



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE Tuesday, 14 December 2010 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor J Moher (Chair), Councillor Powney (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Beswick, Butt and Jones

Also present: Councillors Gladbaum and Long

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

Councillor Beswick declared a personal interest in CPZ Zone HY as a ward member for Harlesden.

2. Deputations (if any)

None.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 October 2010

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 October 2010 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

4. Matters arising (if any)

None.

5. Petitions

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

(i) Petition requesting measures to prevent speeding on Lansdowne Grove, Neasden, NW10

This petition which was to be presented by Mr Manesh Patel, a local resident stated as follows:

“We the undersigned request the removal of the current speeding and short cut problems on Lansdowne Grove, Neasden NW10”.

Mr Manesh Patel was not present at the meeting but submitted a statement which was read to the Committee on his behalf. The statement informed members that cars, vans and lorries were using Lansdowne Grove as a short cut in both directions endangering residents and visitors. The main cause was the traffic which turned left off the A406 onto Dog Lane and then right onto Lansdowne Grove, at about 50mph which was excessive high for residential streets. The statement continued that the situation got worse in the evening peak hours as drivers on Neasden Lane heading towards Neasden roundabout used Lansdowne Grove and then Dog Lane to circumvent the Neasden Lane traffic.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions regarding this petition appear under agenda item 6.

(ii) Petition requesting the implementation of zone “HY” Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) extension in the Harlesden area.

This petition which was presented by Councillor Long on behalf of local residents stated as follows:

“We want Brent Council to take action to resolve the traffic problems in Harlesden. We want the Council to; implement the extension of zone HY. The roads affected have been consulted several times and the parking problems will not get any better so there is no reason for further delays.”

Councillor Long challenged the results of the consultation adding that some of the local roads where residents did not express support for the extension such as Hawkstead Road, Roundwood Road, Leopold Road and other roads around St Joseph Primary school did not suffer from displacement parking. She continued that as local residents wanted to park near to their homes for safety reasons there was every reason for the Council to support the petition and agree to introduce the extension.

RESOLVED:-

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions regarding this petition appear under agenda item 7.

6. Petition Requesting the Introduction of Traffic Management Measures on Lansdowne Grove

The Committee gave consideration to a report that informed them of a petition received from residents requesting the introduction of traffic management measures on Lansdowne Grove in order to address concerns about speeding and rat running traffic following recent road safety incidents.

Tim Jackson Head of Highways and Transportation reported on the outcome of visits to Lansdowne Grove and traffic surveys to assess traffic conditions. He noted

that an analysis of accidents on Lansdowne Grove did not identify evidence of any personal injury accidents (PIA) in this road in the last 3 year period. He informed the Committee that whilst the survey results observed "rat-running", the levels were relatively low and that there was no evidence of speeding along the road.

Tim Jackson continued that on the basis of the results of the investigation, Lansdowne Grove was unlikely to receive priority (when compared with other areas currently under review in the borough) for funding when compiling future programmes. He added that the implementation of speed reducing and road safety measures was subject to the availability of funding chiefly provided to the Council by Transport for London (TfL) via the annual Local Implementation Plan (LIP) process. As the funding was limited, officers would need to give priority to those locations with the most significant problems when putting together the annual programme. Tim Jackson added however that the location would be continually monitored as part of the Council's annual LIP assessment process and should the situation change then the issue would be revisited. Similarly, if any other opportunity to address the concerns utilising other sources of funding (such as developers S106 contributions) was identified it would be taken.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) That the contents of the petition and the issues raised be noted.
- (ii) That the response by officers to the petition as set out in the report be noted.

7. Petition requesting the implementation of zone "HY" Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) extension in the Harlesden area

This report informed members of a petition received from residents requesting the Council to implement an extension of Controlled Parking Zone HY together with officer's responses into the matter. In setting the background to the situation, Tim Jackson informed members that HY controlled parking zone (CPZ) which had been operational since December 2008 was extended in December 2009. In response to a number of complaints received regarding parking displacement into the surrounding streets which were not subject to controls, the Council consulted on extending the zone further. The outcome of the public consultation (February 2010) was inconclusive with an overall response rate of 21% and only 46% of the respondents supporting the introduction of CPZ. He added that by street analysis, the level of support was inconsistent.

Tim Jackson advised that when introducing or extending CPZs the Council took into account the likely effect of any displaced parking and the resources available to address that displaced parking. He continued that in February 2010 officers were unable to identify a discrete area of streets where a CPZ could be introduced with a consensus of support. Accordingly, in April 2010 he agreed to the principle of introducing controlled parking in seven roads (those where support for a CPZ had been identified) subject to further consultation with those roads where the consultation had indicated a lack of support. The roads to be re-consulted were shown in red on the map attached at appendix B to the report.

As the introduction of controlled parking into the seven roads only would inevitably cause displacement it was decided that residents in the surrounding roads should be given a further opportunity to express a view before any extension was progressed. That further consultation was undertaken in June/July 2010. The results, appended to the report (c), were reported to this Committee at its last meeting and were also inconclusive with an overall response rate of 16%. Residents from two streets only (Outgate Road and Redfern Road) supported the introduction of controlled parking whilst the majority of respondents in the other seven roads did not support the proposals. This confirmed that there was no consensus of support for the introduction of controlled parking in a discrete area that would make operational sense without causing displacement problems elsewhere. The results were reported in the context of the decision made by the Executive Committee on 11th August 2010 to introduce an emission based residents parking permit regime, with an associated charging structure, subject to the outcome of the necessary consultation.

At the 19th October meeting the Committee were advised that the responses to the HY extension consultation (and other consultations) would not have been informed by the Executive's decision to introduce the new regime of charges (subject to the outcomes of the necessary consultation). Accordingly, Committee agreed "that no further work should be undertaken in relation to proposals to introduce controlled parking into HY CPZ extensions until such time as a final decision had been made on the introduction of emission based residents parking permits".

Tim Jackson advised that it was the Council's general policy to introduce controlled parking in roads where there was support for controls and in a way that would not cause significant problems elsewhere in the future. He added that when making the decision not to introduce controlled parking in a number of areas until a decision on the emission based regime and charges had been made, the Highways Committee were mindful of the situation in the HY CPZ extension area in which the petitioners resided.

In conclusion Tim Jackson expressed the view it would not be appropriate to progress the implementation of the HY extension until such time that a consensus of support across a discrete area that made operational sense had been identified. Furthermore, to progress implementation of the HY extension on the basis of consultation responses that were made in the absence of knowledge about the possible introduction of major changes to the charging regime and range of charges, would put the Council at significant risk of a (successful) legal challenge at the statutory (Traffic Order) stage. Accordingly, he recommended that no further work to extend HY CPZ should be undertaken at this time and that the most recent round of consultation be repeated in early 2011.

Councillor Gladbaum expressed a view that in order to relieve pressure on parking it would be helpful for the Committee to implement the extension to those roads where residents had expressed support for it, shown in green and attached as appendix B to the report.

In welcoming the report, members acknowledged the need for an action to be taken to address the situation subject to the advice given by the Head of Highways and Transportation including re-consulting with residents around January 2011.

- (i) that the contents of the petition and the issues raised be noted;
- (ii) that the decision made at the Highways Committee with the effect that no further work be undertaken in relation to the proposals to extend controlled parking in HY zones until such time as a final decision on the possible introduction of a new regime of emission based residents permit charges was made be re-affirmed;
- (iii) that the main petitioner should be informed of the outcome of the Highways Committee decision in regard to this matter.

8. **Brent Local (Transport) Implementation Plan (LIP) 2011-2014**

The Committee received a draft report on the Local Implementation Plan (LIP), a document that set out how the Borough intended to facilitate the local delivery of the Mayor's (London) Transport Strategy (MTS). The draft LIP which was prepared taking into account guidance from Transport for London (TfL), Brent's Corporate Strategy and local and sub-regional transport needs and priorities was appended to the report.

Adrian Pigot (Principal Transport Planner) gave a presentation in some detail on the draft LIP and explained that after consultation and any necessary amendments, the final LIP document would be re-presented to this Committee for approval, prior to submission to TfL, at a later date. He added that once approved by TfL/The Mayor, the LIP (which is a second LIP) would become a statutory document supporting Brent's transport improvements, interventions and priorities. Adrian Pigot continued that officers were confident about gaining the Mayor's approval when eventually submitted, thus enabling the Council to meet its legal obligations at the same time as enabling it to maximise opportunities for inward investment in Brent's infrastructure from TfL and others. He explained that within the consultation requirement of the LIP process, the Council would consult with the relevant Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis, TfL, representative organisations of disabled people and other (relevant) London boroughs and any other person required by the Mayor.

In seeking the Committee's approval, Adrian Pigot added that in addition to the prescribed consultation for the LIP, officers would visit the Council's Area Consultative Forums and discuss the plan with residents on an informal basis. Arrangements would also be made to publish and publicise the draft LIP and capture responses to the draft. It would then be submitted to TfL by 20th December 2010, for their comment and in accordance with their prescribed LIP timetable.

- (i) That the Committee the requirement to prepare and submit a draft Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and an accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment, to Transport for London by the 20th December 2010 be noted.
- (ii) That the submission of the draft LIP as set out in Appendix "A", together with the associated Strategic Environment Assessment, to Transport for London be approved

- (iii) That the draft LIP as set out in Appendix “A”, together with the associated Strategic Environment Assessment, for the purpose of consultation with residents and other stakeholders be approved.

9. **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 9 February 2011 at 7.00pm

10. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None

The meeting ended at 8.05pm

J MOHER
Chair