount Pleasant Road**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated the following:-

“Whilst I accept the need for traffic calming measures in Mount Pleasant Road, I strongly object to the current proposal to install 11 sets of speed cushions in Mount Pleasant Road – on the grounds of increased environmental and noise pollution, detrimental effects on personal well being, damage to cars and increased response time for emergency vehicles.”

Parvin Faridian, representing the petitioners, stated that residents were in support of traffic calming measures, however they favoured softer, lower humps than the ones proposed or preferably the introduction of other schemes such as traffic islands and chicanes.

Another local resident, David Finch, also reiterated residents' support for some sort of traffic calming measures and he observed that those residents with children were more likely to favour

measures that would slow vehicles down more, whilst he expressed doubts that softer options would be effective in slowing down speeding vehicles which was a problem in Mount Pleasant Road. David Finch suggested that 11 to 12 speed humps would be sufficient to effectively address the issue of speeding vehicles.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 7.

(b) Against Traffic Calming Humps in Aylestone Avenue

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated the following:-

“We the undersigned, electors and residents of the proposed Aylestone Avenue 20 mph zone, hereby petition Brent Council:

- (a) Not to install any traffic calming humps in Aylestone Avenue
- (b) To build a roundabout at the junction of Aylestone Avenue and Chudleigh Road
- (c) To place flashing 20 mph school warning signs (as in the enclosed picture) at suitable positions on the approaches in both directions to Queens Park Community School (QPCS), such flashing lights to be operated by QPCS only for (i) 30 minutes prior to the beginning of the school day and for 15 minutes thereafter; and (ii) for 15 minutes before the end of the school day and for 30 minutes thereafter. ”

Vivian Moses, representing the petitioners, stated that approximately 90 to 95% of residents in Aylestone Avenue were against speed humps in their road in light of the response to the consultation and the 2 petitions that they had submitted. He confirmed that an additional 18 signatures had been added to the second petition. Vivian Moses stated that Aylestone Road was well lit, with plenty of off-street parking available, experienced low levels of traffic at night, was rarely used as a rat-run and there had only been 3 reported accidents in the last 10 years, none of which were attributable to speeding. In addition, residents did not feel that speeding vehicles were a problem for this road and for these reasons they felt the speed humps unnecessary and strongly objected to them. Vivian Moses explained that the petitioners felt that introducing a roundabout at the junction of Aylestone Avenue and Chudleigh Road, and placing 20 mph school warning signs on the approach to Queens Park Community School, were more appropriate traffic calming measures for this road and these were proposed in the petition.

Stephen Morrall, also speaking in support of the petitioners, added that the main issue was that of traffic movement at the junction of Aylestone Avenue and Chudleigh Road and this is why the petitioners had proposed a roundabout at this location.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 7.

(c) **Request for One Way System to be introduced to Maybank Avenue**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated the following:-

“Petition of the Residents of Maybank Avenue for a one way system to be implemented by the London Borough of Brent to ensure the safety of persons and property.”

Carol Higgins, representing the petitioners, stated that the introduction of speed cushions along Maybank Avenue had not reduced the number of traffic related problems, with road rage incidents and damage to vehicles common, whilst a child had also recently been knocked over. Residents felt that the most effective method to address this problem was to introduce a one way system to the road. Caroline Higgins suggested that the introduction of passing points, as recommended in the report, would not be sufficient and in addition would mean the loss of 4 parking spaces to the road where spaces were already much in demand. She also felt that the survey undertaken by officers at 5.00am was not reflective of the usual parking situation for the road and that the road had higher levels of traffic than had been described in the report.

In reply to queries from Members, Carol Higgins felt that a one way system would not increase traffic speeds as there were already speed cushions installed. She felt that residents of Fernbank and Rosebank Roads would also be in favour of the one way system being introduced initially to Maybank Avenue, with the possibility of it being introduced to the other 2 roads if there was majority support.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 8.

(d) **Request to Introduce Measures to Prevent Speeding Vehicles Windermere Avenue**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated the following:-

“We, the residents of Windermere Avenue, Wembley, wish to inform you that we are concerned about speedy motorists (sometimes even above 60 mph) on our street.

We would appreciate it if you could do something to stop these speedy motorists before any fatal accident happens on our street.”

Mr T Selvaratnam stated that the petition he had organised contained 95 signatures expressing concern about speeding vehicles in Windermere Avenue and the need for measures to be introduced to address this. Members heard that the road was being used as a rat-run and people had almost been knocked down by speeding vehicles. Mr Selvaratnam added that road safety was also compromised by the lack of a pelican crossing and because double parking was occurring.

In reply to a query from Members, Mr Selvaratnam stated that he would support a 20 mph scheme for surrounding area and he felt that there would be significant support for speed humps in these roads.

Peter Boddy advised Members that speeding vehicles had been identified as a problem in Windermere Avenue following surveys that had been undertaken and that a funding bid for it to be included in a 20 mph zone had been approved. Officers were currently designing such a scheme, and subject to consultation, it was anticipated that the scheme would be introduced early in the next financial year.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

(e) **Against the Introduction of Yellow Line Parking Restrictions in Leith Close and Wells Drive**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated the following:-

“We, the undersigned, object to the imposition of yellow line parking restrictions in Leith Close and Wells Drive. We believe it will make an already stretched parking situation intolerable. We urge them to re-consider their decision, and to work with the residents to arrive at a conclusion acceptable to both parties.”

Paul Symons, representing the petitioners, commented that residents were awaiting a site visit by officers. He asserted that Leith Road was at least 6.4 metres in width as opposed to the 6.3 metres stated in the report and queried why only those residents who lived adjacent to the proposed yellow lines were consulted. Members heard that Leith Close had not been consulted with regard to the Wembley Stadium Event Day Protective Parking Scheme. With regard to the report expressing concern about access for refuse vehicles to Leith Close, Paul Symons stated that contact with the contractor concerned had revealed that refuse vehicles encountered problems further down the road, and not at the junction where the yellow lines were proposed. He was not aware of any concerns expressed about access from the Emergency Services and Members heard that residents acknowledged the need to park safely. Paul Symons requested that if the waiting restrictions were approved, that they only be applicable on refuse collection day, or that the proposed restrictions, which he felt were excessive, be reduced from 8.00 am to 6.30 pm to 10.00 am to 4.00 pm.

In reply to queries from Members, Paul Symons stated that 'nose in' parking tended to occur further down Leith Close and that there were no driveways in this road.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 9.

7. Petitions Against Traffic Calming Proposals on Mount Pleasant Road and Aylestone Avenue 20 mph Zone

Peter Boddy introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the detail in the report. He reiterated the reasons for the recommendations as set out in the report.

Councillor Ms Shaw, speaking as ward councillor for these roads, stated that the majority of residents in Mount Pleasant Road supported the introduction of speed humps and confirmed that the petition organiser for Mount Pleasant Road had since withdrawn her signature from the petition. Councillor Ms Shaw drew Members' attention to a letter from Professor Judd and Doctor Judd supporting the use of speed humps. She queried why there had been no public notices in respect of introducing speed humps. In respect of Aylestone Avenue, Councillor Ms Shaw stated that most residents were against the speed humps and therefore their views and wishes should be duly considered. In addition, because there had been no accidents in the road for a number of years, consideration of speed humps should be given low priority compared to roads that were in greater need of such measures. A survey undertaken in 2007 had also

shown that the road experienced considerably less traffic than surrounding roads. Councillor Ms Shaw therefore supported the requests made by petitioners in respect of Ayelstone Avenue.

During discussion, Councillor Wharton enquired if there were any traffic calming measures proposed with regard to the entrance of Queens Park Community School. Councillor Van Colle commented that further consideration of the methodology used in consultation exercises could be undertaken, although he felt that the consultation in respect of this item had generated a reasonable response rate. He also enquired whether there were any other traffic calming proposals for these roads being considered and was there funding for alternative measures. Councillor Blackman sought further details of the response rate to the consultations that had been undertaken.

The Chair drew Members' attention to Professor Judd and Doctor Judd's letter in the report supporting the introduction of speed humps to Mount Pleasant Road and highlighting the 61 per cent of residents in the road supporting these measures in the consultation. Members noted that the letter had suggested that a number of residents had signed the Mount Pleasant Road petition without fully understanding its significance.

In response to the issues raised, Peter Boddy confirmed that traffic calming measures were also being undertaken in respect of Queens Park Community School as part of its School Travel Plan, although this was subject to obtaining the necessary funding from TfL. Members noted that the response rate to the consultation for the whole area was 25 per cent, with variations in the level of support for the proposals in different roads. The Committee heard that if the scheme was approved and a subsequent review identified that further changes would be required, then additional funding would be sought from TfL to undertake these. Peter Boddy advised that horizontal traffic measures designed to deflect vehicular movements were not effective on their own. It was felt that the most cost effective solution for traffic calming was to introduce vertical measures designed to reduce speed and therefore speed humps were proposed and would be funded as part of a 20 mph scheme. Peter Boddy acknowledged that the petitioners' suggestion of a roundabout at the junction of Aylestone Avenue and Chudleigh Road was of some merit, however separate funding would need to be identified to implement this.

Irfan Malik added that results of consultations were given significant consideration because such exercises were of an independent nature as opposed to petitions which normally supported a particular view and therefore were more subjective.

The Committee then agreed to the Chair's request that an additional recommendation be added that the scheme be reviewed within a year of implementation.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petitions and the issues raised be noted;
- (ii) that the outcome of officers' investigation of the petitions and objections as detailed in Section 3 of the report be noted;
- (iii) that the objections to the hump notices on Aylestone Avenue and Mount Pleasant Road be overruled and that officers be authorised to proceed with the implementation of the proposed measures on these roads; and
- (iv) that the scheme be reviewed within a year of its' implementation

8. Petition – Request for One Way System for Maybank Avenue

Peter Boddy introduced the report to Members and advised the Committee that the survey undertaken at 5.00am was the most appropriate time to accurately reflect overnight parking. It was noted that as Maybank Avenue experienced relatively low levels of traffic, the most appropriate and cost effective scheme would be to introduce 2 passing gaps to the road as proposed in the report. In addition, a one way system would mean that residents of Maybank Avenue, Fernbank Avenue and Rosebank Avenue would have to access the area via Greenford Road which was already congested and would cause further traffic disruption. Members noted that the Emergency Services were unlikely to support a one way system.

During discussion, Councillor Wharton commented that Maybank Avenue was already heavily parked and asked how long it would take to implement the passing places and one way system respectively, and would other organisations need to be consulted with regard to the one way system. He felt that there were complications involved in implementing a one way system, as residents of Maybank Avenue, Fernbank Avenue and Rosebank Avenue would all be required to travel further and therefore the passing options should be pursued at this stage. Councillor Van Colle suggested that an additional recommendation stating when a review of the passing gaps scheme be included about and he asked whether consultation was undertaken for schemes where funding had yet to be identified. With regard to disabled parking spaces, Councillor Blackman enquired whether the number of blue badge holders living in Maybank Avenue was known. The Chair asked if there were any funding issues with regard to implementing the passing bays.

In reply to the issues raised, Peter Boddy acknowledged that although the road was quite heavily parked, there would be sufficient spaces even after the 4 spaces that would be removed to accommodate the passing gaps. If approved, the passing gaps would take approximately 6 months to implement and funding was available from the existing budget. A one way

scheme would take approximately 12 months to implement, would require residents of Maybank Avenue, Fernbank Avenue and Rosebank Avenue and also the London Borough of Harrow to be consulted and funding would need to be identified. Peter Boddy reaffirmed that the passing gap scheme would be effective considering the level of traffic experienced in Maybank Avenue.

Irfan Malik advised Members that it was usual to consult on schemes where funding was possible so that such schemes could be delivered and that the passing gap scheme would be monitored and reviewed where appropriate. Hossein Amir-Hosseini (Team Leader, Traffic Management, Transportation Unit) advised the Committee that a Borough-wide investigation was taking place with regard to blue badges and disabled parking bay use and that the removal of any disabled parking bays would require the permission of existing or previous blue badge holder.

Members then agreed to the Chair's additional recommendation that the passing gap scheme continue to be reviewed after implementation and where appropriate it be reported back to Committee on any proposed amendments or additions to the scheme.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petitions and the issues raised be noted;
- (ii) that the outcome of officers' investigation of the petition as detailed in Section 3 of the report be noted;
- (iii) that officers consult residents on the introduction of 2 passing gaps on Maybank Avenue;
- (iv) that officers review the existing usage of the disabled bays within SH zone be reviewed;
- (v) 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 not objections, or he considers the objections or representations are groundless or insignificant; and
- (vi) that following implementation, officers continue to review the scheme and where appropriate to report back to the Committee on any proposed amendments or additions to the scheme.

9. Progress Report on Controlled Parking Zones Programme

Hossein Amir-Hosseini introduced the report and highlighted the details of the schemes proposed and the responses to petitions as set out in the report. Members noted that it was recommended to re-consult Haycroft

Gardens to be included in CPZ scheme Zone HW following requests from residents. Yellow line waiting restrictions were proposed at the junction of Leith Close and Wells Drive following concerns reported by StreetCare that refuse vehicles were having access problems to Leith Close and in light of the need to ensure health and road safety.

Ben Johnson, a resident of Tudor Court Road North, stated that residents were against the introduction of yellow lines to the road and he queried why these were only proposed for this road, whilst there were no such proposals for Tudor Court Road South, whose characteristics were identical to his road.

Rosalind Wilson, a resident of Haycroft Gardens, stated that it was a small cul-de-sac with only a small number of residents which restricted the number of signatures on a petition requesting that the road be re-consulted in respect of being included in CPZ zone HW. Members heard that as a result of the surrounding roads being included in zone HW, Haycroft Gardens was suffering from displacement parking, which in turn was causing other anti-social activities to occur such as drug dealing. Therefore she felt that earlier consultations, which showed most residents of the road were against inclusion of zone HW, no longer accurately reflected the current views of residents and therefore a re-consultation was requested.

In reply to a query from Members, Rosalind Wilson confirmed that the police had been contacted in respect of drug dealing in Haycroft Gardens and had leafleted residents advising them of this and actions they could take.

Councillor Joseph, speaking in her capacity as a ward councillor, supported residents of Haycroft Gardens in respect of a re-consultation regarding inclusion in CPZ zone HW. She stated that there had been incidences of residents not living in Haycroft Gardens who were parking their vehicles on the road and then taking holidays. Lorries had been reported to be damaging vehicles when turning due to the heavy parking. In addition, other unwelcome activities, such as abandoned cars and drug dealing were also occurring and Councillor Joseph enquired when the re-consultation would be undertaken.

Councillor Clues, speaking in his capacity as a ward councillor, advised the Committee that he was speaking on behalf of residents of Park View Road. Members noted that a petition from residents, which the Council was yet to verify, was against the CPZ scheme that had been introduced to the road. Councillor Clues stated that the CPZ had been introduced following a small response rate to consultations undertaken, however the petition showed large opposition to the scheme and a review of its inclusion in CPZ zone MP was requested at the earliest opportunity. Members heard that residents did not feel that the speed cushions in the road were effective against certain vehicles such as lorries and wide axle vehicles and

Councillor Clues suggested that these traffic calming measures also be reviewed.

In reply to a query from Members, Councillor Clues felt that a consultation with residents regarding a possible gated closure would be welcomed.

Councillor Jones, speaking in her capacity as a ward councillor, advised the Committee that she was speaking on behalf of residents of Uffington Road. Councillor Jones advised that residents had submitted a petition requesting that they be consulted with regard to inclusion in a CPZ following incidences of displacement parking occurring in the road. Officers were aware of the situation and Councillor Jones enquired about timescales with regard to a consultation being undertaken. Councillor Jones requested that disabled parking spaces be considered on the hospital side of Robson Road. She also suggested that slow signs at the crossing in Harlesden Road be considered as it had been reported that there had been a number of incidences of speeding buses in the road.

During Members discussion, with regard to the Leith Close/Wells Drive petition, Councillor Blackman felt that yellow line waiting restrictions each day were excessive. He suggested that a preferable option would be to introduce a notice to Leith Close informing residents not to park in the specified area on refuse collection days and that they be ticketed if they were to park there. Councillor Van Colle agreed with this suggestion which he felt was appropriate for an area that was already heavily parked.

In reply to the issues raised, Hosseim Amir-Hosseini advised Members that a CPZ scheme could be introduced to Uffington Road in approximately 6 months if there was support for such a scheme in the consultation. Introducing disabled parking spaces on the hospital side of Robson Road could also be considered. He advised Members that proposals for yellow lines in Tudor Court Road North were made following concerns raised by the refuse collectors with regard to access. With regard to the Leith Close/Wells Drive petition, he confirmed that residents of these roads had been consulted about the Wembley Stadium Event Day Protective Parking Scheme. Hossein Amir-Hosseini stated that although other schemes could be considered, he felt that the best way to address the issue of access of refuse and emergency vehicles to Leith Close was to introduce yellow lines as proposed. He advised that refuse collection days sometimes changed, such as on weeks with Bank Holidays and therefore would present complications if the scheme was only to apply on refuse collection days. He added that there could be difficulties in enforcing a scheme through ticketing, as had been suggested by Councillor Blackman.

Irfan Malik advised Members that the introduction of a gated closure to Park View Road was unlikely to be the most appropriate measure, however he stated that a review of the traffic calming measures for the road could be undertaken. The Committee were advised that any proposals in respect of Tudor Court Road North were to be withdrawn whilst consultation with

residents was undertaken and new proposals would be put before Members at a future meeting.

Phil Rankmore suggested an amendment to the recommendation in the report in respect of Leith Close/Wells Drive, to defer any decision until discussions had taken place with residents to consider alternative options and the proposals to be reported back to the Committee at a future meeting. Members agreed to the amendment of this recommendation.

Members then agreed to the Chair's suggestion that a new recommendation be added where if the informal consultation results show clear support for inclusion in the CPZs for Haycroft Gardens and Robson Avenue, that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with any necessary statutory consultation prior to implementation and only to refer back to the Committee if there are substantial objections or concerns raised.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the petitions received be noted and that the courses of action as detailed in the report for Haycroft Gardens be approved, including that the street be re-consulted about inclusion in Zone HW;
- (ii) that if the informal consultation results show clear support for inclusion in the CPZs for Haycroft Gardens and Robson Avenue, that the Director of Transportation be authorised to proceed with any necessary statutory consultation prior to implementation and only to refer back to the Committee if there are substantial objections or concerns raised;
- (iii) that any decision with regard to waiting restrictions on Leith Close and Wells Drive be deferred whilst officers consult with residents to consider options before reporting back to the Committee with proposals;
- (iv) that the petition organisers be informed of the above decisions;
- (v) that the outcome of the re-consultation with residents of GS extension as detailed in items 3.6 to 3.7 of the report and that the inclusion of Alexander Avenue, Hersant Close and Uffington Road in Zone GA be approved, subject to statutory consultation;
- (vi) that the outcome of the re-consultation with residents of GB extension as detailed in items 3.8 to 3.9 of the report be noted and that the inclusion of Geary Road in Zone GB be approved, subject to statutory consultation;
- (vii) that the outcome of consultation with residents of Winslow Close as detailed in items 3.10 to 3.11 of the report be noted and the inclusion

of Winslow Close in Zone NC be approved, subject to statutory consultation;

- (viii) that the outcome of consultation with residents of Longstone Avenue (part) as detailed in items 3.12 to 3.13 of the report be noted and the inclusion of Longstone Avenue (part) in Zone HW be approved, subject to statutory consultation; and
- (ix) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to 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, otherwise he be authorised to implement the schemes.

10. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Highways Committee would take place on Wednesday, 24th September at 7.00 pm.

11. **Any Other Urgent Business**

Retention of Southern Service from Wembley Central Station to Gatwick Airport (and Brighton)

With the agreement of the Chair, Phil Rankmore circulated to Members a briefing note in respect of the above. The briefing paper detailed how the Southern service via Wembley Central Station would be terminating at Clapham Junction from December 2008. Passenger groups were against the move as it meant the loss of a direct service to Gatwick Airport. Phil Rankmore advised that although it was not possible to prevent the timetable change in December 2008, the Council would seek to support passengers' request that the service to Gatwick Airport be restored in future timetables that would be drawn up. Officers were also seeking to increase the frequency of trains to Wembley Central and to fund additional staff at the station through Section 106 funds. The Council was awaiting a response from Southern.

Members welcomed the actions being taken by officers and the need to improve public transport services in the area and noted that 7 other local authorities had indicated support for this Southern service to Gatwick Airport to be retained.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm.

D BROWN
Chair