

LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

At an **EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL** of the **LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT** held at Brent Town Hall Forty Lane, Wembley, Middlesex on **Monday, 2nd March 2009** at **8.43pm**

PRESENT:

The Worshipful the Mayor
Councillor Fox

The Deputy Mayor
Councillor O'Sullivan

COUNCILLORS:

Ahmed	John
Allie	Jones
Anwar	Joseph
Arnold	Kansagra
Mrs Bacchus	Leaman
Baker	J Long
Bessong	Lorber
Beswick	Malik
Blackman	Matthews
D Brown	Mendoza
V Brown	Mistry
Butt	J Moher
Castle	R Moher
Chavda	Moloney
Clues	Motley
Colwill	Pagnamenta
Corcoran	CJ Patel
Coughlin	H B Patel
Crane	H M Patel
Cummins	Powney
Detre	Shah
Dunn	Ms C Shaw
Dunwell	Singh
Farrell	Sneddon
Mrs U Fernandes	Tancred
Green	Thomas
Hashmi	Van Colle
Hirani	Van Kalwala
Jackson	Wharton

1. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Eniola, Gupta, and Steel.

2. **Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Van Colle declared a personal interest in the item regarding the Council's Travel Plan by virtue of living near to the Town Hall and took no part in the discussion or voting on the item.

3. **Procedural Motion**

Councillor Bessong moved a procedural motion seeking to regulate the discussion of the business on the summons.

RESOLVED:-

that a time limit of up to 30 minutes for each item be imposed with all contributions being subject to the normal rules for debate, and after the conclusion of the debate on each item the meeting shall move to the vote on that item.

4. **Kingsbury Road Local Traffic Scheme**

Councillor J Moher moved the motion that had been submitted with the requisition for the Extraordinary meeting. He also submitted an amendment to it that clarified the intention behind the motion that the scheme should be referred back to the Executive for reconsideration. He submitted that the scheme was based on an exaggerated assessment of the speed of vehicles using the road and was opposed by many local residents, many of whom had not been consulted. Councillor Van Colle supported the motion as amended, stating that no councillor would want to compromise the safety of anyone but that he was not convinced of the safety considerations in this scheme. He added that he felt the scheme was misconceived and had not been adequately consulted on. The money involved was not significant and the opportunity should be taken to review the whole of the Kingsbury Road scheme.

Support for this view was expressed by other members who felt the scheme was misconceived and had not been consulted on widely enough. A view was put that the larger traffic scheme for Kingsbury Road had not worked well and that this needed to be reconsidered rather than adding to it in a piecemeal fashion. It was stated that the issue of funding for the scheme was not as important as the need to get a scheme that worked and had the support of local people.

Support for the scheme was expressed by reference to the road being a residential road that passed a park and a school and had recorded a number of personal injury accidents and one fatality. Consultation on the scheme had followed the Council's guidelines which were the same as had been followed for many years. Officers had carried out surveys along the road and found speed to be a significant issue. Although many of the residents now objecting to the proposal had not been formally consulted they had got to hear of the scheme and had submitted their views which had resulted in the scheme being amended. Councillor Wharton stated that the three Fryent ward councillors were aware of the scheme but had not attended the Highways Committee when it was discussed. He moved an amendment to the motion to reflect this which when put to the vote was CARRIED.

Other members of the Council supported the safety considerations but disputed the effect the scheme would have on safety. It was felt that the scheme would push the road safety issues further along the road and further support was given to calling for a wider review of traffic conditions along the road. Having heard the opposition to the scheme it was submitted that the Highways Committee should recognise that the scheme was not what local people wanted or needed and the Committee should agree to reconsider it. A view was put that not all of the scheme was wrong because pedestrian safety was an important factor but parts of it were flawed and wider consultation needed to be carried out.

Councillor Dunwell moved a motion seeking to ask the Executive to reconsider the scheme, which when put to the vote was LOST.

RESOLVED:-

That Full Council opposes the decision made by the Highways Committee on 20th January 2009 in relation to the Petition against the Kingsbury Road Local Safety Scheme because that decision has been taken on the basis of inadequate consultation with residents and partner agencies (including the police) and is opposed by the vast majority of local residents, who were not consulted. Therefore the Council instructs the Executive via its Highways Committee to reconsider these deficient proposals and come back with fresh proposals. However, Council notes with regret that not one of the three Fryent ward councillors attended the Highways Committee to express a view on the issue.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 47(C), the voting on the amendment in the name of Councillor Dunwell was recorded as follows:-

FOR:	Dunwell and Malik.	2
AGAINST:	Ahmed, Allie, Anwar, Arnold, Bacchus, Bessong, Beswick, D Brown, V Brown, Butt, Castle, Chavda, Clues, Corcoran, Coughlin, Crane, Cummins,	45

Dunn, Farrell, Fox, Green, Hashmi, Hirani, Jackson, John, Jones, Leaman, Long, Lorber, Matthews, J Moher, R Moher, Moloney, Motley, Pagnamenta, CJ Patel, Powney, Shah, Ms Shaw, Singh, Sneddon, Tancred, Thomas Van Kalwala and Wharton.

ABSTENSIONS: Baker, Blackman, Colwill, Detre, Mrs Fernandes, Joseph, Kansagra, Mendoza, Mistry, O'Sullivan, HM Patel, HB Patel and Van Colle. 13

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 47(C), the voting on the amendment in the name of Councillor Wharton was recorded as follows:-

FOR: Allie, Anwar, Bessong, D Brown, V Brown, Castle, Chavda, Clues, Corcoran, Cummins, Dunn, Green, Hashmi, Hirani, Jackson, Leaman, Lorber, Matthews, Motley, Pagnamenta, CJ Patel, Shah, Ms Shaw, Sneddon, Tancred and Wharton. 26

AGAINST: Ahmed, Arnold, Bacchus, Beswick, Butt, Coughlin, Crane, Farrell, Fox, John, Jones, Long, J Moher, R Moher, Moloney, Powney, Singh, Thomas and Van Kalwala 19

ABSTENSIONS: Baker, Blackman, Colwill, Detre, Dunwell, Mrs Fernandes, Joseph, Kansagra, Malik, Mendoza, Mistry, O'Sullivan, HM Patel, HB Patel and Van Colle. 15

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 47(C), the voting on the substantive motion was recorded as follows:-

FOR: Ahmed, Arnold, Bacchus, Baker, Beswick, Blackman, Butt, Colwill, Coughlin, Crane, Detre, Dunwell, Farrell, Mrs Fernandes, Fox, John, Jones, Joseph, Kansagra, Long, Malik, Mendoza, Mistry, J Moher, R Moher, Moloney, O'Sullivan, HM Patel, HB Patel, Powney, Singh, Thomas, Van Colle and Van Kalwala. 34

AGAINST: Allie, Anwar, Bessong, D Brown, V Brown, Castle, Chavda, Clues, Corcoran, Cummins, Dunn, Green, Hashmi, Hirani, Jackson, Leaman, Lorber, Matthews, Motley, Pagnamenta, CJ Patel, Shah, Ms Shaw, Sneddon, Tancred and Wharton. 26

5. Council Travel Plan

Councillor John moved the motion that had been submitted with the requisition for the Extraordinary meeting. She also submitted an amendment to it that sought to instruct the Executive to reverse the decision it had taken on the matter and find alternative ways of funding the Council's travel plan. She submitted that most staff opposed the proposals to charge for parking at the Town Hall and other Council sites and that it was tantamount to introducing a pay cut. Many existing staff had planned their working and personal lives around their ability to park at work. The knock on effect would be to fill the surrounding roads with parked cars, leaving the car parks half empty. Councillor Blackman supported the motion as amended and pointed out that the budget under consideration by the Council did not require the income from charging staff to park at work. He submitted that it would make it impossible for some staff to fulfil their childcare arrangements and supported the view that the surrounding streets would be full of parked cars whilst the car parks remained empty. He felt the true aim of the proposals was to stop people using their cars and he expressed concern that some staff had felt compromised in objecting to the proposals when they had just as much right to respond to the consultation as anyone else.

Reference was made to the Council leading by example in encouraging alternative means of travel that would reduce the level of CO2 emissions. It was felt that some staff would support this view. It was pointed out that the Government had signed up to ambitious targets to reduce the level of CO2 emissions and the Council was doing what it could to support this. It was reported to the meeting that Friends of the Earth supported the Council's travel plan.

Those speaking in support of the motion drew attention to the cost to staff of the proposals and the damage to staff relations this was causing. It was felt that the behaviour of people could not be changed by imposition and that greater encouragement needed to be given to changing habits. Not all staff were able to use an effective alternative means to get to work and many had taken employment with the Council on the basis they were able to drive to work. If the proposals were implemented it was felt that the Council would be faced with the same level of car usage only with the cars parked in surrounding streets or dropping people off/picking them up and the support from staff undermined. The view that the measures amounted to an anti car approach was supported by some members. It was pointed out that many people using the Town Hall were elderly or from the voluntary sector and they too would be faced with car parking charges. The point was made that some staff needed to use their cars to be able to carry out their job and that if the Council wanted to attract the best staff it had

to provide the facilities. It was felt that the matter should be more fully consulted upon and the views of staff given greater attention.

Councillor Lorber referred to the successful introduction of compulsory recycling as an example of getting people to change their habits. He stated that messages from government and other political parties concentrated on how important the environment was. It was necessary to change the mind set of people to get them to stop using their cars and consider alternative ways to get to work. Councillor Lorber also pointed out that under the current arrangements people visiting the Town Hall during the day had no-where to park because the car park was full. He stated that self interest had no place within the Council and that the Council needed to lead by example.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that Council opposes that part of the Council's travel plan which seeks to impose swingeing charges on staff and councillors for use of the Town Hall car park and other car parks which are currently provided to staff and councillors on a no charge basis;
- (ii) that Council notes that these charges are being introduced during a credit crunch when budgets are already overstretched and it will impact adversely on lower paid workers and especially women with childcare responsibilities who need to use their cars;
- (iii) that Council instructs the Executive to reverse the planned charges and instruct officers to find alternative ways of funding the Council's Travel Plan.

The meeting ended at 9:57pm

R FOX
Mayor