



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

### MINUTES OF THE HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE Wednesday, 18 November 2009 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor D Brown (Chair), Councillor Wharton (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Detre and Van Colle

Also present: Councillors Fox, Long and J Moher

Apologies were received from: Councillor Matthews

#### 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 17 September 2009 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### 3. **Matters arising (if any)**

None raised.

#### 4. **Deputations (if any)**

None received.

#### 5. **Petitions**

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

##### i) **Petition against the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) NT in Dudden Hill**

This petition, presented by Mr J K Mehta, the Chairman of the Neasden Neighbourhood Watch Scheme, and containing separate pages of signatures, stated:

"Do you want Controlled Parking Zone in your street, regarding the proposed extension of the CPZ Zone NT in Dudden Hill?"

Beneath this question, residents indicated their support by circling "Yes" or "No" and signing their names. The signatories were residents of Ashcombe Park, Avondale Avenue, Cairnfield Avenue, Kenwyn Drive, North Circular Road and The Circle.

Mr Mehta advised that he had returned from holiday on 30 September to be informed by residents that informal consultation was taking place with residents and businesses in the Dudden Hill area, regarding the proposed extension of CPZ Zone NT. He had contacted 70 per cent of local residents and had found that most were against the proposals for the following reasons: that there were no major traffic problems in the area; that 30 per cent of residents had their own driveways and would lose the freedom to park in front of their own houses; that much parking space would be lost to single and double yellow lines; and that residents did not want to pay more money to the Council, when they already paid council tax and had paid £900 each to change their driveways.

Mr Mehta went on to state that he had been involved in the regeneration of the Neasden Shopping Centre, and that there the implementation of the CPZ had improved the parking situation. However, residents felt that it was unnecessary to extend the CPZ into the proposed extension area.

**RESOLVED:**

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions regarding this petition appear under agenda item 6.

**ii) Petition for consultation about a proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Preston Road/Northwick Park area**

This petition, presented by Mr M Maurice on behalf of residents of the Preston Road and South Kenton area, stated:

"We, the undersigned, would like to see the area with the boundaries of Carlton Avenue East, College Road and Longfield Avenue in HA9 be considered for consultation, ultimately to be designated a Controlled Parking Zone from Monday to Friday."

Included within the petition were more than 50 signatures from residents of Grasmere Avenue who also wished to be considered for consultation for inclusion into the same possible CPZ as above.

Mr Maurice advised that Preston Road and Northwick Park were the only underground stations in Travelcard Zone 4 which had no parking restrictions around them. He explained that the area between these two stations had become a traffic bottleneck, and that residents were often not able to park near their homes. He added that, there were only four exits from the South Kenton and Preston Park Estate, and it could take residents up to 20 minutes to leave the area.

Mr Maurice explained that an infrastructure was already in place for Wembley Stadium event days which could easily be adapted for use as a permanent CPZ.

RESOLVED:

that the contents of the petition be noted.

Further decisions relating to this petition appear under agenda item 6.

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

Committee members had before them a report from the Head of Transportation on the progress of the Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) implementation programme in Brent.

### (i) **Proposed extension to CPZ NT**

Tim Jackson (Head of Transportation) explained that an informal consultation with residents and businesses in the Dudden Hill area had been carried out on whether they wanted to join the existing CPZ NT which operated on Monday to Friday between 8.30 am and 6.30 pm. He added that, in the majority of roads consulted, most residents had expressed opposition to the proposed extension. However, a majority of respondents in Eastleigh Close, Clifford Way and Chartley Avenue had expressed a willingness to join the CPZ. Tim Jackson informed the Committee that officers recommended adding Clifford Way to the existing CPZ and that no new controls should be introduced in the rest of the proposed extension area.

Councillor Fox, speaking in his capacity as a ward councillor for the area concerned, explained that Randall Avenue was an area with significant traffic problems, and even though the majority of respondents in that road had expressed a wish not to be included in the CPZ, implementation would improve the traffic situation in that road. He added that residents in Randall Avenue might be willing to accept a CPZ which only operated between 2.00 pm and 3.00 pm, for example, as opposed to 8.30 am to 6.30 pm. The Chair advised, however, that the Council's policy was only to introduce a CPZ in areas where the majority of residents were in favour of this.

Councillor Van Colle asked why it was proposed to include only one road, Clifford Way, in the CPZ, when the majority of respondents in Chartley Avenue had also been in favour of the extension. He also asked whether a one- or two-hour CPZ could be implemented, as had been proposed by Councillor Fox. Tim Jackson responded by explaining that Clifford Way adjoined the existing CPZ, and so it would make good operational sense to include it. He added that one- or two-hour CPZs could be implemented; however, the Council had adopted a policy of only implementing one of three sets of operational times, which were 10.00 am to 9.00 pm, 10.00 am to 3.00 pm, or 8.30 am to 6.30 pm.

RESOLVED:

that the outcome of the consultation with residents of the zone NT extension area in Neasden to introduce a controlled parking scheme as detailed in paragraphs 3.8 to

3.14 of the reports be noted, and that Clifford Way be included in the NT CPZ (subject to statutory consultation), and that the CPZ proposals in the other consulted streets not be implemented.

**(ii) Preston and South Kenton area petition**

Tim Jackson explained that officers recognised that there was a problem of traffic flow associated with the underground stations in the area. He further advised that there were no financial resources available in this municipal year to implement a new CPZ, although officers recommended that they should consult with residents in the immediate and surrounding areas with a view to including the area in the work programme for 2010/11.

RESOLVED:

that it be noted that officers will meet the petition organiser and other representatives from the Preston and South Kenton area to identify issues to be investigated, so that proper consideration can be given to including an informed proposal within the 2010/11 CPZ work programme.

**(iii) All Souls' Avenue (section between Hardinge Road and Chamberlayne Road)**

Tim Jackson explained that a petition with approximately 50 signatures had been received from residents of All Souls' Avenue, stating:

"We, the residents of All Souls' Avenue (unzoned section), state that, if a majority vote for the CPZ scheme, we will ONLY JOIN THE KH ZONE. There will not be enough parking spaces for any other alternative."

Tim Jackson advised that officers had conducted an informal consultation with residents of that part of All Souls' Avenue not currently within a CPZ about extending CPZ KH to include that part of All Souls' Avenue. The majority of respondents were supportive of the proposal. He advised the Committee that at the commencement of the consultation there had been some concern amongst residents of the existing zone, as they had felt that, by including the un-zoned area of All Souls' Avenue in CPZ KH, this would increase the pressure on parking space for residents in the rest of the CPZ. However, the results of the street surveys had shown that this was unlikely to be the case.

He noted

RESOLVED:

that the outcome of the consultation with residents and businesses of All Souls' Avenue (section), as detailed in paragraphs 3.15 to 3.21 of the report, be noted, and that that section of All Souls' Avenue be included in zone KH CPZ, subject to statutory consultation.

#### **(iv) Programme of work 2009/10**

Tim Jackson advised that it was also proposed to extend CPZ HW, and that CPZ MW was currently under review, and that officers had held an informal consultation exercise with residents in both areas. As both consultation exercises had poor response rates, which might have due in part to the recent industrial action by Royal Mail employees, it was proposed to extend the consultation periods until 27 November 2009.

The Chair asked whether Tim Jackson could give any indication of what the results of the consultation were likely to be. Tim Jackson replied that, at the moment, it seemed likely that residents of the proposed extension area of CPZ HW would be in favour of the extension, while residents of CPZ MW would not favour any change to the hours of operation.

**RESOLVED:**

that the Head of Transportation be authorised to consider objections and representations during the statutory consultation mentioned within the Details section of the report and that the Head of Transportation report back to members if there are substantial objections or concerns raised; otherwise he be authorised to implement the schemes.

#### **7. Update report on the Kingsbury Road Local Safety Scheme**

Peter Boddy (Team Leader, Traffic Management) introduced the report. He explained that on Kingsbury Road NW9, in the area between Valley Drive and Roe Green, there had been 18 personal injury accidents (PIAs) in the three years preceding the implementation of the Local Safety Scheme. The Scheme had not reduced the volume of traffic or improved the problems of congestion, but early indications suggested that average vehicle speed had slowed and there had been no PIAs since the scheme was implemented.

Councillor Jim Moher, in the capacity of ward councillor for the local area, explained that no consideration had been made of the effect of the Local Safety Scheme on traffic in the wider area, and he questioned whether vehicle speed had actually reduced and whether a longer period of observation were needed. He went on to say that the majority of PIAs had been minor incidents. He added that he felt that it would be useful to conduct a consultation on the traffic situation in the whole of Kingsbury, rather than simply this stretch of Kingsbury Road.

Peter Boddy replied that the consultation before the scheme was implemented had been carried out in compliance with the policy adopted by the Council in 2003. He added that observation of traffic speeds had been conducted over a seven-day period.

Councillor Detre then explained that an issue unique to Kingsbury Road was the fact that two buses from Romania parked in the road on Sunday mornings blocking local traffic, and this combined with regular events held in the park or at the Buddhist meeting hall, were preventing free traffic flow on the road. He expressed his view that the traffic controls introduced as part of the Local Safety Scheme were

making the situation worse. Councillor Van Colle asked whether it would be possible to bid for money for the area from Transport for London (TfL) in 2011/12 under the “shared space” scheme, and he agreed with the view expressed by Councillor Jim Moher that the whole area warranted re-examination.

Peter Boddy responded by advising that the Transportation Unit had conducted talks with the local residents’ association on the subject of the Romanian buses: a possible way to prevent the buses parking in the road would be the implementation of weighting restrictions, but residents were against this. He advised that Trading Standards and the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit were also investigating the buses. He added that the police could ask the buses not to obstruct the footpaths and roads.

On the subject of the events held locally, Peter Boddy advised that officers acknowledged that many events happened in a small area, and he suggested that officers could present a report on the matter to the Committee. Turning to the “shared space” scheme, he explained that TfL was already contributing £3 million to the Harlesden Town Centre regeneration scheme, and so it would be unlikely that TfL would fund two large schemes in the same borough at the same time.

Councillor Wharton explained that the Local Safety Scheme had produced the expected results, as vehicle speeds and accidents had been reduced. He went on to state that other problems in the local area also needed investigating: the traffic lights on Roe Green; the “rat running” on the Valley Farm Estate; and the vehicle and pedestrian flows around the Kingsbury Shopping Centre.

**RESOLVED:**

that the contents of the report be noted; and

that a report be submitted by officers to the Committee on the feasibility of bidding for funding from Transport for London under the “shared space” scheme.

**8. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Highways Committee was scheduled to take place on Tuesday 19 January 2010.

The meeting closed at 7.46 pm.

D BROWN  
Chair