

**MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> March 2009 at 7.00 pm**

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Van Colle.

Councillors Arnold, Colwill, Crane, Dunn, Dunwell, Hashmi, Jones, Lorber, Malik, Mistry, J Moher, R Moher, Long and H B Patel also attended the meeting.

**1. Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting Held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting of the Highways Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009 be received and approved as an accurate record, subject to the following amendments:-

Page 4, last paragraph, first 6 lines to read: Councillor Dunwell, as a Member who had received the consultation papers in respect of the scheme and the involvement of the Queensbury Area Residents' (QARA) Association Group of Associations with regard to this issue, of which he was Chair, spoke in support of the formal written objections previously raised by him and the QARA Group of Associations and also in support of the petition.

**3. Matters Arising**

There were none.

**4. Petitions**

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

**(i) Petition Against the Kilburn Streets for People Scheme**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated that:-

"We the undersigned wish to state that we are opposed to the "Streets for People" plan to build 'raised speed-reducing platforms' at all our road entrances and junctions, the felling of 40 trees (including 2 very old plain trees and 2 cherry blossom trees that were originally meant to be included in the 'Greening Plans' over 2 years ago). We do not want to lose up to 60 parking spaces and we do not want the modern design pushed on us for

'Post Box Square' which is in no way in keeping with our Victorian streets and the feel of our area.

We do want the small changes originally put forward two years ago by the 'Greening Committee' which are:

1. The area known as 'Post Box Square' to incorporate a raised planting area around the 2 existing cherry blossom trees so we could have a small community garden area
2. The area by the phone box on Hazelmere Road to also have a matching planting area
3. The alleyway (Glengall Passage) to be cleaned up
4. The area around Ryde House to be cleaned up on a regular basis
5. The bins on St Julian's Road to be moved off the pavements permanently
6. Our roads to be tarmaced properly as they are full of pot-holes
7. Where trees are causing subsidence, their removal

We feel that the 1 million pound(s) is a massive waste on resources, changing an area that does not need so much alteration and could be far better spent reducing our fares and helping out our transport system. We are otherwise willing to accept the £30 thousand promised us by Brent Council to do the minimum changes (that) we asked for."

Dawn Reidy, representing the petitioners, stated that she and her neighbours had not received any letters informing them of the Streets for People scheme and that she did not have internet access to the consultation available on the web, thus only providing her 10 days to respond to the consultation. She stated that the petition contained in excess of 200 signatures which was against the designs proposed and she queried whether the scheme could be stopped as it appeared that a number of measures were being implemented. Members heard that the Greening Committee had initially been advised that the cherry trees in Post Box Square would be retained, however subsequently they were informed that these needed to be removed and she queried why. Dawn Reidy felt that the consultation response to the scheme was low and therefore should not be used as a basis for implementation and she expressed concern that a scheme of this nature would set a precedent. She objected to the proposed loss of parking spaces and the level of noise and disturbance that would be generated from lorries carrying construction materials, adding that there had been no warning of the works that had already commenced. She felt that attention should be given to tarmacing the streets to address a number of potholes that existed and concluded that the petitioners be given a say in how funds should be used to improve their streets. With the agreement of the Chair, Dawn Reidy circulated photographs of the cherry trees in Post Box Square to Members for their consideration.

RESOLVED:-

That the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 5.

(ii) **Petition for 30 minute Free Parking around Church Road, Willesden, NW10**

This petition, submitted by the local MP on behalf of local residents and businesses, stated that:-

“The objective of this petition is to ensure that customers will be able to have access to free parking for up to 30 minutes allowing us to continue to provide a valuable service for the local customers.”

Rajhan Sehdev, representing the petitioners, stated that he was expressing the views of local businesses in Church Road. He stated that since the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) scheme in December 2008 in the area, there had been a significant impact upon businesses in Church Road, with less customers visiting and sales considerably reduced. For his own business, Rajhan Sehdev estimated that income was approximately 30 - 35% down and this had already led to 2 of his staff having to be released. He felt that the Council should consider the views of small businesses and support them, especially because of the present economic climate and he felt that the request for 30 minute free parking in the area around Church Road was reasonable as shoppers would not require much time in the area and it would attract more customers to the area. In reply to queries from Members, he informed the Committee that he operated a bakery and a bakery products supply shop and that the number of customers had fallen from around 440 a day prior to the introduction of the CPZ scheme to around 300-340 a day. He asserted that the main cause of this was due to the introduction of the CPZ.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 6.

(iii) **Petition for Parking Facilities in Robson Avenue, NW10**

This petition, submitted by local residents, stated that:-

“We want Brent Council to take action to resolve the traffic problems in Robson Avenue by the Willesden Centre for Health Care. There are particular problems in parking for visitors to Brent Association of Disabled People (BADP).

We want the Council to:

- Introduce disabled parking bays outside the BADP premises on

- Robson Avenue
- Introduce a Pay & Display meter for visitors to BADP and Willesden Centre for Health Care.”

A report regarding this petition appears under item 8 in the agenda.

Councillor Jones, speaking as ward councillor and representing the views of the petitioners, supported the recommendations in the report and stated that if implemented it would assist visitors to the Willesden Centre for Health Care and also to the Millennium Centre.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition were made under Item 6.

#### 5. **Petition Against the Kilburn Streets for People Scheme**

Josie Warshaw, representing residents and the Brent Eleven Streets (BEST) Residents' Association in support of the scheme, stated that the consultation had shown clear majority support for the proposals. With the agreement of the Chair, Josie Warshaw circulated a written submission to Members in support of the scheme. She explained that the scheme would help meet BEST Resident's Association's objectives and improve the environment, including increasing green spaces, the planting of trees in Post Box Square, and improving pedestrian safety through speed restrictions and improved surfaces. Josie Warshaw added that residents also supported the introduction of large bins at both ends of St Julian's Road.

Gavin Finney, also speaking in support of the scheme and as a member of BEST Residents' Association, commented that there had been a widespread consultation which had included questionnaires being sent to residents and drop-in sessions for residents at a public exhibition. He highlighted that the consultation had shown majority support for the scheme and he felt that the concerns raised by the petition had been addressed in the report.

Councillor Arnold spoke in her capacity as a ward councillor and to represent the views of the BEST Residents' Association. She stated that although the petition had raised a few issues, the scheme should be taken as a whole as it covered a large area and would be of significant benefit to the area overall. With regard to the consultation, Councillor Arnold commented that the website set up by BEST Residents' Association was an additional way by which residents could express their views and that every effort had been made to engage residents during the 2 consultation exercises that were undertaken and the scheme had majority support from residents.

Councillor Dunn, speaking in his capacity as a ward councillor stated that much work had been done to ensure that the consultation was comprehensive and that BEST Residents' Association had played their part in this. Councillor Dunn expressed support for the scheme's implementation, however he felt there were a few issues raised in the petition that needed to be addressed, such as the future of the cherry trees in Post Box Square and he suggested that there be one more consultation undertaken with local residents with regard to the future of the Square.

The Committee considered written submissions in support of the scheme from Mr D Booth and family, Simon Rogers, Andrea Chappell and Sharon Thomas that was circulated to Members.

Peter Boddy (Team Leader, Traffic Management, Transportation Unit) introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the 2 rounds of consultation that had been undertaken showing support for the scheme. Following approval of the scheme on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2008, a petition was received from Dawn Reidy against the scheme and making a number of requests. Peter Boddy then outlined some of the responses to the petition, which included the tidying up of Glengall Passage, upgrading its lighting, renewal of its surface and the installation of a CCTV camera on Priory Park Road to cover Glengall Passage. The alleyway next to Ryde House was to be repaved whilst options with regard to the request for the bins to be removed permanently from St Julian's Road had been subject to consultation, with majority support to retain them, however this issue would continue to be monitored. With regard to trees in the area, there had been considerable discussion with residents with approximately 150 new semi-mature trees to be planted, 20 of which would be in or close to Post Box Square. Members noted that the 2 cherry trees in Post Box Square were to be removed as they were causing damage to the surrounding footway, whilst other trees found to be diseased would also be removed.

During discussion by Committee, Councillor Blackman commented that the photographs of the cherry trees in Post Box Square provided by Dawn Reidy appeared to show the trees in good condition and he enquired what specific damage were the trees causing. He welcomed the planting of new trees to the area and felt that existing trees should be preserved wherever possible, with diseased trees replaced with their equivalent. Councillor Blackman felt that overall the scheme would improve the area, however he felt there were still some concerns and he enquired if any other measures could be considered to address the petitioners' concerns, such as the loss of parking spaces and Councillor Dunn's suggestions with regard to the future of Post Box Square.

The Chair also sought further details with regard to the situation concerning the 2 cherry trees in Post Box Square and what other action could be taken in response to the petition.

In reply, Peter Boddy advised Members that the damage caused to the footway by the 2 cherry trees in Post Box Square was severe and these trees were also assessed to be in poor condition and were not likely to live for much longer. Steering group meetings with regard the future of trees had discussed the cherry trees in question and had decided it was not viable for them to remain. Members heard that 25 trees were due to be felled and that up to 8 more may also be, following an assessment of their condition.

Irfan Malik (Assistant Director [Streets and Transportation] Environment and Culture) advised that there was a policy on maintaining trees and a tree replacement programme was in place. The policy included the removal of mature trees from narrow streets or those that were diseased, damaged or dying. Although the cherry trees may appear to be in sound condition, Irfan Malik informed Members that the advice of the Council's horticultural officer would be taken with regard to their condition and Members heard that the new trees would flower quickly and be of robust girth.

Members then agreed to an additional recommendation moved by the Chair that a proportion of new trees, to be determined by officers, be cherry trees to compensate for the loss of cherry trees in Post Box Square.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petition and the issues it raised be noted;
- (ii) that it be agreed to continue with the implementation of the scheme and advise the petitioner accordingly; and
- (iii) that a proportion, to be determined by officers, of new trees to be planted be cherry trees to compensate for the loss of the cherry trees at Post Box Square.

## 6. **Controlled Parking Zones Programme – Progress Report**

Taher Chaudhary (Senior Engineer, Transportation Unit) introduced the report and advised that with regard to the Church Road petition, that the Executive had agreed a policy in 13<sup>th</sup> November 2006 that there be no extension of existing free parking areas or the creation of new free parking areas. With regard to the Robson Avenue petition, he confirmed that 2 pay and display parking bays and 2 disabled parking bays would be provided in this road.

The Chair advised Members that the Preston Road Pay and Display Parking scheme was now not going ahead contrary to what was included in the report and its funds would be reallocated elsewhere.

During discussion, Councillor Blackman queried why the Pay and Display Parking scheme in Harrow Road was going ahead despite majority opposition to it in the consultation. He felt that the scheme was unfair to small businesses in the road as it would dissuade shoppers from coming to the area, especially in light of the economic circumstances, whilst larger businesses invariably were able to provide free parking. Councillor Blackman commented that the free parking available along this road and also Preston Road and Bridge Road had helped businesses maintain customers and this would be undermined by a pay and display scheme. Councillor Detre stated that every effort should be made to assist secondary shopping centres in the Borough and free parking for a short period for customers outside or near smaller businesses should be provided to enable them to compete with larger businesses. He concurred with Councillor Blackman that the free parking in Preston Road had helped businesses in this road. Councillor Wharton sought further details as to the situation in Harrow Road and who was consulted about the proposed pay and display scheme.

The Chair, in noting that there was majority opposition to the pay and display scheme in Harrow Road in the consultation, enquired whether those consulted were mainly shopkeepers.

In reply, Taher Chaudhary advised that a bus lane was in operation in front of the shops in Harrow Road which had been of concern to local businesses. However, the availability of a pay and display scheme would allow the bays to be used at certain times and prevent visitors from using the bays for long periods. He confirmed that the area consulted was not part of a CPZ scheme and that it comprised of ground floor shops, with all those consulted being from these shops. Irfan Malik added that cycle stands would be included in the Harrow Road pay and display scheme. Members heard that some businesses in Harrow Road had been maintaining a monopoly of particular bays and the proposed scheme would address this issue. Irfan Malik advised that there was also ample parking available behind the shops although regrettably some businesses were guilty of using the space for dumping purposes which needed to be addressed. However, overall the scheme would be an improvement to the present situation.

Councillor Blackman moved that the Bridge Road pay and display scheme be withdrawn from the programme. This was put to the vote and declared lost. Members then agreed to Councillor Blackman's suggestion that recommendation 2.3 in the report seeking authorisation of a pay and display scheme in Harrow Road be withdrawn from the programme.

#### RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the outcome of the consultation with residents living near zone HY, that asked whether they would like to be included in zone HY extension as detailed in item 3.3 and Appendix A of the report be

noted and that Conley Road and Essex Road be included in the existing CPZ Zone HY, and that the following streets be included in a separate zone because of separate geographic boundaries; Fawcett Road, Fortunegate Road, St Thomas's Road, Tunley Road, Glynfield Road and Norfolk Road;

- (ii) that the outcome of the consultation on zone GA CPZ review detailed in item 3.4 and Appendix B of the report be noted and that the new operational times of Monday to Friday, 10am to 3pm be approved;
- (iii) that the proposed CPZ programme for the 2009/10 financial year as detailed in the table in 3.7 of the report, with the exception of the Harrow Road (Westside) north of the North Circular Road Pay and Display and Preston Road Pay and Display Parking Schemes, be approved for implementation;
- (iv) that the petition as detailed in item 3.1 of the report, submitted by residents of Church Road, NW10 be noted and that it be agreed that adequate parking facilities have been provided by the provision of pay and display parking;
- (v) that the petition as detailed in item 3.2 of the report, submitted by residents of Robson Avenue, NW10 be noted and that Transportation Unit be instructed under delegated authority to install pay and display parking and 2 disabled bays, for visitors to the Brent Association of Disabled People (BADP) and Willesden Centre for Health Care; and
- (vi) 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.

#### **7. Implementation of Short Sections of Loading and Waiting Restrictions (SSWR) Schemes within the Borough**

Members considered the report seeking approval for implementation of the Council's ongoing Short Sections of Loading and Waiting Restrictions Programme for 2008/09 and subsequent years.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that it be affirmed that the Transportation Unit carry out both informal and statutory consultation on the proposed schemes as detailed in the report;

- (ii) that the criteria as set out in Appendix 2 of the report used in the assessment of locations where SSWR are requested be approved; and
- (iii) 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.

#### **8. Transport for London (TfL) Capital Approved Programme 2009/10**

Phil Rankmore (Head of Special Projects, Transportation Unit) introduced the report and confirmed that TfL funding allocation for the Capital Approved Programme for 2009/10 was £5,261,000.

Councillor Blackman commented that there were some schemes, such as the Kingsbury Road Local Safety Scheme and some bus priority schemes which raised a number of issues and concerns. He suggested that consultation with the relevant ward members commence at an early stage before any action was taken.

Phil Rankmore advised that there was only 12 months to prepare designs for the schemes, nevertheless every effort would be made to facilitate the consultation process and to consult with ward councillors as early as possible.

#### **RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the TfL Capital allocation of £5,261,000, some additional funding secured outside of the (annual) Funding Application process, as well as further funding allocated to Brent through Strategic Partnerships including the Park Royal Partnership (PRP), the West London Transport Partnership (*WestTrans*) and the North Orbital Rail Partnership (NORP) be noted;
- (ii) that the Director of Transportation, subject to compliance with the Council's contract standing orders and financial regulations, be instructed to implement the schemes set out in the report and ensure their delivery using the allocated budget and resources; and
- (iii) that the Director of Transportation be authorised to undertake any necessary non-statutory and statutory consultation, to consider any objections or representations and to implement the necessary traffic management orders if there are no objections or representations, or if he considers the objections or representations are groundless or insignificant and

otherwise to refer objections or representations to the Committee for further consideration.

## 9. Kingsbury Road – Local Safety Scheme

Peter Boddy introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the consultation that had been undertaken. The Committee heard that consultation documents and questionnaires were sent electronically to Fryent and Queensbury ward councillors and it was noted that in future Transportation consultations, paper copies would also be sent to ward councillors. The public consultation of the scheme resulted in a 20% response rate, with 58% in favour and 39% opposed to the proposals. Following a petition received from residents of Valley Farm Estate against the scheme, a meeting was held with the lead petitioner Julia Day, ward councillors J Moher and R Moher and Gary Pidgeon, Metropolitan Police Sergeant for the Fryent Safer Neighbourhood Team on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2008 and a subsequent review of the proposals was undertaken. As a result of concerns made and the review, some amendments to the scheme were made to address the concerns raised, including space for 2 lanes of traffic on the westbound side of Kingsbury Road from the stretch between just before Old Kenton Lane to the junction with Valley Drive, introducing a right turn into Valley Drive from Kingsbury Road and a review of street lighting along Kingsbury Road. Members heard that the scheme was supported by PC Colin Ponsford, Police Liaison Officer to the Council and representing the official view of the Metropolitan Police.

Peter Boddy continued that following the scheme's approval by the Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009, the item was subsequently called-in for consideration by the Forward Plan Select Committee, whose recommendations to re-consider and re-consult the scheme were put before the Executive who subsequently resolved not to refer the scheme back to the Highways Committee. The item was then raised at an Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2009, which agreed a motion put forward by Councillor J Moher that the Highways Committee reconsider the proposals which were considered deficient and to come back with new proposals. Peter Boddy reiterated that it was recommended that the decisions by the Highways Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009 be reaffirmed and that implementation be allowed to continue.

The Chair then invited ward councillors to address the Committee. Councillor R Moher, speaking in her capacity as a ward councillor, began by asserting that similar schemes in the borough had not been effective in reducing vehicles speeds or overtaking and drivers would not be deterred from driving over painted road markings. She felt that the effectiveness of similar existing schemes should be closely monitored prior to introducing such a scheme to Kingsbury Road. With regard to the consultation, Councillor R Moher felt that greater emphasis on residents' views was required and that a re-consultation of the scheme should be undertaken taking on board their feedback. With regard to accidents, Councillor R

Moher suggested that if this was such a problem along Kingsbury Road that consideration should be given to introducing speed cameras.

Councillor J Moher, speaking in his capacity as ward councillor, felt that the nature and number of accidents did not justify a safety scheme of this sort, stating that in the 3 years between 2005 and 2008, there had not been more than 20 accidents and most were not speed related. He felt that the extent of the consultation was insufficient as it had only included approximately 100 residents with only around 30 responding and he claimed that over 1,000 residents' views, including those on Valley Farm, had been ignored. He felt that modifications made to the scheme after meetings with Valley Drive residents proved that this road would be affected by the scheme despite assertions that it would not be. In light of a number of concerns raised by residents with regard to the proposals, he stressed that there should be a re-consultation of the scheme and that such was the strength of feeling, that the Government and Transport for London (TfL) would be approached if the scheme was agreed. Councillor J Moher also questioned whether the scheme could be withdrawn, as elements to the scheme were already in the process of being implemented, although this had not included changing road markings which he stressed should not be completed.

Councillor Crane, speaking in his capacity as ward councillor, felt that the proposals were based on flawed and insufficient information, particularly in view of what he felt was a limited consultation in the context that the scheme would impact upon a wider area. He acknowledged that there were some safety concerns, however he felt that the measures proposed were not the most appropriate to address these. Councillor Crane stated that a significant number of ward councillors, as well as residents, felt that the scheme should be reconsidered and a re-consultation should be undertaken so that a new scheme could be proposed.

Councillor Mistry, speaking in her capacity as ward councillor, also felt that not enough residents had been consulted and that more emphasis should be placed on their views. Referring to Fryent Way where a 40mph speed limit with similar road markings to the scheme's proposals were in place, she stated that she had personally been overtaken in an unsafe manoeuvre by another vehicle and she felt that Kingsbury Road would encounter similar problems. She felt that the proposals would not meet their objectives and that the area would benefit from introducing newer methods of traffic management, adding that the large festivals held at Roe Green Park would exacerbate the level of traffic in Kingsbury Road and represent a significant danger.

Councillor Dunwell, speaking in his capacity as a ward councillor, stated that he had carried out his own detailed research on this issue and was concerned about some of the technical aspects of the scheme and that this scheme would not be appropriate for this area. He felt that the narrowing of Kingsbury Road would not meet its objectives but would cause

considerable further congestion to the road and he suggested that the scheme should not go ahead as proposed.

Members then considered the report and the issues raised by ward councillors. Councillor Detre commented that on balance the scheme would not necessarily benefit motorists, suggesting that the scheme may prevent around 2 accidents per year but at the cost of adding to congestion for a large number of drivers, including those who lived locally and outsiders. He suggested that an additional recommendation be added to review and re-assess the scheme by around November 2009 if implemented.

Councillor Blackman commented that the scheme would directly affect Valley Drive residents as it was bounded by both Kingsbury Road and Fryent Way. He felt that there were already a number of traffic schemes in the area, such as the one in Kingsbury Town Centre and that by introducing another there was a danger that this would confuse motorists. He therefore suggested that a more comprehensive scheme encompassing a wider area from Kingsbury Road through to Edgware Road would be more appropriate. Councillor Blackman referred to the hatch lines on Preston Road, commenting that drivers tended to ignore these after dark, driving over them and speeding and therefore he did not think these would be effective for this scheme either. In addition, drivers would be heavily inconvenienced during peak hours. Councillor Blackman also felt that some of the junctions, such as the one with Valley Drive, were unsafe and the introduction of traffic lights should be considered and residents should be consulted on this as such a measure would allow drivers to access Kingsbury Road from Valley Drive. Councillor Blackman also sought confirmation of the contractual situation, how much funding had already been spent and what were the implications if the scheme was refused.

Councillor Wharton commented that Valley Drive residents had been consulted about the scheme through their residents' association who had also met with officers and ward councillors. He felt that the revisions made to the scheme as a result of these meetings largely addressed the residents' concerns. Councillor Wharton commented that there was no clear argument to show that the scheme was flawed or would raise safety issues, whilst he also did not think that the scheme would inconvenience drivers and he felt the measures would be sufficient to reduce vehicle speeds. He indicated his approval of Councillor Detre's suggestion with regard to reviewing the scheme.

Councillor Matthews stressed the importance of ensuring public safety and enquired of the implications to the Council if the scheme did not go ahead and there was a subsequently a serious accident in Kingsbury Road. The Chair sought confirmation that the consultation followed standard procedures that had been adopted by the Highways Committee since 2003. He also enquired about the effectiveness of similar schemes in the Borough.

In response to the issues raised, Phil Rankmore, advised Members that a well-established consultation policy was in place that was adhered to during the consultation for the Kingsbury Road Local Safety Scheme. The policy included a number of guidelines on different types of schemes depending on their nature. In the case of a local safety scheme, although the views of residents are regarded as important, the need to adhere to Government directives and to address safety concerns was necessary. In addition, some of the residents who were against the scheme actually supported a number of the measures it contained, especially in assisting pedestrians to safely cross the road and the scheme was not dissimilar to other schemes in the borough. Phil Rankmore advised that reducing the road to 1 lane each way was not anticipated to cause significantly longer journey times. He felt that sufficient turning space had been required for left hand turns into Valley Drive from Kings Road, although carriage lines could also be introduced if deemed necessary through monitoring.

Phil Rankmore confirmed that the scheme had received TfL funding for 2008/09 with the expectation that funds would be used to reduce speeds on Kingsbury Road and that it would not be beneficial to the Council's relationship with TfL, which to date had been excellent, if the scheme did not proceed. In addition, the Council would be liable for costs to the contractor for the consultation undertaken, the works that had already been undertaken and the withdrawing of these works. It was not clear whether TfL would accept a claim of funding for aborted works and non-deliverance of the scheme. Phil Rankmore explained that funding was provided on a cost/benefit analysis, with the prevention of a fatality, as well as saving human life, being valued at £1.3m a person which would represent savings such as health and medical care costs. Members heard that no funding was available in 2009/10 for a safety scheme in Kingsbury Road and that the present scheme must be completed in 2008/09. The earliest that funding could be obtained for an alternative scheme would be 2010/11. Members were advised that bids for funding to TfL could be made in respect of junction improvement programmes and studies could conclude with suggesting a number of options, such as traffic signals although consultation with residents would be required. Phil Rankmore advised that a review of the scheme to assess its effectiveness could be undertaken after a 6 month period of operation.

Irfan Malik warned that a more comprehensive scheme could be more problematic in obtaining widespread agreement amongst residents and could result in no scheme being implemented. He advised that a more localised scheme was more appropriate in this instance, especially as safety was a high Council priority which had the highest accident reduction rate of all London boroughs. With regard to hatch lines, Irfan Malik commented that most drivers respected these and reduced their speed, adding that there would always be a very small element of drivers who would breach these and the police were responsible for enforcement action. He reaffirmed that funding had been provided for the scheme as it met TfL criteria and that this money would be withdrawn if not spent in

2008/09. Irfan Malik also warned that any expense incurred by the Council as a result of withdrawal of the scheme would have to be paid using the funds from the Major Works Programme.

Members then agreed an additional recommendation moved by Councillor Detre to review and re-assess the scheme to be reported back to the Committee around November 2009.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (i) that the previous decision made by the Highways Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2009 to implement the Kingsbury Road Local Safety Scheme be reaffirmed and the implementation be allowed to continue; and
- (ii) that a report reviewing, monitoring and reassessing the scheme after 6 months of operation be considered by the Highways Committee (around November 2009).

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Highways Committee would be confirmed at the Council meeting in May 2009.

**11. Any Other Urgent Business**

There was none.

The meeting ended at 9.08 pm.

D BROWN  
Chair