



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 17 July 2012 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor J Moher (Chair), and Councillors Beswick, Jones and Long

Also present: Councillors Cheese, Chohan, Hashmi, Kansagra and BM Patel

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillor Powney

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

None declared.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 March 2012 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to the following corrections:

Item 7, fourth paragraph, eighth line – amend the word ‘compromising’ to read ‘comprising’,

Item 11, fourth paragraph, first sentence to read “In relation to the shared space element within option B, the Chair invited Mr Tom Reid to speak on behalf of the Brent Association of Disabled People. He highlighted traffic movement, including bicycles.

Item 11, fourth paragraph, second sentence – amend the word ‘bends’ to read ‘benches’,

Item 11, fifth paragraph, first sentence to read ‘Mr Paul David, representing the National Federation of the Blind, also opposed and other objects’,

Item 11, ninth paragraph to read – ‘Councillor Beswick welcomed the proposals, a view shared by Councillor Jones. Councillor Powney also welcomed the proposals but requested officers to revisit the use of dog mess bins specifically and rubbish collection in the town centre in general. Councillor Long stated that officers had not consulted the Brent Association of Disabled People (BADP) on option B, which consisted of a shared space/pedestrian priority area in the High Street, Harlesden between Jubilee Clock and Tavistock Road. John Dryden referred to the key comments and engineer recommendations and added that further dialogue on the design of the scheme would continue with all interested parties, including BADP. The Chair reiterated that the design of the shared space/pedestrian priority had not

been decided on as yet and that should option B be progressed, the design would be finalised with the Town Centre Team and disability groups. Councillor Long moved to formally instruct officers to carry out further consultation on the disabled parking provision and the shared space element within option B. This was voted upon and declared lost. Councillor Long asked for her dissent to be recorded’.

3. **Matters arising**

Willesden Junction station access road and Wembley Central station issues

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation, stated that, whilst Willesden Junction access road was not in Brent, it affected many Brent residents walking to and from the station. The Council had offered to contribute towards the funding of a much larger scheme and Transport for London was expressing some optimism that a scheme could be agreed, but this was still a matter for on-going negotiation.

David McKibbin reported that he understood the problem of water egress onto the station platforms at Wembley Central Station had been solved. He hoped this was a permanent solution but would continue to monitor the situation.

4. **Deputations (if any)**

None.

5. **Petitions**

5.1 Petition: parking controls outside Islamia School, Salusbury Road

Representatives of the school outlined the main issues behind the petition submitted which expressed how unhappy parents were regarding the parking problems outside the school. It was felt that, on a daily basis parents had to go through a challenge to find parking in order to get their children to school. Assurances were given that the school was prepared to continue to work on producing a school travel plan but parents were feeling that their needs were not being met. It was pointed out that the Parent School Association did not condone illegal parking but they were asking for limited dispensation from parking restrictions around the school during the time that parents collected their children. Mrs Nur Enver, PSA chairperson, added that many parents had 3 or 4 children they needed to drop off and collect and many had to use their cars because they did not live close to the school. She pointed out that the school did not have the usual yellow zig zag markings outside it and this created a danger to the safety of the children.

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation, responded that some of the points raised at the meeting went beyond the content of the petition. The zig zag markings were a safety issue rather than a traffic management issue and would be considered separately. He submitted that the issues facing the school were not unusual for many schools in Brent and one of the many reasons why efforts were made to encourage sustainable transport. In the meantime it had been identified that there was a serious problem with illegal parking taking place around the school. Parking was available on a paid basis. He referred to the request for assistance in purchasing a school bus for which the Council did not

have the funds but, as part of the school travel plan process, may be able to provide the school with some advice. He hoped the plan could be more strongly supported by the school.

David McKibbin introduced the report submitted to the Committee that responded to the issues raised in the petition.

Members of the committee asked about the prospects for the school purchasing a bus, car sharing, walking buses and public transport links. It was recognised that whilst it might not be commercially viable for one school to purchase a bus, it might be possible to work with other schools in the area to raise funds and share costs. There appeared scope to increase the amount of car sharing and walking buses had proved successful with some schools. The public bus links were good and cycling could be more actively encouraged.

David Thrall, Head of Service, Safer Streets, responded to accusations that parking restrictions around the school were being over-zealously enforced. He explained that between 15 June and 6 July, 20 schools had been visited and 1276 vehicle movements recorded, of which 1120 were compliant. Only two parking tickets had been issued but he stated such surveys would continue around the borough in order to deter illegal parking.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the petition and issues raised be noted;
- (ii) that the course of action taken so far by officers from the Environment and Neighbourhood Services Department, as outlined in the report submitted, be noted and continue to be pursued.

5.2 Petition: footpath in Regal Way rather than only the section between Preston Hill and Westward Way

Councillor Kansagra spoke on behalf of Councillors Colwill and BM Patel in supporting the views of some local residents in Regal Way who had petitioned the Council for the pavements along the whole length of the road to be upgraded. Whilst understanding the rationale used to prioritise highway repairs, he asked whether, if the condition survey had treated the whole of Regal Way as one section, it would have scored high enough to be included in this year's programme. If not, he urged that the remaining length of Regal Way be included in next year's programme because where the upgraded length joined the length not upgraded it created an unsightly street scene.

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation introduced the report submitted which responded to the points raised in the petition. He drew attention to how the extremely limited funds available for footpath upgrades were allocated following a rigorous assessment of priority areas within the borough. If the whole of Regal Way was now to be upgraded this would approximately double the amount spent on the footway and funds for other schemes of a higher priority would consequently have to be withdrawn. In answer to a question from a member of the committee, David McKibbin confirmed that following inspection of the length

of Regal Way between Westward Way and Shaftesbury Avenue, a number of potential trip hazards had been repaired.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the petition and the issues raised be noted;
- (ii) that it be noted that the Highways Major Works programme was approved by the Executive on 23 April 2012;
- (iii) that the methodology used to determine which streets are prioritised and the reasons why the whole of Regal Way was not included be noted;
- (iv) that the decision not to include the whole of the footway in Regal Way in this year's highways programme be confirmed;
- (v) that it be noted that the condition of the section of footway in Regal Way from Westward Way to Shaftesbury Avenue will be included in the next annual condition survey for consideration to be included in a future programme and that the Council will continue to maintain this footway in a safe condition, in accordance with the Council's intervention levels.

5.3 Petition: parking restrictions and arrangements on Ealing Road

Linda Parmar introduced herself as representing businesses in Ealing Road. She presented the petition submitted by residents and traders concerning the level of charges imposed for parking and seeking more free parking. Linda Parmar submitted that the parking restrictions in the area were having a detrimental effect on businesses which were already struggling to survive. They relied on visitors being attracted to the area but due to the lack of parking and high charges for what parking was available, people were shopping elsewhere. She urged the Council to work with businesses and residents to address what she considered to now be a very grave situation before more businesses chose to close down and move elsewhere. She asked for a reduction in parking charges, the lifting of event day parking restrictions, dual use of parking bays, Sunday free parking, provision of a car park and lifting of the maximum two hour stay.

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation, responded by saying that some of the points raised at the meeting went beyond the terms of the petition submitted. He stated that the Council was aware of the many difficulties facing traders across the borough which were caused by many factors. David McKibbin introduced the report submitted which explained the background to the introduction of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) and responded to the points made in the petition. He reminded the committee that this was primarily a residential parking scheme that had been introduced following extensive consultation back in the 1990's. The charging levels were comparable to other areas of the borough and he was reluctant to suggest changes in response to the views of just the petitioners, hence the recommendation to review the zone by carrying out a full consultation exercise in about 18 months' time.

Councillor Beswick recognised that the petitioners would consider 18 months a long time to wait. He felt the situation in Ealing Road was in need of review both from

the trader's and resident's points of view and asked if the consultation could be brought forward. The Chair referred to a meeting he had attended to hear the concerns of local people and asked if any progress had been made on identifying a site for parking. In response David McKibbin stated that consideration could be given to bringing the consultation forward to the beginning of the 2013/14 programme. It was put to the meeting that a prime site for parking had been identified but that it was occupied by two properties which the Council would first need to buy.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the petition and the issues raised be noted and the lead petitioner informed of the decision of the Committee set out in (ii) below;
- (ii) that the response to the petition set out in the report submitted be noted and a review of the E CPZ operational hours be considered for inclusion in the 2013/14 CPZ work programme to be submitted for approval in due course.

5.4 Petition: 20mph zone into the Harrowdene Road area

Sue Saville, representing residents from the Harrowdene Road area, spoke in support of the petition submitted which objected to the proposed traffic plans for Harrowdene Road, Sudbury Avenue, Sylvester Road, Crawford Avenue and Copland Avenue. She submitted that the consultation carried out by the Council and detailed in the report submitted addressed two issues but only allowed residents to comment on one. She stated that a majority of residents were in favour of the proposed 20mph zone and vehicle weight restrictions but did not support the proposed number or positioning of speed reduction measures. She questioned the accident statistics used and said that details had not been sent to her as requested. As local residents, they were not aware of the number of accidents as presented. It was submitted that many householders had claimed not to have received the consultation documents and were not aware of what was proposed for the area. Whilst appreciating that the number of road humps had been reduced from that set out in the original proposals, it was felt that there were still too many. Sue Saville also stated that she was concerned that from the feedback she had received when discussing the proposals with the fire service and the ambulance service it appeared they were not aware of the proposals.

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation, confirmed that the emergency services were always consulted on such road safety schemes but undertook to check this had been done. He introduced the report submitted which informed members of the proposal to extend the existing 20mph zone to include the Harrowdene Road area and responded to the points raised in the petition. David McKibbin explained that there were stringent rules around introducing 20mph zones. Recent changes to these rules had allowed for a reduction in the number of road humps proposed for this scheme but any further reduction would lead to the scheme not being self-enforceable and therefore not viable. In light of the significant majority of residents responding to the consultation being in favour of the scheme, it was proposed to proceed with it.

In response to questions concerning the accident figures used, David McKibbin referred to the figures shown in paragraph 3.3 of the report submitted, although he

acknowledged that the measures now proposed may not have prevented the one fatality from occurring.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the results of the public consultation showing strong support for the proposals, the petition submitted against the proposals and the views expressed at the meeting be noted;
- (ii) that the review of the original proposals and the response to the concerns of the petitioners, as set out in the report submitted, be noted and the lead petitioner be informed of the exact accident statistics used to justify the scheme;
- (iii) that implementation of the amended proposals be approved, subject to confirmation that the emergency services were consulted;
- (iv) that subject to (iii) above, the advertising of the necessary traffic management orders towards implementing the amended proposals be approved;
- (v) that the Head of Transportation be delegated authority to consider objections and representations to statutory and other consultations undertaken on the scheme and to report back to Committee if those objections are substantial but otherwise implement the scheme with minor modifications if appropriate.

6. Recent success and future direction of cycling in Brent

David McKibbin, Interim Head of Highways and Transportation, introduced the report before the committee which outlined what the Council had achieved in relation to cycling, current work being carried out and proposals for the future. Whilst pleased to report the progress made, David McKibbin recognised there was still much to do.

The issue of the provision of cycle stands was raised and although new-build developments could insist on the provision of cycle stands it was pointed out that most people lived in properties that did not have any storage for cycles and this put them off buying one. The Chair stated that although more cycle stands were being provided the thrust of the programme was to reduce cycle related accidents.

RESOLVED:

- (i) that the overarching approach taken to improve the attractiveness and safety of cycling across Brent be noted;
- (ii) that the significant achievements the Council has made in reducing cycling related serious injuries and deaths on Brent roads be noted;
- (iii) that the details relating to three key cycling programmes in Brent; Brent Biking Borough, Bike-it and Cycle Training/Travel Awareness be noted.

7. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

8. **Date of Next Meeting**

Noted on 11 October 2012.

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm

J MOHER
Chair