



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE Monday 20 October 2014 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Butt (Chair), Councillor Mashari (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Denselow, McLennan and Moher

Also present: Councillors S Choudhary, A Choudry, Filson, Hirani, Jones, Long, Mahmood, Miller, Perrin and Krupa Sheth

Apologies for absence were received from: Councillors

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

None.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 17 July 2014 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. Matters arising

None.

4. Deputations

None.

5. Petition objecting to the proposed parking restriction changes in zone MA

Members considered a report that informed of a petition received from the Shree Swaminarayan Temple objecting to the proposed amendments to parking restrictions in zone MA controlled parking zone (CPZ). Tony Antoniou (Head of Transportation) set out the background that led to the proposals as outlined in paragraph 4.8 of the report and following which the Temple representatives submitted the petitions. He explained the measures officers had taken to resolve the situation including reassuring representatives that the proposals would not be progressed without further consultation, and that further meetings would be arranged to discuss parking issues. Additionally proposals would be developed for changes to parking restrictions that would be acceptable to the Temple and residents association.

Members noted and endorsed the successful partnership working arrangement between officers and the Temple representatives which would ensure that the interests of both the Temple and the local residents were not compromised.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the petition and the results of officers investigations into parking issues in the area be noted;
- (ii) that officers be instructed to progress with the informal and statutory consultation of the proposed no waiting 'at any time' restrictions (double yellow lines) at all junctions within the MA zone, and to change the existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines in Willesden Lane from the junction of Deerpark Road to the northwest side of the Willesden Lane, and on Lydford Road between Chatsworth Road and Dartford Road;
- (iii) that officers be instructed to abandon the previous proposals to extend the parking restrictions in Chatsworth Road and to continue to meet with Temple representatives and local residents to develop solutions to parking issues that are acceptable to all parties.
- (iv) that subject to the outcome of further informal and statutory consultation and consideration of objections and representations, the Head of Transportation be instructed to amend the necessary Traffic Management Orders and implement amendments to parking restrictions using delegated authority, or to report back to the Highways committee if objections are substantial;
- (v) that officers continue to liaise with the Temple on temporary traffic management and parking arrangements for religious events and assist in developing and/or reviewing their travel Plan;
- (vi) that the main petitioner be informed of the outcome of the Highways Committee decision in regard to this matter.

6. Petition - CCTV parking and traffic enforcement at Willesden Green

Mr Tony Antonio MBE, Chair of Willesden Green Traders Association (the Association) addressed the Committee. On behalf of the Association, he alleged that CCTV cameras based by Scout House on the High Road Willesden and at the junction of High Road Dudden Hill Lane were being misused. He continued that the traders believed that the cameras were installed for crime prevention purposes but were now being used for parking offences. Mr Antoniou MBE added that their suppliers and customers were receiving an increased volume of penalty charge notices (PCN) when parking, resulting in loss of shoppers and increasingly damaging businesses on the Willesden High Road which were already badly suffering due to recession. He therefore requested that the CCTV cameras be used for crime prevention purposes only and not for parking.

Mr Kalyan Patel (local resident) also addressed the Committee. He echoed the views expressed on behalf of the traders association adding that all PCNs issued to shoppers to the High Road be withdrawn. Mr Patel also requested a 15 to 20

minute free parking for shoppers except during the busy hours of 08.30 – 09.30pm and 4.30 – 7.00pm after which times traffic enforcement could take place.

Both Mr Antoniou MBE and Mr Kalyan Patel were thanked for their addresses.

Michael Read (Operational Director, Environment and Neighbourhood) introduced the report. He stated the Council used a variety of methods to bring about parking and traffic compliance in the borough, including Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) deployment, removal truck deployment, mobile CCTV deployment, and CCTV officer deployment (located in the Council's CCTV Enforcement Room in the Civic Centre). Whilst consultation was undertaken prior to the introduction of the CPZ, there was no statutory requirement for the Council to consult on the use of CCTV or signage at any specific location. He emphasised that the principal use of the cameras was for prevention of crime and public safety and that the process of parking and traffic enforcement was secondary.

The Operational Director continued that parking restrictions in the High Road were designed to keep the traffic, including buses, flowing on a busy main road and to protect vulnerable pedestrians from being forced into the road by parking on the footway. 62% of the offences detected by these two cameras were for parking on yellow lines and 36% were for parking on the footway. He added that the intention was to get motorists to behave responsibly, not to raise cash. He then outlined some of the measures put in place to assist shoppers and local trade which included visitor parking bays and since last year, a low cost short stay tariff (20p for 15 minutes) to help people who wanted to stop for a "drop-in" transaction.

Councillor Tom Miller (ward member) stated that it was good practice to consult with the traders and raise awareness by considering additional signage in the High Road. Councillor Miller also requested a period of grace to allow motorists to park.

Councillor Hirani (ward member) echoed the views expressed by Councillor Miller adding that the grace period could be introduced except for rush hour traffic hours.

During the ensuing discussion, members welcomed the fact that the primary and principal purpose of the CCTV camera was for crime prevention and that traffic enforcement was of a secondary significance. Although they accepted that the threat of a CCTV camera was more effective as an enforcement tool to maintain the free flow of vehicles and counter the growing problem of fly tipping, they enquired as to whether officers could explore the possibility of additional signage.

In response, officers stated that whilst they could consider measures for additional signage, they felt that the introduction of parking grace period for specific locations could result in ambiguity for both parking enforcement officers and the general public and possibly parking displacement. Members heard that as Transport for London (TfL) would be keen to ensure that the free flow of buses on the High Road was not impeded, they would resist any attempts which would result in obstructive parking to the detriment of their services.

In bringing the discussion to an end, the Chair reiterated that the CCTV cameras were being used for legitimate purposes and that the principal aim was for community safety with traffic enforcement being of a secondary significance.

Members also heard that Councillor Mashari (lead member for Employment and Skills) would be meeting with the business community to discuss support for them.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the content of the petitions, set out in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.4, and the issues raised within it be noted;
- (ii) that it be noted that the use of CCTV for the purpose of enforcing parking contraventions in High Road, Willesden Green is appropriate, and that cameras were not being misused, as established through the investigations within the report;
- (iii) that the main petitioner be informed of the outcome of the Highways Committee report in respect of this matter;
- (iv) that officers review existing restrictions in the locality and opportunities for additional parking and loading facilities, with due consideration for road safety and traffic congestion;
- (v) that officers check existing signage and road markings, and consider whether any additional signage is necessary.

7. Petition for Road Improvements in Tanfield Avenue

Members considered a report that informed of a petition received in July 2014 from Residents in Tanfield Avenue requesting improvements to the road.

Mr Nadeem Khan speaking on behalf of Tanfield Avenue Residents' Association (TARA) stated that due to the volume, frequency and the weight of vehicles and buses using Tanfield Avenue, properties were suffering from vibrations resulting in damage to the structure of those properties and considerable distress to residents. He requested that the road be upgraded appropriately to the necessary depth to be able to cope with the current load and in order to prevent a recurrence, to introduce a 20mph speed limit with immediate effect. Mr Khan also requested financial recompense for all residents of Tanfield Avenue where damages to their properties were not covered by their household insurance policies. He undertook to provide photographic evidence in support of his request.

Mrs Harbuz also from TARA echoed the views expressed by Mr Khan adding that the speed humps in Tanfield Avenue were adding to the noise caused to residents and requested their removal.

Tony Antoniou (Head of Transportation) submitted that it was unlikely that structural damage could have been caused to properties in the way described by the representative of TARA. He referred to a report by the Department of Transport (DoT) which identified that properties within 5 metres may notice vibrations but there were no other risks posed to those properties. He continued that most of the properties in Tanfield Avenue were about 8 metres away from the road. The Head of Transportation informed members that the road was inspected for potholes which had all been repaired and that a section of Tanfield Avenue had been prioritised in a programme of works for resurfacing from the results of a condition survey. He

added that the issue of road humps would form part of the consultation on introducing a 20mph speed limit and road safety measures in the area in 2014/15 and 2015/16.

Members were advised that speed restrictions and maximum weight limit of 7.5 tonnes already applied, however there was a need to engage with TfL to ensure that their drivers exercised care when using the road not to exceed the speed limit. In responding to claims that buses exceeded the 7.5 tonne weight limit, the Head of Transportation clarified that the weight limit applied where the vehicle had no legitimate business in the area. Bus drivers however were within the category of carrying out legitimate business in the area.

Councillor Hirani (ward member) welcomed the pothole repairs but added that there was a need for the weight restriction and the new 20mph speed limit to be vigorously enforced. He urged a separate line of communication with TfL about their buses and the behaviour of their drivers.

Members welcomed officers' initiatives including the 7.5tonne weight and 20mph restrictions and the scheme for programmed repairs and urged officers to prioritise it. The Chair added that the issues raised including bus drivers' behaviour could be taken to the next meeting of Public Transport Liaison Committee and that on-site meetings would be organised.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that vibrations arising from the general construction and condition of the highway were considered unlikely to be the cause of structural damage and problems to adjacent properties and rejected the petition;
- (ii) that the combined actions and planned measures described in the report to mitigate the issues of noise and vibration from the typical traffic levels and road condition that are evident in Tanfield Avenue be noted;
- (iii) that it be noted that a short section of approximately 50 metres in length and the full width of the road outside properties nos. 26 to 38 was identified via a condition assessment to contain defects that contribute to noise and vibration and that resurfacing of this section was programmed for completion in autumn 2014.
- (iv) that it be noted that Tanfield Avenue was in a 7.5 tonnes weight restricted area, which had been identified for periodic traffic enforcement involving CCTV camera equipped vehicles and thus there was no requirement to install CCTV.
- (v) that it be noted that Transport for London (TfL) were responsible for London's safety camera programme. Their Surface Planning Team liaise with representatives from the boroughs on improvements to existing sites, identification of new sites and decommissioning sites, where it was agreed that cameras were no longer required.
- (vi) that it be noted that TFL applied stringent prioritisation criteria to determine which sites would have speed cameras installed. There must have been a

minimum of 4 killed or seriously injured (KSI) collisions in a three year period, and at least 2 of these must have been identified in accident reports as being a result of speeding. There have been no reported personal injury accidents in Tanfield Avenue for the 3 year period up until the end of April 2014, therefore a speed camera would not be justified.

- (vii) that a letter would be sent to TfL highlighting the need for bus drivers to be mindful of noise and appropriate speeds when travelling along Tanfield Avenue.
- (viii) that officers should arrange on site meeting with TfL, bus operators and residents to reinforce need for bus driver speed to be moderated;
- (ix) that officers develop a plan for the enforcement of the 7.5 tonne weight restriction in the area.

8. **Quietway Pilot: Regents Park to Gladstone Park**

Members received a report that introduced the proposed pilot Quietway cycle route in Brent from Regents Park to Gladstone Park which was being undertaken by Sustrans working with Transport for London (TfL), the Cycling Commissioner and Boroughs to produce a Route Delivery Plan for each of the 8 selected pilot routes of the Quietway programme. The current programme envisaged delivery by 2016.

Tony Antoniou (Head of Transportation) informed members that Quietways were part of the Mayor of London's Cycling Vision to provide a network of routes on safer, lower-traffic back streets, aimed at new and less confident cyclists. They would be routes where people would want to cycle, by providing direct and comfortable journeys to key destinations across London, using parks and green spaces where suitable. Members attention were drawn to the proposed pilot route through Brent, shown in Appendix A. It would start at Regent's Park and connect to a proposed network of cycling-friendly routes in Central London being developed as the 'Central London Grid'. It would then pass through the London Borough of Camden into Brent, finishing at Gladstone Park near to Neasden and Dollis Hill underground stations. As part of the proposed scheme, interventions would be developed at various junctions (as set out in the report) to improve safety for cyclists, subject to public consultation and final GLA and TfL approval. The Head of Transportation confirmed that fundamental elements of the pilot included improvements for pedestrians and cyclists access to parks.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (ii) that the route of the proposed Quietway through Brent be agreed;
- (iii) that the scheme be continued to detailed design and consultation;
- (iv) that the Head of Transportation be authorised to undertake any necessary statutory and non-statutory consultation and consider any objections or representations regarding the proposed Quietway route and interventions. If there are no objections or representations, or the Head of Transportation

considers the objections or representations are groundless or insignificant, the Head of Transportation is authorised to deliver the scheme. Otherwise, the Head of Transportation is authorised to refer objections or representations to the Highways Committee for further consideration.

9. Stanmore to Thames cycle route

Members received a report that introduced the proposed cycle route in Brent developed by WestTrans from Stanmore to Thames (Kew Bridge). The route planning was being coordinated WestTrans as it stretched across four boroughs (Harrow, Brent, Ealing and Hounslow) and was being developed using the Mayor of London's Quietway principals.

Tony Antoniou (Head of Transportation) informed members that following approval of the report, Transport for London (TfL) would commence detailed design work and apply for funding under the Quietways programme. Members heard that as part of the detailed design of the scheme, interventions would be developed at a number of junctions and conflict points along the route, subject to public consultation and final GLA and TfL approval. Signage would also be provided at key locations (such as intersections) and at regular intervals along the route to ensure legibility for riders. Members noted that funding had not yet been secured from TfL for implementation

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the contents of the report be noted;
- (ii) that the proposed route through Brent be approved in principle subject to consultation by Transport for London with assistance from Brent;
- (iii) that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Transportation to implement the scheme through Brent subject to the outcomes of the consultation and funding being secured.

10. Any Other Urgent Business

None.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Noted that the next meeting would take place on 22 January 2015.

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm

M BUTT
Chair