REPORT OF ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LEISURE COMMITTEE

MEETING ON
10 JULY 1996 (SPECIAL)

Chairman: * Councillor Susan Boobis

Councillors: * Mrs Boethe * Mrs Martian * Mrs Chamberlain * Mrs Muncherie * Mrs Cocksende * Mrs Cowan * Mrs Swaine * Thamaiah (4) * Cliff Thomas * Stephine Gile (Sr Medhurst) * Mrs Kinnear * McNulty (1) * Mrs Nandhra * Swaine

* Denotes Member present (1), (2) and (4) Denote category of Reserve Member / Denotes attendance for part of meeting

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION I: Evaluation of the Tenders Received for the Leisure Centre Management CCT Contract

The Committee considered a confidential joint report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Development Services which set out full details of the tenders received and evaluated for the Council’s Leisure Centre Management Contract. Tenders had been invited from four external contractors, of which one, Relaxion Group plc, had submitted a tender, in addition to the DSO. The other three contractors had formally withdrawn and did not submit a tender. The report set out the tenders received from the DSO and Relaxion including details of the respective service strategies, relaunch procedures, income, expenditure and attendance forecasts and equipment and staffing arrangements.

The tenders had been considered in accordance with the Compulsory Competitive Tendering requirements under the 1988 Local Government Act. The report set out full details of their evaluation, which had been undertaken in accordance with the guidelines and evaluation criteria approved by the Client Sub-Committee. The Department of the Environment’s guidance on tender evaluation were set out and it was noted that Relaxion had made the lowest tender under CCT regulations.

The Committee received the notes of presentations by the tenderers in support of their bids, references taken up on the external contractor, details of several site visits to leisure centres run by the external contractor and comments from Unison.

The deputation from Unison stressed reservations relating to the tender bid by Relaxion. Particular reference was made to the need to maintain the Council’s commitment to sports development and the importance of security provision at the Leisure Centre. The Committee was asked to take account of the issues raised by Unison as its decision would have a profound effect on staff, residents and the Council.

Client Sub-Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 8 July 1996, at which a motion that the contract be retendered on the grounds that neither tender was acceptable, causing Members to doubt whether it would be in the best interests of the Council to award the contract was lost, but further details regarding the full implications of this course of action were requested and the meeting also discussed meeting the opening deadline of the Leisure Centre. The Sub-Committee recommended that this Committee award the Leisure Centre Management Contract to Relaxion, being the most economically advantageous tenderer to this Authority. It was confirmed that a meeting had been arranged on Wednesday 17 July for the Nominated Members of Client Sub-Committee and this Committee, at which further information on the option of retendering would be considered and continuing the existing contract until its termination in December 1997 to avoid a delay to the opening of the Leisure Centre.

The Committee noted that having committed substantial capital resources including Lottery funds to the extensive refurbishment and repair of the Leisure centre, an experienced operator who would maximise the investment and use of the Centre for the benefit of the whole community was needed. Discussion concentrated on the ability of each tender to meet the specification in staffing, strategic approach and equipment provision and the effects of these factors on use of the facility by the community.
The Committee accepted the concern expressed at Client Sub-Committee that the high rate of growth of Relaxion may adversely affect its ability to dedicate adequate resources to maximise use and development of the Leisure Centre, particularly as Harrow's complex was larger than their nearest concerns. Reservations were also expressed about the adequacy of the proposed level of investment in equipment particularly in the Health and Fitness suite, the proposed budget for the relaunch, the pricing structure and introduction of Club Membership which may give the impression of restricted access to the local community and the proposed security arrangements. It was noted that the Council would have no power to influence these issues after the award of the contract, without negotiation and possible compensation to the contractor.

An amendment to retender the contract on the grounds that neither tender was acceptable and it was not in the best interests of the Council to award the contract was lost. In view of the meeting arranged with Nominated Members of Client Sub-Committee and this Committee on 17 July to consider further information on this matter, it was

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That further consideration of the matter be deferred to Council on 18 July 1996 pending the receipt of further information requested by the Client Sub-Committee at its meeting on 8 July 1996.

(Notes: (1) Councillors Cox and Cripps both declared an interest in this item by virtue of their membership of the DSO Board and exercised their right to remain, take part in the debate and vote;

(2) Councillors Davies, Fox, McNulty and Swaine wished to be recorded as having voted for the motion moved in the course of discussion calling for the Council to retender for the contract;

(3) Councillors Susan Boobis, Mrs Boethe, Budden, Ms Chamberlain, Cox, Stephen Giles-Medhurst, Mrs Nandhra and Cliff Thomas wished to be recorded as having voted against the motion to retender the contract).
157. Reserve Members: RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Reserve Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Davies</td>
<td>Councillor Tammeiah (part of meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Frogley</td>
<td>Councillor McNulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Toms</td>
<td>Councillor Swaine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

158. Arrangement of Agenda: RESOLVED: That the following items in Part II of the agenda be considered with the press and public excluded for the reason indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Parking Enforcement CCT Contract Strategy</td>
<td>The reports contained exempt information under the provisions of paragraph 7 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) relating to the financial or business affairs of applicants to tender for a contract for the supply of services for the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Options for the Street Cleansing of Major Shopping Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Evaluation of the Tenders Received for the Leisure Centre Management CCT Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159. Minutes: RESOLVED: That the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 13 June 1996 be deferred until printed in the Council Bound Volume.

160. Public Questions: RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions at this meeting under the provisions of Standing Order 32.

161. Petitions: RESOLVED: To note that there were no petitions submitted to this meeting under the provisions of Standing Order 32.

162. Deputations: RESOLVED: That the deputation from Harrow Unison in respect of the Leisure Centre Management Contract be received.

163. Wealdstone Highway Improvement Scheme: The Head of Property and Construction Services provided a verbal update on the final phases of the Wealdstone Highway Improvement Scheme as requested by the Committee at its last meeting.

Details of the final works carried out on the North/South route were provided and the opening arrangements for the whole section of the road between The Bridge and Grant Road at 10.00 am on Monday 15 July were reported.

Works on the East-West Relief Road had been re-programmed to mitigate delays forced by the late completion of the North/South Road. It was expected that completion of the traffic management measures at the Miles Avenue and Headstone Drive junctions and the installation of two toucan crossings would permit the East-West Road to open in August prior to contract completion.

Details were provided of interim pedestrian proposals to discourage traffic from using the High Street as a through route between completion of the relief roads.

Works relating to the extension to the Peel House multi-storey car park were one week behind programme but this was not expected to affect the anticipated completion by the end of November. Completion of the Byron Road/Oxford Road junction works were expected at the end of August.

RESOLVED: That the verbal report of the Head of Property and Construction Services be noted.

164. West London Waste Authority - Update on Tendering Process: Having considered the progress of the West London Waste Authority’s tendering strategy at its meeting on 13 June 1996, the Committee received a further report of the Head of Environmental Services on the principal decisions reached by the Board at its meeting on 19 June 1996.

At that meeting West Waste had considered reports on its contract strategy for waste management and the proposed Local Authority Waste Disposal Company (LAWDC) transfer. A motion to suspend the tendering process to allow the strategy to be reviewed was passed, in the light of the financial implications for constituent authorities, the length of commitment required, the new policy context created by the London Waste Regulation Authority and London Pride Initiative on the Zero Option, wider community consultation and to ensure prospective tenderers did not commit resources to the tendering process before the Authority’s intentions were clear.
The new timetable involved review of the strategy with London Pride during June to September 1996 and report to West Waste Board 25 September, consultation with community groups September to December 1996 and report to West Waste Board 4 December. Progress beyond December 1996 was difficult to predict, slight modifications would lead to a contract starting date of July/August 1997, but significant changes may require the tender to be readvertised which may delay a contract until December 1997/January 1998.

It was noted that the Board in September may ratify the existing situation and make only minor procedural changes, but if the strategy was reviewed and Members wished to debate the matter, then a special meeting would be required. It was agreed that officers provisionally arrange a special meeting on either 29, 30 or 31 October 1996.

The Council's representative on West Waste attended the meeting to provide the Committee with an update of the current position. West Waste was under direction from the Department of the Environment (DoE) to follow the agreed timetable and comply with its statutory duty to submit its operations to competitive tender. Much of the strategy had in the past been determined following the use of the casting vote of the Chairman. However, a change in representation and Chairmanship at the AGM had led to the strategy being halted. The Clerk had advised of the legal duty to comply with the statutory directions issued by the DoE requiring divestment by given dates, and it was noted that the Boroughs of Richmond and Harrow had consistently voted in favour of progressing the strategy.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report be noted;

(2) a special meeting be arranged provisionally on either 29, 30 or 31 October 1996.

165. Parking Enforcement CCT Contract Strategy: The Committee considered a confidential report of the Head of Environmental Services which set out the current position with regard to the Parking Enforcement CCT Contract Strategy. As this contract was due for completion in July 1997, Members were asked to formulate a strategy to either extend the contract or retender. The existing contract made provision for extension for a further two years to July 1999 and the report assessed the performance to date under the contract.

Given the additional parking restrictions imposed since the introduction of the contract, the report proposed that the scope of the contract be increased to take account of these changes. The report discussed the financial and staffing effects of such changes and it was noted that there would be a significant net increase in the income to the Authority based upon a projected increase in ticket issue.

Client Sub-Committee at its meeting on 8 July 1996 recommended this Committee to extend the Parking Enforcement contract for a further two years to July 1999, and to endorse the increase in the scope of the contract and its financial and staffing implications.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Parking Enforcement contract be extended for a further 2 years to July 1999;

(2) the increase in the scope of the contract and its financial and staffing implications be endorsed;

(3) the financial implications of the increased contract scope be referred to the Scrutiny Panel on 24 July 1996.

(Note: Councillors Cox and Cripps both declared an interest in this item by virtue of their membership of the DSO Board and exercised their right to remain, take part in the debate and vote).

166. Options for the Street Cleansing of Major Shopping Centres: In accordance with the decision of the Client Sub-Committee on 3 June 1996, the Head of Environmental Services reported on the options for improving the street cleansing of major shopping centres during afternoons. This followed the award of the Street Cleansing Contract to the DSO, based on the 'existing' service plus an enhanced performance specification for the Town Centre and the seven day opening of toilets at a tender sum of £820,189.

The report set out a range of contract prices and operational requirements for additional options for Members' consideration. As this Committee on 13 June 1996 had decided that compensatory savings be identified to cover the increased contract costs over current budget provision, a number of alternative options were presented for consideration.

Client Sub-Committee at its meeting on 8 July 1996 had recommended that the Street Cleansing contract specification be enhanced by a full sweep of all major shopping centres on Saturday afternoons, as described in paragraph 4 of the report of the Head of Environmental Services, with this situation being reviewed after one year of operation.

After detailed debate, it was
RESOLVED: That (1) the recommendation of Client Sub-Committee of 8 July 1996 that the Street Cleansing contract specification be enhanced by a full sweep of all major shopping centres on Saturday afternoons, with this situation being reviewed after one year of operation, be endorsed;

(2) this year's total additional contract costs of £24,400 be contained by a reduction in the Highway Maintenance Resurfacing Budget of £494,030;

(3) the additional costs for 1997/98 be provisionally covered by the additional parking income identified in agenda item 9, subject to review during the 1997/98 budget making process;

(4) the financial implications be referred to Scrutiny Panel on 24 July 1996.

(Note: Councillors Cox and Cripps both declared an interest in this item by virtue of their membership of the DSO Board and exercised their right to remain, take part in the debate and vote).

(Note: The meeting closed at 9.15 pm)

(Signed) SUSAN BOOBIS
Chairman
REPORT OF ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LEISURE COMMITTEE

MEETING ON 26 SEPTEMBER 1996

Chairman: * Councillor Susan Boobis
Councillors: * Alexander (4) * Cripps
* Branch (6) * Davies
* Budden * Fox
* Mrs Chamberlain * Frogley
* Cockedge * Mary John (2)
* Mrs Cowan * Mrs Kinsear
* Cox * Cliff Thomas
* Stephen Giles-Medhurst * Toms

* Denotes Member present
(2), (4), (6) Denotes category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

167. Attendance by Reserve Members: RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Reserve Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Mrs Boethe</td>
<td>Councillor Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Mrs Champagne</td>
<td>Councillor Mary John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Mrs Nandira</td>
<td>Councillor Branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168. Arrangement of Agenda: RESOLVED: That (1) the following items in Part II of the agenda be considered with the press and public excluded for the reasons indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Sewerage Management Contract - Thames Water Utilities Ltd</td>
<td>This report was considered to contain exempt information under the provisions of paragraph 9 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that it contained information relating to negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Review of Closed Circuit Television - Appendix B - Metropolitan Police Monitoring Report</td>
<td>This report was considered to contain exempt information under the provisions of paragraph 14 of Schedule 1 to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that it contained information relating to any action taken, or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 33(c), item 3 on the Committee's Information Circular relating to Sunday Trading in Harrow Town Centre be admitted to the agenda as item 23;

(3) the following items be tabled at the meeting: the Liberal Democrat proposals, a briefing note on Waste by West London Friends of the Earth and the minutes of the Trading and Standards Consortium Committee meeting held on 4 July 1996.

169. Minutes: RESOLVED: That (1) the minutes of the special meeting held on 26 April 1996 and the ordinary meeting held on 13 June 1996 be taken as read and signed as correct records;

(2) the minutes of the Special meeting held on 10 July 1996 be deferred until printed in the Council Bound Volume.
170. **Public Questions: RESOLVED:** To note that there were no public questions asked at this meeting under the provisions of Standing Order 32.

171. **Petitions: RESOLVED:** To receive the petition submitted to this meeting under the provisions of Standing Order 9. The petition requested the Council to stop the noise nuisance being caused by motorcycles at Harrow Driving Centre.

172. **Deputations: RESOLVED:** That two deputations be heard, one from the Greek Orthodox community and the other from the person leading the petition to stop noise nuisance being caused by motorcycles at Harrow Driving Centre.

173. **Reference from Council - 18 July 1996:** Two petitions were submitted to Council on 18 July 1996 and were referred to Committee for consideration. The first requested the pavements in North Harrow shopping centre to be resurfaced as a matter of urgency. The second related to noise and nuisance occasioned by the use of a grassed area on Southdown Crescent by teenagers and asked the Council to erect a sign banning ball games and for the ban to be rigorously enforced. The second petition was also the subject of a deputation at the meeting.

Deputation Regarding Ball Games Being Played on Southdown Crescent: The deputation explained that residents were concerned about the damage to property that was arising from teenage boys playing football on the small green in Southdown Crescent. They were not objecting to the green being used for games but rather the disregard the players had for residents’ property and the way the teenagers treated younger children who also wanted to play on the green. Steps had been taken to try to remedy the situation, such as asking the teenagers to play football in West Harrow Park, but to no avail.

Members sympathised with the residents’ concerns and considered that they had approached the situation in a very tolerant manner. It was felt that the erection of a sign banning ball games would not be an effective way to address the problem. The Committee advised the residents to raise their concerns at the next Harrow Police Sector meeting. A Member, who was also a governor of the school that most of the teenage boys were likely to attend, stated he would bring the matter to the attention of the Headteacher. It was agreed that a letter, signed by the Nominated Members, would be sent to the Police Community Liaison Officer asking him to see how the police could assist in resolving the matter. A Member, who was also a governor of the school that most of the teenage boys were likely to attend, stated he would bring the matter to the attention of the Headteacher. It was agreed that a letter, signed by the Nominated Members, would be sent to the Police Community Liaison Officer asking him to see how the police could assist in resolving the matter. It was agreed that a letter, signed by the Nominated Members, would be sent to the Police Community Liaison Officer asking him to look into the matter to see how the police could assist in resolving the matter.

RESOLVED: To (1) note the submission of the petition requesting the pavements in North Harrow shopping centre to be resurfaced;

(2) in view of the fact that such signs are unenforceable by the Council, and would therefore not constitute an effective deterrent, the Council’s previous resolution not to erect such signs on the highway be upheld;

(3) send a letter, signed by the Nominated Members, to the Police Community Liaison Officer asking him to look into the matter to see how the police could assist in resolving the matter.

174. **West London Waste Authority - Tendering Process:** The meeting was advised that West Waste at its meeting on 25 September 1996 had considered its tendering strategy for waste disposal. It was noted that West Waste was currently undertaking a consultation exercise with the Local Authorities in its area and relevant bodies to identify the best way forward.

It was agreed that, as West Waste had not been able to complete all of its intended business, an Information Circular would update Members on the outcome of the reconvened meeting for further discussion at the Special Environment, Transport and Leisure Committee meeting on 29 October 1996.

A representative of Friends of the Earth stressed the importance of recycling waste and urged the Council to support the London Pride Initiative. With regard to West Waste, he requested the Council to require this organisation to do no more than its legal obligations.

175. **Revenue Outturn 1995/96:** A joint report of the Chief Executive and Director of Development Services informed Members of the revenue outturn of the Committee for 1995/96. A comparison with the Committee’s spending plans as reflected in the budget and reasons for significant variations were reported. The Resources Committee had been informed on 4 July 1996 that the Council’s outturn of £151.4m was £2.5m less than the original estimate and £2.1m less than the revised estimate. The total outturn for the Committee was £22.190m, a net saving of £0.989m on the repriced original estimates.

RESOLVED: That the revenue outturn for 1995/96 summarised in Appendix A of the joint report and the reasons for the major variations detailed in Appendix B of the report be noted.
176. **Annual Review of Capital Investment Plans 1996-2000:** As part of the Civic Budget process, Service Committees were asked to review their capital investment plans, to enable Scrutiny Panel to establish an initial corporate priority ranking of competing bids at its meeting on 9 October 1996, prior to final determination by Resources Committee on 6 February 1997, in the light of available resources and within the wider context of the Civic Budget objectives.

The report set out the latest estimate of the current level and phasing of expenditure on the Committee's approved programme (as shown in Appendix 1) along with a list of proposed investments in a suggested priority order (Appendix 2). The proposed order of schemes reflected the Council's investment strategy which targeted scarce resources in support of statutory responsibilities and the maintenance of local services. Detailed justifications for all schemes were set out in Appendix 3.

This year’s review had been widened to encompass other potential sources of funding for both approved schemes and new proposals, together with their attendant service and budgetary implications. Two schemes, the Harrow Town Centre Car Parks Variable Message Signs and the Street Lighting Replacement Programme, were identified as possible schemes that might attract funding from sources other than the annual capital settlement.

The current forecast of resource availability indicated that, after allowing for financing, the committed investment plan of £48.6m, which assumed a revenue contribution from the General Fund of £4.34m over the period of the programme, the Council’s ability to support any additional investment would be severely limited.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the approved programme of expenditure and how following the Executive Action this had been increased by £212,000 for the Sheepcote Road widening scheme.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the suggested current priority order, subject to notification of the TSG, be approved;

(2) the budgetary increase of £212,000 for Sheepcote Road be noted.

177. **Recycling:** The Head of Environmental Services updated the Committee on the various recycling options that were available to the Council, following the unsuccessful bid for Supplementary Credit Approval for the Blue Box scheme.

The report outlined details of the London Pride Initiative which was preparing a Waste Action Programme for the introduction of collections schemes and the recycling of waste across the whole of London. It was anticipated that the Council’s Blue Box scheme would be a suitable scheme for inclusion within the Waste Action Programme and could be funded via a joint bid for Capital Challenge Funding. In view of the need to submit a bid by 23 September 1996, Harrow had made a provisional submission that was subject to this Committee’s approval. If the bid was successful, a report on the financial implications of joining the London Pride Initiative would be submitted to the next Committee meeting.

It was reported that discussions had been taking place with British Glass regarding drawing up a five year contract to replace the current ad hoc arrangements for glass cullet. British Glass was seeking to contract its supplies in order to stabilise the supply of material. The main advantage of such an arrangement for the Council was that it would guarantee an outlet for glass should a surplus of glass cullet occur. It was noted that no further discussions with British Glass were to take place to finalise any contract until after the results of the London Pride Initiative bid were known.

**RESOLVED:** To (1) note the approach from London Pride and to confirm the action taken to date in submitting a bid for Capital Challenge Funding for the Blue Box Scheme as part of the London Pride Initiative;

(2) request a report on the revenue implications, following a successful bid, to the next Committee meeting;

(3) note the bid for the Blue Box Scheme had been submitted on the basis that two rounds be introduced in 1997/98 for the area not subject to the Blue Bag paper collection;

(4) note the discussions with British Glass and for no further action to be taken until the position on material prices has been clarified with London Pride.

178. **Request for a Greek Orthodox Cemetery:** The Head of Environmental Services reported on the further information that had been received from the Greek Orthodox community regarding the community’s request for the Council to provide a separate area of cemetery.

The report referred to the response that had been received from the Greek Orthodox community that indicated that the community would welcome an area of Pinner New Cemetery being allocated for predominantly Greek Orthodox burials for Harrow residents. The report proposed that an area of land, suitable for 200 burials, be set aside for the Greek Orthodox community subject to the area not being fenced off and burials following existing Cemetery rules.
Prior to considering the report, the Committee heard a deputation from the Greek Orthodox community regarding their request for a Greek Orthodox Cemetery. It was explained that it was customary for Greek Orthodox families to regularly visit the graves of departed relatives and that Greek Orthodox Christians were not allowed, under church law, to be cremated. Also there were also four days in the Church calendar when prayers were said at the graveside of the departed. These practices would greatly be helped by the existence of a Greek Orthodox cemetery. The community was very satisfied with the proposed arrangements set out in the report and had no objections to people from other religious backgrounds being buried in their allocated area, provided the rest of the Cemetery had been utilised.

RESOLVED: That (1) the request from the Greek Orthodox Community be noted;

(2) an area of Pinner New Cemetery be allocated for the use of the Greek Orthodox community, as described in the report, and the Head of Environmental Services be authorised to agree final details with the community representatives.

179. Review of Closed Circuit Television: The Committee considered a report of the Head of Environmental Services on the review of the CCTV operation in Harrow since its launch in May 1995. The report also considered the options for a bid for the Home Office Challenge Competition for 1997/98.

The report advised Members of the CCTV Challenge Competition being run by the Home Office. The competition was seeking entries from schemes intending to cover Town Centres or local neighbourhoods. Two potential sites were identified as satisfying the bidding criteria and these were for Pinner District Centre and Station Road, Harrow. Both schemes were supported by the Police, however, the Station Road link was considered by the Police to be the greater priority. The Committee also favoured the Station Road link scheme being pursued.

Following the Council’s previous successful bid for Capital Challenge funding, it was reported that £57,000 had been awarded towards the cost of installing a CCTV system in Wealdstone Town Centre and that matching funds had been agreed by Resources Committee in July 1996. The Wealdstone system was to comprise up to 10 fully functional colour cameras at key locations within the town centre. The operational requirements were currently being finalised and installation was expected to be completed by May 1997.

The report then went on to explain the other enhancements being planned or underway for the systems in place at Harrow Town Centre, Roxborough Bridge and Peel Road Car Park. Members were informed that four additional cameras to extend the core Town Centre scheme had been installed and three cameras in and around the pedestrian subways by Roxborough Bridge have been upgraded. Consideration was then given to transferring the mobile units in Chapel Lane Car Park, however, the cost that would be incurred if these cameras were relocated was not thought to justify installing the cameras at a different site and this view was supported by the Committee.

Members were advised that two requests had been received from the Town Centre Retailers’ Forum for additional afternoon monitoring and for a radio link to be established between shops and the CCTV control room. The report explained that a trial of afternoon monitoring had not proved very effective at detecting incidents and therefore it may not be cost effective to employ extra staff to cover this period. However, the report recognised the benefits that could be gained from establishing a radio link between shops and the CCTV control room when it was staffed and recommended that such a link should be installed, provided it could be contained within the existing Revenue budget for CCTV equipment and maintenance.

It was noted that the Council’s CCTV code of practice to a great extent complied with the Local Government Information Unit’s Advisory Code of Practice for the operation and management of CCTV systems. It was proposed that in order to more closely meet the Local Government’s Model code of practice a public Annual Report should be produced for the year 1996/7 and copies to be distributed to local libraries and public offices subject to a further report to the Committee in June 1997. It was also intended to make the Council’s own code of practice more widely available. In view of the costs involved, it was not planned to translate either the Council’s code of practice and the Annual Report into other languages or Braille. It was agreed that the Code of Practice be widened from referring only to Harrow Town Centre to encompass all the Council’s CCTV systems in public areas.

It was further agreed that, rather than notifying Nominated Members on every occasion when CCTV video tapes were released to the police, a register should be compiled which Members may inspect any time.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report, the operation of the CCTV system over the first fifteen months, the adoption of an annual report and the distribution of the Code of Practice from 1997, subject to a further report of this Committee in June 1997, be noted;

(2) officers be authorised to submit a bid to the Home Office Challenge Competition 1997/98 for funding for CCTV in Station Road, Harrow;

(3) a register of tapes and photographs released to the Police, as described in the report, be established;
(4) the change to the Addendum of the Council's Code of Practice, as set out in the report, be approved;

(5) the request from the Town Centre Retailers' Forum for a radio link with the Council's CCTV Control Room be approved in principle;

(6) the cameras in Chapel Lane Car Park be left at their present site for the time being.

180. Public Conveniences - Hatch End: Following the closure of the public conveniences at the Woodridings Close site, this Committee requested a further report on the feasibility of alternative provision for public conveniences in the local vicinity. The joint report of the Heads of Property and Construction Services and Environmental Services informed the Committee of possible sites, under Council control, where a public convenience could be located.

Members favoured public conveniences being located at site 1, as this was considered to be the best option. It was agreed that the scheme should be included in the capital bid list, provided the location was acceptable to the Hatch End Residents Association.

RESOLVED: To (1) agree in principle to provide a public convenience at site 1 (the car park), subject to a detailed feasibility study and consultation with the local community including in particular the Hatch End Association when the scheme received funding;

(2) include the scheme in the capital bid list for further consideration by Scrutiny Panel and Resources Committee.

181. Strategy for the Retendering the CCT Contract for Grounds Maintenance: The Committee received a report of the Head of Environmental Services on the options for a strategy for retendering the contracts for the Council's Grounds Maintenance function and this report was considered in conjunction with the reference from Client Sub-Committee.

Grounds maintenance work has currently been contracted out in 5 geographic areas, each representing about 20% of the Borough and all five existing contracts were due to expire in December 1999. Two of the existing contracts were held by the Council's Direct Service Organisation and the rest were held by an outside contractor. As defined by the 1988 Local Government Act, the Grounds Maintenance contracts involved the maintenance of grassed areas, shrubs and floral beds and the control of weeds. Additionally, services subject to CCT in other areas (cleaning of changing rooms, the collection and removal of litter and maintenance of park facilities) and digging of graves, which is not part of the CCT requirements, have been included.

The Committee noted the views of Client Sub-Committee for further details to be provided on the implications of removing grave digging from the contracts and that the Sub-Committee had endorsed the Head of Environmental Service's strategy for retendering the contracts for the Council's Grounds Maintenance function.

Members requested officers to investigate replacing areas of bedding in the parks and highway verges with low maintenance shrubs and for this option to be included in the report being submitted to the next Committee meeting.

RESOLVED: That (1) the strategy for retendering, recommended by Client Sub-Committee, be adopted;

(2) the specification and any improvements be noted, subject to a further report in January 1997 following public consultation and financial costing;

(3) public consultation be undertaken, in accordance with the report, and the results be reported to Committee in January 1997. Furthermore, options for replacing areas of bedding in parks and highway verges with low maintenance planting be included in the report;

(4) the reference from Client Sub-Committee be noted.


The draft Energy Conservation Report acknowledged that a substantial financial investment in all housing stock sectors would be required to achieve the Government's target of 30% improvement in energy efficiency for all residential accommodation in the Borough and this was reflected in the timetable for implementation. In relation to the Council's own stock, the proposed measures reiterated the Council's previously agreed future energy improvement programme. The measures identified for other sectors focussed on advisory and promotional activity.
It was noted that following a consultation exercise the draft Energy Conservation Report would be amended to take on board any comments arising from this process and those from the Members of Housing Committee and this Committee. Once revised, the final version would be reported for approval under the Executive Action procedure, prior to its submission to the Secretary of State.

RESOLVED: That (1) the general format and content of the draft Energy Conservation Report be approved;

(2) the proposed arrangements for finalisation and printing of the Energy Conservation Report, as set out in the officer report, be noted.

183. The United Kingdom National Air Quality Strategy: The Head of Environmental Health Services reported on the Government’s draft National Air Quality Strategy which had recently been published for consultation. The Strategy document sought to put into context the new system of local air quality management that was to be undertaken by Local Authorities, as set out in Part IV of the 1995 Environment Act. It also explained more fully the role which local authorities will be expected to play in achieving the Strategy’s objectives.

The main objective of the Strategy was that members of the public should, in public places, be exposed to air with minimum risk to their health and quality of life. Local authorities had a major role in achieving this aim. The Government’s Strategy required local authorities to focus on several key measures, which included reviewing local air quality on a regular basis, ensuring local planning took into account air quality issues and for co-operation on air pollution to take place between neighbouring authorities.

It was reported that London had been selected as one of a number of pilot areas for trialling the Guidance on Reviewing and Assessing Air Quality. Following discussions between the Department of the Environment and London Chief Environmental Health Officers’ Association, the London Borough of Haringey had agreed to act as the London lead authority and the South East Institute of Public Health, who have been actively involved in London air quality issues, had been appointed as consultants for the review. As the lead authority, it was proposed that Haringey should receive the funding of £450,000 on behalf of the Boroughs to pay for the consultancy, monitoring and modelling costs. The distribution of this money would be subject to the approval of the boroughs.

All the London boroughs were to receive £3,250 in recompense for their input into the Review and Assessment of Air Quality, however, it was proposed that each Borough would make a payment of £450 to Haringey to contribute to the additional costs being incurred by this authority in leading the trial.

It was noted that this Council’s response to the draft National Air Quality Strategy would be submitted for approval under the Executive Action procedure, in order to meet the Government’s deadline of 21 November 1996.

RESOLVED: That (1) the publication of the draft National Air Quality strategy be noted and for the response to the Department of the Environment to be approved under the Executive Action procedure;

(2) the involvement of London as a pilot area in trialling Guidance on Reviewing and Assessing Air Quality be noted;

(3) the London Borough of Haringey be endorsed as the London lead authority for the purposes of the trial;

(4) the proposed arrangements, as set out in the officer report, for the distribution of the Government funding for the trial be approved;

(5) the additional income of £2,800 accruing to the Council in the current year, arising from the Council’s involvement in the trial, be noted.

184. Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Trading Standards for 1995/96: Members received a copy of the Annual Report for 1995/96 detailing the work of the Trading Standards Department. The reports were required to be submitted annually to the Department of Trade and Industry under the Weights and Measures Act 1985. It was reported that there were no financial or staff implications.

RESOLVED: That the annual report of the Chief Inspector of Trading Standards for 1995/96 be approved for transmission to the Department of Trade and Industry.

185. West London Transport Strategy - Objectives: The Committee received a report of the Director of Development Services on the preparation of a draft transport strategy for West London, which would complement and facilitate the achievement of the West London Strategic Development Framework.
The West London Transport Strategy was the work of West London Leadership (WELL), WELL being a partnership of West London Boroughs, West and North-West London Training and Enterprise Councils and major companies located in West London that had joined together to promote the social and economic health of West London. One of the main priorities of WELL was to produce a West London Transport Strategy which would support WELL’S wider economic and social objectives and would provide a basis for joint bids to Government for future capital investment in transportation.

It was reported that WELL’s Transport Working Group had just completed the first stage in preparing a West London Transport Strategy. The report outlined the 28 transport objectives that had been drafted following an initial consultation exercise with some 42 organisations representing public and private sector transport operators and users. As well as relating to the views of those who were consulted, the objectives also reflected national and regional transport strategies. The report supported all the Working Group’s objectives, with the exception of objective 14 which related to managing transport capacity. This objective was considered to be too prescriptive as it did not allow any flexibility in allocating priorities for road space to take account of local conditions and road hierarchy.

RESOLVED: That West London Leadership be advised by the Director of Development Services that all the draft transport objectives were acceptable, with the exception of number 14 where more flexibility was required in allocating priorities for road space to take account of local conditions and road hierarchy.

186. Sewerage Management Contract - Thames Water Utilities Limited: The Head of Property and Construction Services updated the Committee on the current position regarding the transfer of staff to TWUL following this organisation’s decision not to renew the existing Sewerage Management Contract arrangements after expiry on 31 March 1997.

Members were informed that negotiations with TWUL had been delayed whilst TWUL had reconsidered some of its original intentions about how it was going to replace the Sewerage Management Contract. It transpired that some minor changes were envisaged but none of these appeared to affect this Authority. However, the delay had prevented any meaningful negotiations regarding staff transfer taking place. As the Authority had only received confirmation of TWUL’s intentions on 13 September 1996 this had resulted in a very tight timetable being needed for transfer arrangements. In view of this, the report proposed that the Head of Property and Construction Services would proceed with negotiations with TWUL and for Nominated Members of this Committee to be consulted on any outcome prior to decisions being finalised.

The TWUL had only so far given initial consideration to the proposal to manage functions. Terms of reference were currently being drawn up in pilot consultation areas, although, TWUL had already made it clear that such fora would not monitor the performance of TWUL. It was likely that the fora would follow the arrangements set up for handling day to day management issues.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Council’s responsibility for certain statutory land drainage functions after the ending of its agency arrangement contract with TWUL in April 1997. It was agreed that a report detailing the proposals and costs for undertaking the residual drainage functions, as well as the outcome of negotiations, would be submitted to the next Committee meeting.

RESOLVED: That (1) the report and the current stage reached by negotiations with TWUL regarding the transfer of functions be noted;

(2) approval for the conclusion of contractual and staff transfer matters be obtained through the Executive Action procedure;

(3) TWUL be requested to formally consult this Authority regarding the terms of reference for a future forum on drainage and sewerage matters;

(4) a report detailing the outcome of negotiations and the proposals and costs for undertaking this Authority’s residual drainage functions be brought to the next meeting of Environment, Transport and Leisure Committee on 13 January 1997.

187. Noise Nuisance from Motorbikes at Harrow Driving Centre: The meeting discussed an item placed on the agenda by Councillor Frogley relating to the noise from motorbikes at Harrow Driving Centre that was disturbing local residents during the weekend.

A deputation was heard from a resident of Christchurch Gardens requesting the Council to take action to stop the noise nuisance that was being caused by motorbikes at Harrow Driving Centre 7 days a week. In particular, it was hoped that soundproofing would be provided to reduce the noise problem.
The Committee noted that Environmental Health Officers were currently assessing the noise nuisance being caused by motorbikes using the Driving Centre. It was agreed that a detailed report on the results of the investigation and options for reducing the noise problem should be submitted to the next Committee meeting. When compiling the report officers were to consult with the affected residents to obtain their views as to how the situation could be remedied, examine the scope for restricting the hours motorbikes used the Driving Centre and also to clarify who owned the motorbikes in question.

RESOLVED: That a report on this matter be submitted to the next Committee meeting.

188. **Meetings in this Committee Cycle:** RESOLVED: To (1) note that the following subsidiary meetings had taken place since the last Committee meeting, and these minutes were to be printed in Volume 3 of the Council and Committee Minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date 1996/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Entertainments, Licensing and Safety Panel</td>
<td>25 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Entertainments, Licensing and Safety Panel</td>
<td>1 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub-Committee</td>
<td>12 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Environmental Protection Sub-Committee</td>
<td>16 September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) the Recommendations of the Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub-Committee on 12 September 1996 be received and hereby confirmed.

189. **Executive Action:** RESOLVED: To note and, insofar as it is necessary, to confirm the following action taken since the last ordinary meeting of the Committee after consultation with the representatives of the four groups on the Committee:

Sheepcote Road Widening/Station Road Environmental Improvement: Authorising acceptance of the most favourable tender for the main carriageway/footway works following completion of all preliminary site works, and to increase the Capital Programme provision by £212,000 to ensure that works commence as early as possible to minimise cost effects arising from imposition of the new Land Fill Tax operative from 1 October 1996.

190. **Sunday Trading in Harrow Town Centre:** The meeting discussed an item that had previously been circulated within the Committee's Information Circular and had been placed on the agenda at the request of Councillor Cripps.

Concern was expressed about the environmental implications of encouraging Sunday trading, in particular the increased car use that was likely to occur as a result.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(Note: The meeting having started at 7.30 pm, finished at 10.44 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR SUSAN BOOBIS
Chairman
PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENTS LICENSING AND SAFETY PANEL

Chairman: * Councillor Budden
Councillors: * Finch * Mrs Kinneir (1) * Lane * Swaine

* Denotes Member present
(1) Denotes Category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

51. Attendance by Reserve Members: RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:

   Member Reserve Member
   Councillor Cocksedge Councillor Mrs Kinneir

52. Arrangement of Agenda: RESOLVED: That (1) all items be considered with the press and public present;

   (2) the following agenda item be considered after agenda item 4:

   Item 6: Application for the Grant of a Night Café Licence - McDonald's Restaurant, 29 St George's Centre, Harrow

53. Minutes: RESOLVED: That the signing of the minutes of the meetings held on 10 April 1996 and 14 May 1996 be deferred until printed in the Council bound volume.

54. Application for a Public Entertainments Licence for the Weald Stone Inn, 328 High Road, Harrow Weald: The Panel considered a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application by the owners, Practical Peripherals Ltd, for grant of an Annual Licence for Public Music and Dancing on weekdays and Sundays.

Members were informed that the only public entertainments that could presently be provided were pre-recorded music or live entertainment by not more than two performers, which were allowed under the existing liquor licensing legislation.

It was reported that the application was for up to 200 persons, with a finish hour of 11.00 pm on Monday to Thursday nights and midnight on Friday to Sunday nights. This represented an extension beyond the normal finish hour of 11.00 pm within the Council's Rules of Management.

The Head of Planning and Development had not raised any planning objections to the proposed opening hours of the premises.

It was reported that the application had been advertised in accordance with the Council's Rules governing applications.

The Panel noted that two formal objections had been received regarding the application from local residents. The grounds of objection related to noise from the premises, parking problems, the potential for disorder and the disturbance of residents. An anonymous letter objecting to the application had also been received.

In addition, Councillor Mary Graham presented a Ward Councillor's submission to the Panel describing the concerns of local residents over the application. She confirmed that she had not previously discussed the application with Members of the Panel and that she would take no part in the determination of the application.

Whilst recognising that the landlord of the premises had taken steps to improve the reputation of the public house, Councillor Mary Graham expressed the residents' concern that the noise of customers leaving the premises and the potential for damage to residents' property at closing time caused an intolerable nuisance to those living in close proximity to the public house.

In response to the submission, the applicant confirmed that recent damage to a fence bordering the car park to the premises, for which he was responsible, had been repaired and that the neighbour was content with the action taken.
With regard to concerns about noise levels on the premises, the applicant advised the Panel that sound-proofing had been applied to the wall between the 'music' room and the adjacent florists' shop. Curtains had also been provided to deaden sound from the room. The applicant had undertaken to affect further measures for noise control in the event of his application being successful.

No objections to the application had been received from the Metropolitan Police or the London Fire and Civil Defence Authority (LFCDA). However, the Police requested the introduction of a condition restricting admission to the premises after 10.30 pm.

The Panel was advised that the public house currently operated a policy of not admitting to customers after 10.30 pm and that this would be continued. The applicant assured the meeting that the licence was sought solely to retain regular customers who might otherwise leave at closing time to visit other establishments with later licences.

It was reported that in accordance with the Council's Rules where there were fewer than five objectors to an application, conciliation between the parties had been attempted, but as it had not been possible to resolve their differences, the application had been referred to the Panel for determination on written representations.

It was noted that the premises were of solid construction, had a capacity for 200 persons and that whilst not purpose built for entertainments, the applicant had been advised of the works necessary for the premises to meet the requirements of the Council's Technical Regulations regarding construction. A location map showing a parking area at the rear of the building for patrons was circulated at the meeting. The applicant confirmed that the area was often full to capacity but that the majority of its users were not patrons of the public house, but lived or worked in the immediate locality.

Complaints in relation to noise from the premises had been received in recent years and whilst the owners had carried out works to ameliorate noise levels, not all complaints had been resolved.

The Panel noted the recent observations of the Group Environmental Health Officer and his recommendation that the premises should install an amplification system incorporating a noise limiter to maintain the volume at a preset lower level.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given for refusal to grant the application or the imposition of additional conditions, which would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice and that the applicant would have the right of appeal to a Magistrates' Court.

RESOLVED: That the application for a Public Entertainments licence be GRANTED until the following hours:–

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Thursday</td>
<td>11.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday to Saturday</td>
<td>midnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>11.00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The licence to be granted subject to the following conditions:–

1. The premises are not to be used for entertainments until a suitable amplification system incorporating a noise limiting device is installed. The system is to be designed and installed so as to prevent tampering. All works and the maximum sound levels are to be to the satisfaction of the Head of Environmental Health Services;

2. There is to be no new admission of persons to the premises after 10.30 pm.

Reason: To limit the impact of the premises on the surrounding residential area.

Application for the Grant of a Night Cafe Licence - McDonald's Restaurant, 29 St George's Centre, Harrow:

The Panel considered a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application for the grant of an annual night cafe licence for McDonald's Restaurant, 29 St George's Centre, Harrow.

A night cafe licence would normally be granted by the Head of Environmental Health Services under delegated powers. This application was referred to the Panel for determination as it firstly requested an increase in opening hours beyond the Council's standard hours for night cafes and secondly because objections to the application had been received from local residents. The applicant had originally wished to serve takeaway food until 3.00 am on Friday and Saturday nights and 1.00 am the rest of the week.

Objections to the application had been received from 12 local residents, the Metropolitan Police, the Roxborough Road Residents' Association and Councillor Fox. The objections related to the lateness of the finish hours, the possibility of disturbance to local residents, litter, vandalism and public order problems.
It was reported that in accordance with the Council’s Rules, a conciliation process had been commenced between the applicant and objectors. In response to the objections, the applicant had twice reduced the proposed hours of opening of the premises. The application now to be considered by the Panel was for a finish hour of 1.00 am on Friday and Saturday nights, 12.30 am on Monday to Thursday nights and until midnight on Sundays. It was reported that these hours had met the requests of both the Metropolitan Police and the Roxborough Road Residents Association.

The Head of Planning and Development had confirmed that there were no planning conditions which would limit the hours of opening of the premises.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given for refusal to grant the application or the imposition of additional conditions, which would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice and that the applicant would have the right of appeal to a Magistrates Court.

RESOLVED: That the application for an annual night café licence be granted to permit trading until the following hours:

- Monday to Thursday: 12.30 am
- Friday and Saturday: 1.00 am
- Sunday: midnight

56. Application for a Public Entertainments Licence for The Silver Trumpet Public House, 41-43 Station Road, Harrow: The Panel considered a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application by Mr J D McGowan for an Annual Licence for Public Music and Dancing.

The Silver Trumpet had not previously been licensed for music and dancing entertainments, however an application for a similar licence was refused by the Panel in 1993. Members were informed that the only such entertainments that could presently be provided were pre-recorded music or live entertainment by not more than two performers, which were allowed under the existing liquor licensing legislation.

The application proposed the use of the ground floor for up to 200 persons and the basement function room for up to 50 persons for entertainments until 11.00 pm on each day of the week. It was reported that, subject to the completion of certain works, the numbers complied with the Council’s Technical Regulation.

The premises currently hold a video licence granted in 1993 to permit the use of a video system for the replaying of recordings of sporting events.

The Head of Planning and Transportation had indicated that the premises did not require any change in planning permission. It was reported however that in its capacity as local planning authority, the Council had refused permission for the extension of the public house (A3) use to the first floor of the premises and had also refused permission for the retention of the single storey extension to the ground floor bar. A planning application for a midnight finish to the hours of operation had been refused in March 1995 and was currently the subject of an appeal. The hours of operation had been limited by planning conditions to 11.30 pm on Monday to Saturdays and 10.30 pm on Sundays.

The application had been advertised in accordance with the Council’s Rules governing applications and details had been circulated in the list of Planning Applications.

A total of 9 objections to the application had been received from local residents and also the Metropolitan Police. The objections related to the current problems associated with the clientele of the premises including noise from customers leaving the premises, problems of public order, anti-social behaviour and the possible increase in nuisance should the licence be granted. Problems with noise from the premises, deliveries, parking and traffic congestion were also raised.

At the meeting the applicant confirmed that he proposed to provide music by way of a three piece band, music for functions in the basement area, in addition to the current entertainment provided on the ground floor.

In response to residents’ concerns about the potential increase to the existing noise levels, the applicant advised that the doors at the rear of the premises could not be opened as they were fully alarmed and should remain closed at all times. It was further advised that the air conditioning system would negate the need to open any windows on the premises. The band could also be moved towards the front of the premises.
Residents questioned the applicant’s ability to control admission to the public house. The applicant advised that admission was at the discretion of the manager but that doormen might also be transferred from other establishments in the chain of public houses for which he was responsible, within 20 minutes, if required. In response to Members’ questions about the chain of management at the premises, the applicant advised the Panel that he had daily contact with the manager who was present on site.

In response to residents’ concerns regarding the loading and unloading of beer barrels at unsociable hours, the applicant explained that brewery deliveries could be restricted to two visits per week, in the mornings only. He conceded despite initial denials, that 40 to 50 empty barrels were currently stored in the parking area at the rear of the premises but assured the Panel that these would be removed the following morning. The applicant further confirmed that public houses within the locality regularly transferred barrels if stock levels were running low.

Residents expressed concern that the increased patronage would exacerbate the existing parking problems in the area. The recent provision of the shared, limited on-street parking at the front of the premises, in addition to the rear car park spaces, was advised by the applicant.

The objections by the Police concerned problems with control at the premises in previous years, concern over future developments and nuisance to local residents. The Metropolitan Police advised the meeting that their records showed that at least 16 visits had been made to the premises since the beginning of the year, including seven calls at the invitation of the licensee. It was confirmed that, in view of the current problems of disorder in the immediate area, stringent and workable control measures for admission would need to be introduced.

Members noted that no objections to the application had been received from the London Fire and Civil Defence Authority.

The Panel noted the recent observations of the Group Environmental Health Officer and his recommendations that urgent noise reduction measures were needed and that any outstanding work should be completed before the basement could be used for public entertainments purposes.

It was reported that the premises were of solid construction. The only on-site parking was provided by a few spaces off the rear service road. A double emergency exit door, opened onto the service road and the only windows at the rear ground floor were to serve the toilets. It was reported that the basement function room had been converted from an existing beer cellar. The applicant had agreed to carry out the works necessary for the premises to meet the requirements of the Council’s Technical Regulations regarding construction and the transmission of noise.

In the last year five complaints, three of which related to noise from the premises had been received by the Council’s Environmental Health Division.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given for refusal to grant the application or the imposition of additional conditions, which would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice and that the applicant would have the right of appeal to a Magistrates Court.

RESOLVED: That the application for an Annual Licence for Public Music and Dancing be REFUSED. The Panel gave the following reason for reaching this decision.

REASON: It is more likely than not that the existing lack of management control at the premises would give rise to the grant of a music and dance licence having an unacceptable impact upon the surrounding residential area.

Application for an Occasional Variation to a Public Entertainments Licence - The Trinity Bar, 378-380 Station Road: The Panel considered a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application for an occasional variation to a public entertainments licence for The Trinity Bar, 378-380 Station Road, Harrow.

It was reported that the application was for music and dancing entertainments until 2 am on Friday 5 and Saturday 6 July 1996 and until 1 am on Sunday 7 July 1996. The Panel noted that the reason for the application was to hold a “weekend festival” to attract a greater variety of musicians to the premises. Posters for the event were circulated at the meeting, for Members’ information. The applicant confirmed that the event would be advertised within the premises and by a limited number of flyers distributed by the bands themselves.

The application had been referred to the Panel for determination due to the requested extension beyond the Council’s standard hours.

The current annual Public Entertainments Licence for the premises, permitted music and dancing until 1 am on Friday and Saturday nights and midnight on Sundays.

The premises were reported to comprise ground and first floors with a total capacity of 200 persons.
It was noted that occasional licence applications were not subject to the same advertising requirements as full annual licence applications but the applicant was required to send copies of the application to the Metropolitan Police and London Fire and Civil Defence Authority. No objections to the application had yet been received from either of these bodies, but the Metropolitan Police advised the meeting that they would appreciate the opportunity to consult recent records regarding the premises.

There had been no recent complaints to the Environmental Health Division concerning the premises.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available which included the grant or refusal of the licence. The Panel also had the further option of postponing the decision. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given to the applicant for the refusal to grant the application or for the variation of existing conditions. Any changes to the conditions would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice. The applicant would have the right of appeal to the Magistrates Court if the licence was refused or if conditions on the licence were varied.

In view of the lack of notice of the application provided by the applicant, the Metropolitan Police had not had a chance to comment on the application, hence it was,

RESOLVED: That further consideration of the application be deferred to the next Panel meeting on 1 July 1996, to enable the Metropolitan Police to comment on the application.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.40 pm finished at 12.01 am.)

(Signed) P BUDDEN
Chairman
PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

58. **Attendance by Reserve Members:** RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:

- **Member:** Councillor Finch
- **Reserve Member:** Councillor Mrs Boethe

59. **Arrangement of Agenda:** RESOLVED: That (1) all items be considered with the press and public present;

(2) agenda item 8 be taken before item 7.

60. **Minutes:** RESOLVED: That the signing of the minutes of the meetings held on 10 April 1996, 14 May 1996 and 25 June 1996 be deferred until printed in the Council bound volume.

61. **Gaming Act 1968, Section 34(5E) Permit Applications:** The Panel considered a report of the Head of Law and Administration on three applications for the grant of a new type of permit relating to the licensing of gaming machines for use in amusement arcades from the following applicants: Birmid Leisure Ltd of 65 High Street, Wealdstone, Rank Amusements Ltd trading at 365 Station Road, Harrow and Sun Valley Leisure Ltd in respect of its premises at 312 Station Road, Harrow.

A report which outlined both the background and approach to be adopted in determining this new type of application had been considered by the Environment, Transport and Leisure Committee at its meeting on 13 June 1996.

It was reported that the Deregulation (Gaming Machines and Betting Office Facilities) Order 1996 had come into force on 20 June 1996 and amended the provisions of Section 34 of the Gaming Act 1968 (the Act).

It was reported that the current Section 34 permit enabled the holder to install, in premises used wholly or mainly as an amusement arcade, amusement with prizes machines with a limited cash prize of £4. The new provision, pursuant to Section 34(5E) of the Act firstly increased the cash prize ceiling to a total of £10 and secondly introduced an age restriction policy in terms of entry, to prevent those persons under the age of 18 years from being admitted to the designated area in which these machines were located or the premises as a whole. It was reported that the age restriction policy was regulated by mandatory conditions.

Members noted that in respect of amusement arcades the Authority had no power to exercise the policy adopted by the Council on 18 October 1990 and amended by the Environment, Transport and Leisure Committee on 16 June 1994.

The Panel noted the advice of the Home Office that although both Section 34(1) and Section 34(5E) permits could co-exist in theory, this, in practice, would not need to happen as the original machines installed under Section 34(1) of the Act could be installed by the holder of the new Section 34(5E) Permit.

It was reported that all three applicants currently held a Section 34(1) permit and whilst the Panel retained a discretion on whether or not to grant the permits, the applications for the new Section 34(5E) permit could only be refused in three defined circumstances: firstly, that the Authority, or its officers had been refused reasonable facilities to inspect the premises; secondly, that there was cause for concern about the machines being on the premises arising out of the conditions, or the manner in which the machines had been used; and thirdly that other amusements had been provided or conducted on the premises whilst the permit had been in force.
Members noted that no objections to the application had been received from the Metropolitan Police and the Head of Environmental Health Services. The Head of Planning and Development had not raised any planning objections to the applications.

Both Birmid Leisure Ltd and Rank Amusements Ltd had confirmed that entry to their premises was restricted to those persons over the age of 18 years. The Panel noted that these applicants would therefore, as a condition of a grant of the licence, have to ensure that its age restriction policy was enforced.

Sun Valley Leisure Ltd confirmed the intention that their premises would comprise a designated area in which the all cash amusement with prizes machines would be located. The Panel noted that the applicants would therefore have to ensure the following mandatory conditions were observed:

(i) that the designated area should be separated from the remainder of the premises by means of a physical barrier which is effective to prevent access otherwise than by means of an entrance designed for the purpose;

(ii) that only persons aged 18 years or over are admitted to the area where the machines are located;

(iii) that access to the area is supervised;

(iv) that the area is arranged as to permit all parts of it to be observed; and

(v) that at the entrance to, and inside, any such area there are prominently displayed notices indicating that access to the area is prohibited to persons aged under 18 years.

The Panel was advised that the design of the designated “over 18” area would be a matter for the applicants to determine and that if the Panel was dissatisfied with the arrangements this would not appear to be a ground for refusal of the permit. Officers would however, retain the right to inspect the premises and comment on the applicant’s arrangements in the event that the area was found not to comply with the conditions.

The Panel noted that any permit granted would remain in force for three years from the date of grant and was not transferable upon a change of ownership of the premises. An applicant found subsequently to be in breach of a condition would be liable to criminal prosecution and revocation of the permit.

In determining the applications, the Panel considered the options available and noted that if the permit were to be refused on the grounds of the three conditions outlined in the report, the application would have the right to appeal to the Crown Court.

RESOLVED: That (1) the application for a Section 34(5E) Permit for Birmid Leisure Ltd be GRANTED in respect of their premises at 65 High Street, Wealdstone;

(2) the application for a Section 34(5E) Permit for Rank Amusements Ltd be GRANTED in respect of their premises at 365 Station Road, Harrow;

(3) the application for a Section 34(5E) Permit for Sun Valley Leisure Ltd be GRANTED in respect of their premises at 312 Station Road, Harrow.

Informative: In respect of Resolution (3) above, the Panel requested that the applicant, Sun Valley Leisure Ltd be asked to submit plans of the layout of the designated “over 18” area, including details of how access to the area will be supervised.

Reason: To demonstrate how the applicants seek to comply with the reported mandatory conditions which are attached to the permit.

Application for an Occasional Variation to a Public Entertainments Licence - The Trinity Bar, 378-380 Station Road: The Panel considered a further report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application by the proprietors of the business, Mr S V Eyles and Mr M G Blake, for an occasional variation to a public entertainments licence for The Trinity Bar, 378-380 Station Road, Harrow. A report had been submitted to the Panel’s last meeting on 25 June 1996 but it was agreed that further consideration of the application should be deferred to enable the Metropolitan Police to comment on the application.

It was reported that the application was for music and dancing entertainments until 2 am on Friday 5 and Saturday 6 July 1996 and until 1 am on Sunday 7 July 1996. The Panel noted that the reason for the application was to hold a "weekend festival" to attract a greater variety of musicians to the premises.
The application for an Occasional Variation to a Public Entertainments Licence would normally be granted by the Head of Environmental Health Services under delegated powers. This application had been referred to the Panel for determination as it requested an extension beyond the Council’s standard finish hour of 11 pm.

The current annual Public Entertainments Licence for the premises, permitted music and dancing until 1 am on Friday and Saturday nights and midnight on Sundays.

The premises were reported to comprise ground and first floors with a total capacity of 200 persons.

It was noted that occasional licence applications were not subject to the same advertising requirements as full annual licence applications but the applicant was required to send copies of the application to the Metropolitan Police and London Fire and Civil Defence Authority.

There had been no recent complaints to the Environmental Health Division concerning the premises.

At the meeting, the Panel received an objection to the application from the Metropolitan Police relating to problems of public order within Central Harrow and the potential increase in nuisance should the licence be granted.

The background to the incidents outlined by the Police was advised by the applicants in relation to the concern that the extension of hours might attract large numbers of customers over the weekend period, the proprietors advised the Panel of the range of clientele who might be expected to attend the entertainments on the Friday, Saturday and Sunday nights.

Notwithstanding that the applicants currently held an unqualified special hours certificate from the Licensing Justices, the proprietors undertook not to sell liquor on the premises beyond midnight on Sunday 7 July 1996.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given to the applicant for refusal to grant the application or of the variation of existing conditions. Any changes to conditions would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice. The applicant would have the right of appeal to the Magistrates Court if the licence was refused or conditions on the licence were varied.

RESOLVED: That the application for the occasional variation to a Public Entertainments Licence for the Trinity Bar, 378-380 Station Road, Harrow be GRANTED until the following hours:

- Friday 5 July 1996 until 2am
- Saturday 6 July 1996 until 2am
- Sunday 7 July 1996 until 1am

The application is granted subject to the following undertaking being added to the existing conditions on the licence:

On Sunday 7 July 1996, the sale or provision of alcoholic beverages to persons on the premises is to cease at midnight.

Reason: To limit the likely impact of the extension of hours on local residents.

(Note: Councillor Ms Boetae took no part in the above resolution since she had not been in attendance at the meeting held on 25 June 1996 when the application was first considered.)

Application for an Occasional Variation to a Public Entertainments Licence - Safari Cinema, Station Road, Harrow: The Panel considered a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on an application for an occasional variation to the Annual Film Exhibition Licence for the Safari Cinema, Station Road, Harrow.

It was reported that the application by Mr J B Patel of M Hari Ltd, firstly requested that the Safari Cinema be permitted to show films beyond midnight until 6.00 am the following morning on the evening of 1 August 1996, to coincide with the final day of the Hindu festival of Jagaran, in which women and girls stay awake all night. Secondly, the applicant had applied for an extension in the hours of operation to show films beyond midnight until 2.00 am on the August Bank Holiday weekend for the evenings of 23, 25 and 26 August 1996.

The application had to be referred to the Panel for determination as it requested an extension beyond the Council’s standard finish hours of midnight.
The annual film exhibition licence currently held by the applicant permitted film exhibitions until 2 am on Saturday nights and midnight for the remainder of the week. In the last year, a number of occasional variations to the annual licence had been granted. An extension until 6 am, had been granted for one occasion and extensions until 2 am had been granted for 14 other occasions.

It was noted that occasional licence applications were not subject to advertising requirements but the applicant was required to send copies of the application to the Metropolitan Police and London Fire and Civil Defence Authority. It was reported that no objections to the application had been received from either of these bodies. Officers had discussed the application with the person who had co-ordinated the objections to the annual licence application determined by the Panel last summer. He considered that the recent extension of hours granted over the May Bank Holiday Weekends had been satisfactory.

The premises were reported to comprise a main auditorium with a capacity of 612 persons and a second screen with a capacity of 133 persons.

In considering the application, Members noted the applicant’s assurances that the cinema would continue to request patrons to leave the cinema quietly and advise both new patrons and regular customers to park in Tesco’s car park rather than in nearby residential roads.

In determining the application, the Panel considered the options available. Members were informed that clear reasons would have to be given to the applicant for refusal to grant the application or of the variation of existing conditions. Any changes to conditions would have to be practical, enforceable and meet the rules of natural justice. The applicant would have the right of appeal to the Crown Court if the licence was refused or conditions on the licence were varied.

RESOLVED: That the application for an occasional variation to a Public Entertainments Licence for the Safari Cinema be GRANTED to permit the showing of films beyond midnight on the following evenings:

Thursday 1 August 1996 until 6.00 am
Friday 23 August 1996 until 2.00 am
Sunday 25 August 1996 until 2.00 am
Monday 26 August 1996 until 2.00 am

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.00 pm closed at 7.52 pm).

(Signed) P BUDDEN
Chairman
TRAFFIC, TRANSPORT AND ROAD SAFETY
SUB-COMMITTEE

Chairman: * Councillor Budden
Councillors: * Ms Chamberlain * Giles-Medhurst
* Cockedge * Frogle
* Cripps * Mrs Kinnear
* Alexander (2) * Swaine
Advisers: * Mr G Bartlett   * Mrs R Carratt
* Mr A Blann * Mr A Wood
* Sgt H Brown

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes Category of Reserve Member

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1: Footway and Verge Parking Exemptions:

At its previous meetings in February and May 1996, the Sub-Committee had agreed in principle a number of streets which broadly met the criteria for exemptions to the footway and verge parking ban. On 12 September 1996, the Sub-Committee considered a further report of the Head of Environmental Services which identified all the streets to be considered for exemption and included provisional cost estimates and budgetary implications. Members noted that these would need to be considered in the light of the Council's current budgetary position and the moratorium on new initiatives.

It was reported that the second tranche of 33 streets from the schedule had been investigated and assessed against the criteria. Details of the streets which broadly met the criteria were provided and of outstanding consultations in streets identified as not meeting the criteria but having a high level of footway or verge parking and significant under use of off street parking.

It was recommended that the detailed design of schemes should await clarification from the Department of Transport who were currently consulting the Parking Committee for London on the signing and lining requirements. It was also advised that implementation of the programme would take two years using existing staff resources, with two schemes reported to each cycle following a lead in time of two cycles. An alternative would be to employ temporary or agency staff to enable completion in mid 1996 at an additional cost of £10,000 in this financial year.

The cost implications of the 14 streets identified as meeting the criteria totalled £12,400, for which there was no provision in the budget. If the first option implementation programme (over 2 years) was carried out, it would only be necessary to include budget provision for 50% of the projected costs in 1997/98 (£6,200). The remaining costs would fall in the following year. However the deferment of the two sections of Long Elmes, for further investigation could reduce the total funds required by £2,350.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That the exemptions be introduced over a two year period and that the funding should come from the highways maintenance budget.

(Note: See also Minute 157).

RECOMMENDATION 2: Traffic Control in London Consultation Document

The Traffic Control Systems Unit (TCSU) annually consults London Boroughs on its programme of works, its proposed expenditure and requests comments on various topical issues. Officer comments were required by 30 June 1996 which were given, and Council comments by 30 September 1996. The Sub-Committee was advised on appropriate responses to each section of the consultation. The responses on both the capital and revenue budgets were that these should not be increased beyond inflation and the response concerning quality and performance of service was that it needed to be radically improved. Suggestions were made in the Officer letter as to how this could be done.

Resolved to RECOMMEND:

That (1) the Officer comments as set out in the letter in Appendix 11.1 be ratified;

(2) the Officers' comments be forwarded to the ALG requesting them to raise their concerns on performance at the next Management Liaison Committee.
Reserve Members: RESOLVED: To note the attendance of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

Ordinary Member Reserve Member
Councillor Finch Councillor Alexander

Arrangement of Agenda: RESOLVED: That (1) all items on the agenda be considered with the press and public present;

(2) a supplemental agenda and tabled addendum be admitted to the agenda in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 by reason of the following special circumstances and grounds for urgency;

(3) the agenda items relating to the deputations be considered immediately after the deputation;

(4) the item on Priory Way be considered after the deputations.

Minutes: RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 1996 be signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment of the final sentence or Minute 126, Note 1, to read "During the course of the debate relating to the proposed mini-roundabout at the junction of Oxford Road and Byron Road, Councillor Frogley decided that whilst he would remain, he would neither contribute to the discussion nor vote."

Standing Order 32: RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions or petitions at this meeting under the provisions of Standing Order 32.

Deputations: RESOLVED: That deputations from West Lodge School, Elmwood Avenue, Aran Drive, Kings Road, Headstone Road and Warren House Estate be heard under the provisions of Standing Order 32.

West Lodge School, West End Lane: The deputation representing the teachers, Governors and parents of West Lodge First and Middle Schools supported by the local police and community outlined the need for safety measures outside the school in view of the lack of adequate sign posts and crossings, speed of traffic and poor visibility.

Members accepted that there were problems at this location for pedestrians/children often caused by obstructive parking by parents and it was felt that the installation of a School Safety Zone which would include a review of lighting and signage would benefit the area. It was suggested that this school be moved up the priority order for implementation as soon as practicable. It was explained that public consultation would have to be undertaken with surrounding properties followed by a statutory process and in the meantime officers were requested to contact the police with a view to them finding a replacement school crossing patrol officer.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Head of Planning and Transportation undertake a public consultation for the implementation of a School Safety Zone for West Lodge School as soon as practicable;

(2) the Police be advised of the urgent need to find a school crossing patrol officer to supervise the crossing of school children at the site.

(Note: Councillor Ms Chamberlain declared a clear and substantial non-pecuniary interest in this item, left the room and took no part in the debate.)

Kings Road - Speed Cushions: The Sub-Committee received a deputation on behalf of the local residents objecting to the speed cushion scheme which had been introduced in the Kings Road. The main objections concerned passenger discomfort on the buses, particularly for the elderly and disabled people. A complaint was also made about the lack of consultation with bus passengers. A complaint was also made about the lack of consultation with bus passengers.

Details of the consultation carried out were provided and it was explained that the scheme had been designed in accordance with the Regulation and DoT and LT Guidelines so as to meet the concerns of the emergency services, and buses. It was pointed out that if bus drivers aligned up properly and drove at a reasonable speed the problem of passenger discomfort would be minimised.

Members acknowledged the concerns raised by the deputation and it was suggested that the problems caused by the buses be discussed with the Manager of Sovereign Buses and at the next London Transport Liaison meeting in October. The Chairman of HPTUA undertook to update the Sub-Committee at its next meeting.
RESOLVED: That (1) the problems caused by buses driving over the speed cushions in Kings Road be raised with the Manager of the Bus Company and be considered at the next LT Liaison meeting in October;

(2) an oral report on the above from the Chairman of HPTUA be received at the next meeting.

156. References from Council: RESOLVED: To note that the petition submitted to Council on 18 July 1996 objecting to speeding traffic and obstructive parking in Priory Way was reported elsewhere on the agenda.

157. Footway and Verge Parking Exemptions: Further to Recommendation 1, the Sub-Committee

RESOLVED: That (1) streets which broadly meet the exemption criteria be agreed;

(2) the overall timescales required for preparing, consulting and reporting on schemes be noted;

(3) the streets which do not meet the exemption criteria be noted and residents be notified accordingly before routine enforcement recommences;

(4) the Head of Environmental Services be requested to draw up an implementation programme;

(5) the two sections of Long Elmes (Courtney Avenue to Boxtree Lane, and Headstone Lane to Courtney Avenue) be re-investigated after the footway reconstruction has been completed and the zebra crossing is in place;

(6) no further exemptions will be formally approved until the current programme is completed and there has been a sufficient period of time to allow a review of both the criteria and how the exemptions are working in practice.

158. Petition from Residents of Headstone Road: The Head of Environmental Health Services and the Head of Planning and Transportation reported in response to a petition from residents concerning traffic related problems which were principally brought about through the numbers of heavy vehicles and buses using Headstone Road. Noise and other pollution issues would be considered by the Leisure and Environment Protection Sub-Committee on 16 September 1996.

At the meeting, the Head Petitioner objected to the fact that she had not received a copy of the report prior to the meeting and that the item should therefore be deferred. The Sub-Committee agreed to this request and that the Head Petitioner be taken as the first deputation at the next meeting on 20 November 1996.

RESOLVED: That (1) consideration of the petition from residents of Headstone Road be deferred to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee, when the Head Petitioner would be invited to speak as the first deputation.

159. Aran Drive: Objections to a Disabled Person’s Parking Space and Further Request for Disabled Persons’ Parking Spaces: The Head of Planning and Transportation reported on an objection to the proposed introduction of a residential disabled persons parking space in Aran Drive, together with the receipt of further applications for disabled persons parking spaces in Aran Drive.

The Sub-Committee noted four points raised by the objector to the introduction of a disabled person’s parking space outside Kelmscott Court. These were addressed in the report accordingly. Two further letters from the objector were tabled for Members of the Sub-Committee and the objector drew attention to these in his deputation.

Further information was imparted by the applicant’s husband during the course of his deputation. The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant’s household owned only one vehicle and that the deputee did not feel that the surveys examined parking availability during the day when the applicant would require the disabled persons parking space. It was reiterated by the deputee that the applicant had recently been diagnosed as having osteoporosis.

Two further applications from Aran Drive residents living in Gressenham Court and Bickley Court had been received orally, and details of these were provided. A further application from Warren Fields was expected. Parking surveys indicated that criterion 5 of the Criteria for Residential Area Applications was not met by the first application. However the receipt of several other applications may affect the current applicant’s ability to park within 50m of her premises and the Sub-Committee felt that this application should be dealt with under the Executive Action procedure.

RESOLVED: That (1) the objection to the advertised disabled person’s parking space be noted and that consideration of this and additional applications be deferred until a complete assessment has been made;

(2) the original application for a disabled person’s parking space outside Kelmscott Court and any others that may be received during the assessment, be determined by Executive Action to avoid unnecessary delay to the applicants if this proves practical.
160. **Flambard Road Area: Proposed Waiting Restrictions Objections:** At its meeting on 22 May 1996 the Sub-Committee resolved (Resolution 134) to introduce waiting restrictions (yellow lines) to apply Monday to Friday 11.00 am to 12 noon in the Flambard Road Area. Three objections to the Traffic Order had been received which the Head of Planning and Transportation reported on. These were mainly concerned about the lack of resident parking spaces. The Sub-Committee was asked to consider whether they wanted to overrule the objections and proceed with the current proposals or address the objections by withdrawing them and reconsulting as part of Harrow Town Centre State 2 proposals.

It was reported that a petition of 17 signatures, representing 16% of Elmwood Avenue householders believed that the proposal would not address the problems of residents without off-street parking or visitors. Reference was made to the consultation results reported to the May meeting where of the 48 replies, 75% affirmed support for the scheme. The claim that yellow lines would devalue properties in the area was refuted as the removal of commuter parking could improve residential amenity and enhance the area’s attractiveness.

However, the deputee felt that no account had been made for flat conversions which left more residents with insufficient parking than acknowledged and that the residents had been given the option of yellow lines or nothing. The deputee expressed their preference for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), incorporating a residents parking scheme. Officers advised that whilst yellow lines could be installed immediately the CPZ option was at least a year away because of the need to consult over a much wider area and because of the statutory process, with any implementation being dependent on funds being made available.

RESOLVED: That the residents be reconsulted on whether they wished to proceed with the current proposals to install yellow lines which could be implemented immediately or wait for approximately one year whilst the consultation exercises were undertaken on the extension of the Harrow Town Centre CPZ, with implementation being dependent on adequate funding being available.

161. **Bus Priority Measures in Station Road:** The Head of Planning and Transportation reported on an objection to the bus priority scheme in Station Road between Greenhill Way and Woodlands Road.

It was noted that the provision of speed tables in the service road would deter "rat-running" on the eastern side of Station Road by vehicles attempting to by-pass Greenhill Way traffic signals and improve safety for pedestrians and bus passengers by providing a level crossing to the pedestrian crossing and bus stop. Members were also advised that the road humps in Central Parade would deter northbound rat-running by vehicles attempting to by-pass the pre-signals.

RESOLVED: That (1) the objection be overruled for reasons given in the report and the objector be informed accordingly;

(2) officers be authorised to take all necessary steps to complete the order-making process.

162. **Wetheral Drive: Proposed No Right Turn from Weston Drive - Objections:** At its meeting on 27 November 1995 the Sub-Committee had proposed that a no right turn be introduced in order to alleviate the accident problem and rat-running issue in Wetheral Drive. In response to this, objections had been received from the Cyclists’ Touring Club and a resident of Wetheral Drive. The former had requested that local cyclists be exempt from the right turn ban due to the Uppingham Avenue road humps and the extra mileage which would be incurred.

It was noted that whilst regulations could allow cyclists to be exempted from such restrictions in this instance it was not considered safe to do so. Any detour incurred by cyclists was considered minimal. It was pointed out that road humps in Uppingham Avenue, were not necessarily unfriendly to cyclists and that the former cyclist representative had been in favour of road humps on Uppingham Avenue.

During the course of discussion it was also contended that a bus-stop at the junction of Wetheral Drive and Weston Drive would place cyclists in a hazardous position and that cyclists heading for Coledale Drive and the northern end of Wetheral Drive, Kynance and Braithwaite Gardens would incur longer journeys as a result of the ban. It was suggested by a Member that it would be practicable for cyclists to push their bikes across the road where appropriate. An objection from a resident in Wetheral Drive over likely inconvenience caused by the need to use alternative routes thereby extending travelling times was also acknowledged. However, it was considered that road safety should take precedence over convenience. The Sub-Committee determined that on balance none of the objections raised could override the likely improvement in safety resulting from the scheme.

RESOLVED: That (1) the objections to the proposed No Right Turn be overruled for reasons given in the report, and;

(2) the objectors be informed accordingly and that officers be instructed to take all necessary steps to complete the order making process.
163. **Stammore Controlled Parking Zone (East of Merrion Avenue) - Objections:** At its meeting on 14 February 1996 the Sub-Committee resolved to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) incorporating a residents’ parking scheme in the proximity of Stammore Station which would be operational between 10.00 am to 11.00 am and 3.00 pm to 4.00 pm Monday to Saturday.

The four formal objections to the scheme were noted accordingly. The Headteacher of Aylward First and Middle School had requested an alternative time for the afternoon operation of the scheme to accommodate the “pick-up” period by parents. As unrestricted on-street parking was available in roads outside the zone it was felt that this would allow parents to park for the short “pick-up” period.

A resident of Chestnut Avenue felt that the introduction of the proposed scheme in Kerry Avenue would prevent him from parking to gain access to Stammore Park. It was noted that the north section of Kerry Avenue would not be affected as it was outside the zone and parking would still be possible in the south section, outside of the restricted hours. Although the scheme would require short-stay visitors planning their journeys to avoid such restrictions, in this case the objector would still be able to visit the park between 11.00 am to 3.00 pm and 4pm to 10.00am the next day.

The residents of Warren House Estate had objected to the scheme due to the perceived adverse effect on parking levels in the Estate roads, namely Glenleam Road, Kerry Avenue (North), Reenglass Road and Valencia Road, which were all private streets with public rights of way, ie unadopted highways. The “at any time” waiting restrictions as recommended by the Metropolitan Police (Traffic Management Unit) on security grounds, constituted part of the scheme and had been proposed in the service road and Reenglass Road, outside the Synagogue. The Association body questioned the Council’s authority to introduce waiting restrictions in an unadopted road. However as Reenglass Road constituted a public highway the Council was legally entitled to introduce waiting restrictions under Sections 6 and 142 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984. Although it was within the power of the Association to control the affects of displaced parking onto Estate roads, this was subject to the Council’s agreement. It was acknowledge that the proposed “at any time” waiting restriction outside the Synagogue created an unusual situation due to the security issues involved, and that funding was considered appropriate under these circumstances. The Association’s representative orally withdrew their objection to the particular aspect of the scheme. The proposal to introduce a CPZ on the estate, either separately or with the existing Stanmore Zone, had been an on-going discussion between the Council and the Association for many years. At its Annual General Meeting on 18 September 1995 this offer was declined and a pre-condition relating to improvements to sub-standard road humps had not been met. (The subsequent appearance since April 1996 of unauthorised signs and yellow road marking on the estate, was reported elsewhere on the agenda.)

An objection raised by a resident in London Road that additional financial pressures would be placed on householders was acknowledged, but it was pointed out that the results of the consultation exercise indicated that the large majority of residents welcomed the introduction of the scheme and had been proposed in the service road and Reenglass Road, outside the Synagogue. The proposal to introduce a CPZ on the estate, either separately or with the existing Stanmore Zone, had been an on-going discussion between the Council and the Association for many years. At its Annual General Meeting on 18 September 1995 this offer was declined and a pre-condition relating to improvements to sub-standard road humps had not been met. (The subsequent appearance since April 1996 of unauthorised signs and yellow road marking on the estate, was reported elsewhere on the agenda.)

An objection raised by a resident in London Road that additional financial pressures would be placed on householders was acknowledged, but it was pointed out that the results of the consultation exercise indicated that the large majority of residents welcomed the introduction of the scheme and had been proposed in the service road and Reenglass Road, outside the Synagogue. The proposal to introduce a CPZ on the estate, either separately or with the existing Stanmore Zone, had been an on-going discussion between the Council and the Association for many years. At its Annual General Meeting on 18 September 1995 this offer was declined and a pre-condition relating to improvements to sub-standard road humps had not been met. (The subsequent appearance since April 1996 of unauthorised signs and yellow road marking on the estate, was reported elsewhere on the agenda.)

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the objections be overruled and the objectors be informed accordingly;

(2) officers take all necessary steps to complete the order making process.

164. **Warren House Estate - Update (CA):** Further to the February Information Circular 1/96, report number 5 regarding a proposed private system of parking control on roads within the Warren House Estate, the Head of Planning and Transportation reported that unauthorised yellow lines and time plate signs had been installed on the estate roads. The Association stated that they had not initiated these acts and that they did not know who had.

Members were advised that as the Council had not been able to ascertain who the perpetrators were they could not prosecute under Section 132 of the Highway Act 1980. The expediency of enforcement action needed to be viewed in light of the on-going ownership dispute with the Association, their denial of responsibilities and the fact that the yellow lines and signs had not adversely affected traffic management or safety on the adjoining highways. Whilst there was a wish to avoid setting an undesirable precedent this was balanced against the difficulty in recovering the costs of enforcement, the potential for claims for damage by the Association and the risk of the process of removal and subsequent replacement of unauthorised lines and signs being repeated again and again.

The Chairman of the Warren House Residents’ Association outlined the background of the case, emphasising the need for parking controls on the Estate. It was explained that the roads on the Estate were privately maintainable public highways. During debate, the Association indicated that it would be willing to co-operate with the wishes of the Council but requested the Council to suspend action for 3 months during which time the Association could discuss the matter with residents. The Association also reported that the sub-standard road humps would be rectified before the end of the year.
RESOLVED: That officers seek to remove the illegal signs and carriageway markings in consultation with the Warren House Estate Residents’ Association at no cost to the Council within 30 days, and that in the event of any failure to agree the Council undertake the work required and any reparation that may be required and seek to recover the cost from the Residents’ Association.

165. Priory Way - Petition Concerning Speeding, Visibility Problems and the State of the Road Surface: A petition, received by Council on 18 July 1996 had requested that action be taken on obstructive parking at the junctions between Priory and Parkside Way and Priory Way and Headstone Lane, and dangerous and noisy speeding of vehicles down Priory Way itself. An addendum to the petition called for the road to be resurfaced.

On the basis of the results of traffic counts taken in January 1996 and the accident record, Priory Way collected a point score of three against the Council’s traffic calming assessment method which therefore gave it low priority. Officers reported that police had been requested to assist with regard to a van regularly parked in Parkside Way, adversely affecting visibility. It was noted that ghost capes would significantly assist visibility to the right and the cape, together with the presence of two vehicle crossovers should effectively keep about 20 metres of kerbside clear of parked vehicles.

It was noted that the edge deterioration of construction joints along the whole of Priory Way would be monitored and that some patching may be required in the future to prevent the ingress of water. At present the defects to the surface of Priory Way were insufficient to justify expenditure on it. The condition of the road would be reviewed by annual inspection for the HERMIS pavement management system.

During the course of discussion the issue of similar problems in Manor Way, which was parallel to Priory Way, was raised.

RESOLVED: That (1) the petitioners be informed that the traffic situation does not currently warrant priority being given for implementation of traffic calming, but that “ghost capes” will be installed at the junction of Parkside Way and Priory Way and that the road surface of Priory Way is considered to be adequate at the present time but will be kept under annual review;

(2) officers investigate whether the Manor Way junction meet the “ghost capes” criteria and take action if appropriate.

166. Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes: The Sub-Committee considered the Head of Planning and Transportation’s annual review of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) & Resident Parking Schemes for the whole Borough which assessed both existing zones and requests for new ones. In addition to reviewing the appropriate recommendations in each case the report also included a prioritisation of the workload for the next year. Details of the ten petitions received in connection with parking problems during the last year either requesting resident parking schemes, changes to existing CPZs or complaining about the side effects caused by the introduction/expansion of such zones, were provided and the concerns addressed. Officers also orally advised of a petition from Frognal Avenue that had previously been reported and recommended that this road together with Woodlands Road and Rosslyn Crescent be included in the Harrow Town Centre CPZ Stage 2 consultation.

Members raised a number of detailed points on the petitions which would be considered in the relevant reviews of the CPZs.

The financial estimates given were provisional as neither the size or details of the zones were known. Rayners Lane was in the approved Capital Programme, but it was anticipated that the other schemes could be funded from the Traffic Management Capital Budget subject to continued annual funding and appropriate priorities being set for the budget. The nature of the consultation and Traffic Order making process would mean that the schemes would be spread over more than one financial year.

It was noted that the list of Controlled Parking Zones/Resident Parking Schemes was long and beyond the scope of current resources. Consequently prioritisation would be needed.

RESOLVED: That (1) the recommended current priorities listed in paragraph 8.10.1 for the next year and the next set out priorities at this stage be as shown in paragraph 8.10.2 of the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation be agreed and;

(2) the following be agreed regarding petitions:

(a) the petitioners from High Road, Harrow Weald be advised that their request will be considered in conjunction with the review for the Fontwell Close zone;

(b) the petitioners from All Saints Mews be advised that the police have been asked to take appropriate enforcement action concerning parking too close to the junction with Uxbridge Road and that further consideration of the problem would be undertaken as part of the review for the Fontwell Close zone;
(c) the petitioners in White House Drive be advised that their concerns will be investigated as part of the existing Stanmore Zone review;

(d) the petitioners from Sherwood Road be advised that a residents' parking scheme will be considered for the whole of South Harrow Area when funding is available but currently it is not possible to consider their request on a "street only" basis;

(e) the petitioners on Donmeffield Avenue be advised that a residents' parking scheme will be considered for the whole of the Canons Park area at some time in the future when resources permit but currently it is not possible to consider their request on a "street only" basis;

(f) the petitioners from Woodlands/Southway be advised that a residents' parking scheme would be considered as part of an investigation into a zone for North Harrow when resources permit.

(g) it be noted that the petitioners from September Way and Stanmore Hill have already been advised that their concerns will be investigated as part of the existing Stanmore Zone review;

(h) it be noted that the petitioners from Reynolds Drive have been advised that a residents' parking scheme is being considered in conjunction with Brent and are currently being consulted.

(i) the petitioners for Frognal Avenue be advised that a residents parking scheme for the road will be considered as part of Harrow Town Centre Stage 2 CPZ.

167. School Safety Zones: At its meeting on 14 February the Sub-Committee resolved to introduce a further 12 zones subject to consultation and the Head of Planning and Transportation reported back with appropriate recommendations for each one.

The 12 proposed school safety zones were of Weald First and Middle School, Kenmore Park First and Middle School, Rook Heath High, Stanburn First and Middle School, Belmont First and Middle School, Whitefriars First and Middle School, Rooks Heath High, Stanburn First and Middle School, London First and Middle School, Newton Farm First and Middle School, Roxboume First and Middle School, Priestmead First and Middle School, St Joseph's First and Middle School, Grimsdyke First and Middle School. Details were provided for each zone, taking account of both the responses to the consultation exercise and any recommended alteration if so required. The estimated cost for the implementation of the 12 proposed schemes was £24,000 which could be met from this year's budget.

A letter was tabled at the meeting from residents of Waverley Road on the Roxboume School Safety Zone. Amendments had now been made so that restrictions were now removed and the residents would be informed. A petition had been received from the residents of Ravenswood Crescent objection to the proposed School Safety Zone at Newton Farm. Amendments had now been made and the Head Petitioner would be informed of this together with the residents' right to make formal objections if they wished when the statutory advert was published.

A petition was also received from the residents of Abercom Road objecting to the Stanburn School Safety Zone and tabled at the meeting. Whilst the Committee noted the concerns expressed by the petitioners, it was advised that school safety took precedence and that the petitioners would be advised accordingly together with their statutory rights.

The results of the consultation indicated that the majority of residents affected by the School Safety Zones were in favour of the proposals. Where this was not the case, attempts had been made to accommodate those objections where possible but safety had not been compromised in doing so.

RESOLVED: That (1) officers be authorised to take all necessary steps under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce school safety zones and waiting restrictions as detailed in plans shown at Appendices 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5.1, 9.6.1, 9.7.1, 9.8.1, 9.9.1, 9.10.1, 9.11.1, 9.12, 9.13.1, 9.14.1 and 9.12 of the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation;

(2) the "Statement of Reasons" to be given as "to improve road safety";

(3) the residents immediately affected by the proposals, headteachers and any objector to the consultation exercise be advised of the proposals as it affects them;

(4) the petitioner relating to the School Safety Schemes at Ravenswood Crescent be advised that the scheme has been modified from that originally proposed as shown at Appendix 9.8.1 and that residents would have a further opportunity to formally object if they wished when the statutory advert is published.

(5) the petitioners from Abercom Road be advised that the Council considers road safety should take precedence in this particular case but that they will have the opportunity to formally object if they wish when the statutory advert is published.
168. **Cycle Network Update:** The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Head of Planning and Transportation on proposals for sections of Cycle Route 1 along the A410 from Marsh Lane to Kenton Lane and for the roundabout at Uxbridge Road/Oxhey Lane/Courtenay Avenue. It also advised of the launch of the National Cycle Strategy by the DoT which made a number of long term commitment targets, including the doubling of cycle use nationally by 2002. The imminent production of cycle route publicity bulletins for Harrow's cycle network were also reported.

The details of the proposals for four further sections of Cycle Route 1 were reported and consisted primarily of advisory cycle lanes, together with a cycle gap at The Broadway, revised road markings and enlarged refuges at Church Road and narrowed junctions at three side roads along Uxbridge Road. The cost of the works was estimated at £65,000 and would be funded from the London Cycle Network (LCN) budget.

The roundabout at Uxbridge Road, Oxhey Lane and Courtenay Avenue was the subject of a Local Safety Scheme, programmed for 1996/97. The junction is particularly vulnerable for cyclists because of the high speeds and the large width of the carriageways with dual carriageway approaches on the Uxbridge Road.

As part of Cycle Route 1 it was proposed to provide off-carriageway cycle facilities at the roundabout and in order to provide the necessary width for segregating pedestrians and cyclists a combination of kerb realignments. This involved the transfer of a strip of land 50m long and up to 2m wide at the Roger Bannister Sports Centre from the Education Committee to Environment, Transport and Leisure Committee subject to the concurrence of the Education Committee; and the acquisition of a triangle of land 3m x 4m, by Agreement from 205 Courtenay Avenue for highways purposes subject to agreement with the owner.

The total cost of the cycle proposals shown was estimated to be £65,000. This would be funded from the LCN budget and was in addition to the accident remedial works element of the scheme which would be funded from the Local Safety Schemes 1996/97 budget. To minimise transitional and abortive work it would be preferable to implement some of the cycle scheme to a maximum cost of £20,000 during 1996/97, with the remainder to follow in 1997/98 in accordance with the cycle priority schedule agreed at the February 1996 meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the proposals for advisory cycle lanes on Cycle Route 1 along the A410 Uxbridge Road from Marsh Lane to Kenton Lane, as shown on drawing C01/07/01, C01/08/01, C01/09/01, and C01/10/01 (Appendices 10.1, 10.2 10.3 and 10.4 of the report of the Head of Planning and Transportation) be agreed;

(2) the proposals to provide cycle facilities in association with accident remedial works at the Uxbridge Road/Oxhey Lane/Courtenay Avenue roundabout, subject to consultation and obtaining the necessary land by agreement, as shown on drawings no C01/15/01 and C01/15/02 (appendix 10.5 and 10.6 of the report) be agreed;

(3) Education Committee be requested to declare the land hatched on plan C01/15/02 (appendix 10.6 of the report) surplus to requirements and refer the transfer to the Property Sub-Committee;

(4) the acquisition by agreement of the land shown cross hatched on plan C01/15/02 (appendix 10.6 of the report) be referred to the Property Sub-Committee.

169. **Direction Signs to University of Westminster and Northwick Park and St Mark's Hospital:**

The Head of Planning and Transportation reported that Northwick Park and St Mark's NHS Trust Hospital and the University of Westminster (Harrow Campus) had submitted requests for direction signs to their premises.

It was noted that these requests were contrary to the current policy for local direction and name place signs as determined by the meeting of the Sub-Committee on 4 March 1992 (resolution 198), but in view of the size and importance of the establishments, Members agreed that they be exempted from the criteria. Direction signs could be erected on the approaches to the Northwick Park roundabout, specifically Sheepcote Road, Kenton Road west of the roundabout, Kenton Road east of the roundabout and on the island at the exit on Watford Road. The last two proposed locations were in the London Borough of Brent, but they had agreed to their erection, subject to there being no financial implications to their Council. The proposal was also consistent with an aim of Harrow's Economic Development Strategy to improve links between important sites and Harrow Town Centre.

The Hospital Trust and the University had agreed to share in the costs for the design, supply and erection of the signs which had been estimated at approximately £1,400.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) direction signs to the University of Westminster, Harrow Campus and Northwick Park and St Mark's Hospitals be approved for implementation;

(2) London Transport be requested to improve the signing to these establishments from Harrow Bus Station;

(3) the London Borough of Brent be advised of the need to improve the directional signs for traffic approaching from the south via Watford Road.
170. **Road Traffic Reduction Bill:** The Head of Planning and Transportation reported that the Council had been consulted on whether it wished to support a proposed Parliamentary Bill aimed at reducing traffic levels and that the view of the Sub-Committee was sought.

It was noted that the Bill required the Secretary of State to draw up a National Road Traffic Reduction Plan containing specific targets. Local Plans would not contain specific targets but would need to outline measures that were felt by Local Authorities to be appropriate for their areas.

The Council's current policy relating to traffic restraint was Policy T2 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan which stipulated that any traffic restraint measures should form part of a London-wide initiative and be in conjunction with improvements to public transport.

**RESOLVED:** That the proposed Road Traffic Reduction Bill be supported in principle and that the opportunity provided by London-wide traffic management and sustainable transport be welcomed.

171. **Reference from Planning Applications Sub-Committee (East Area) (Development and Planning) 29 July 1996: Garages at Rear of Belmont Circle:** **RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

172. **Executive Action:** **RESOLVED:** To note and insofar as it may be necessary to confirm the following actions taken with the relevant Members representing all four political Groups on the Council:

1. **London Bus Priority Network:** Authorising minor amendments on proposed waiting and loading restrictions and bus stop clearways for bus route 32 to those previously agreed by the Sub-Committee on 22 May 1996 as a result of detailed discussion with consultants and the boroughs of Barnet and Brent.

2. **Stanmore Controlled Parking Zone:** Authorising an amendment to Resolution 101 of the Sub-Committee on 14 February 1996 to amend waiting restrictions in the vicinity of United Synagogue, London Road, Stanmore at the request of the Metropolitan Police.

3. **Cycle Route 11 (Kenton Road to Station Road):** Authorising approval of the sections of cycle route 11, (i) along Bonnersfield Lane and Northwick Park Road together with the associated traffic calming, and (ii) along Gayton Road including advisory cycle lanes and pedestrian refuges.

(The Sub-Committee considered the proposals for part of cycle route 11 between Kenton Road and Station Road at their 22 May 1996 meeting. Proposals were subject to consultation with the non-voting advisers, emergency services and frontages affected, prior to reporting back for Executive Action.)

173. **The Relocation of the Sign Near the Junction of Headstone Road and Hindes Road:** Under any other business the Sub-Committee considered the feasibility of relocating the sign at the junction of Headstone Road and Hindes Road in response to the concerns expressed by a chemist resident in that locale.

Members recognised that visibility problems may have been caused as the sign obscured one of the Chemist's signs.

**RESOLVED:** That officers report back on this matter at the next meeting on 20 November 1996.

174. **Adviser Representing the Metropolitan Police, Traffic Management:** It was noted that Sergeant Brown would be retiring and that this would be her last meeting in her capacity as Police Adviser. The Sub-Committee expressed their gratitude for her service and efforts.

The Sub-Committee was informed that no replacement would be provided due to time and resource constraints. It was requested that the police authorities be written to so as to convey the Sub-Committee's desire for another representative.

**RESOLVED:** That a letter be written to the Traffic Management Section of the Metropolitan Police signed by the Chairman and Nominated Members of the Sub-Committee stressing the importance of nominating a replacement adviser.

175. **Termination of Meeting:** In accordance with Standing Order 30(g) it was

**RESOLVED:** At 11.30 pm to continue in the normal manner and complete the business remaining on the agenda.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 7.30 pm closed at 12.24 am.)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR P BUDDEN
Chairman
LEISURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SUB-COMMITTEE

Chairman: * Councillor Cliff Thomas
Councillors: * Mrs Bothe * Mrs Cowan * Mrs Nandhra
* Susan Boobis * Mrs Kinnear * Mrs Nandhra
* Cripps
Advisers: * Mr R J Dickens * Mr D Goff
* Mr D Goff
* Mr J Hollingdale

* Denotes Member present
(2) Denotes category of Reserve Member
/ Denotes apologies received

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

93. Reserve Members: RESOLVED: To note the attendance of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

Member Reserve Member
Councillor Fox Councillor Frogley

94. Arrangement of Agenda: RESOLVED: That (1) all items on the agenda be considered with the press and public present;
(2) agenda items 9, 7 and 13 respectively be taken after agenda item 6 as there were members of the public attending for these items.

95. Minutes: RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 1996 be signed as a correct record.

96. Public Questions: RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions to be asked under the provisions of Standing Order 32(a).

97. Petitions: RESOLVED: To note that there were no petitions submitted to this meeting by members of the public or Councillors.

98. Deputations: RESOLVED: That three deputations be heard prior to the relevant agenda item and where necessary the procedures, as described in Standing Order 31, governing such requests be waived.

99. Reference from Council - 18 July 1996: A petition on Noise Nuisance from Fireworks had been submitted to Council on 18 July 1996 and was referred to this Sub-Committee for consideration. The petition requested that the Council act to reduce noise and nuisance caused by the extended firework season in the late Autumn around the dates of Guy Fawkes and Diwali.

A deputation from a local resident was heard expressing concern regarding the increasing availability and use of powerful fireworks. In recent years it had become usual for firework celebrations to span the weekends before and after traditional celebrations associated with firework displays. This practice was increasing the nuisance being experienced by pet owners and parents of young children in particular.

Members sympathised with the views expressed by the petitioners and deputation. During the debate on this matter, it was agreed that the Council's response to the Department of Trade and Industry's review of firework controls should refer to this Sub-Committee's unanimous support for limiting the sale of fireworks to licensed displays.

RESOLVED: That (1) a response be made to the Department of Trade and Industry's review of firework controls calling for increased controls over the periods of sale of fireworks and the size of fireworks that may be sold to the public;
(2) the principal petitioner be advised of the action taken.

100. Headstone Manor Lottery Submission - Landscaping Proposals: The Director of Development Services reported on the progress that had been made on the bid for National Lottery Funding for landscaping and external works at Headstone Manor, as a major phase in the repair, restoration and enhancement of the Headstone Manor complex.
The officers' report was considered in conjunction with the report prepared by the Land Use Consultants, which was the proposed basis for the submission to the Heritage Lottery Fund. It was noted that lottery funding of £390,000 had already been granted for the first phase of building works, internal fitting, displays and interpretation facilities. The current bid concerned the landscaping and external works for the Headstone Manor and Harrow Museum complex.

Both reports emphasised that if the submission was approved in full, three issues would need to be addressed. It was advised that the use of the showfield and size and nature of the Harrow Show would need to be reviewed, budgeting for the additional parts of the park that would require management and maintenance would have to be done and, lastly, consideration on how to minimise the inevitable disruption that would be caused when the works were begun would be necessary.

A representative of Friends of the Earth expressed some concern regarding the development of the site and hoped that it would not become just a tourist attraction but would reflect local needs and interests. He suggested that the building should be used as an ecology centre and be designed to last over a 1000 years.

Members welcomed the report and looked forward to seeing the site being restored.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Land Use Consultants’ Report be approved as the basis for the submission to the Heritage Lottery Fund;

(2) the potential implications, as set out in paragraph 5 of the officers’ report, be noted and a report on these implications be submitted to this Sub-Committee at the earliest opportunity.

The Director of Development Services reported on the review that had been conducted regarding West Harrow and Marshalls allotment sites.

It was reported that the West Harrow Allotment Site was currently underused with approximately a third of the plots being vacant. The report proposed that a consolidation exercise be carried out to allow underused land to be released and added to the adjoining playing field site for leisure use. It was also suggested that this might be a suitable opportunity to create a straight line boundary between the allotments and the playing fields. The report identified two areas of allotment land that would need to be released if a straight boundary was to be achieved. One area, shown as the hatched land on plan ES 8923, had not been cultivated for some time, however, the other area of land, the cross-hatched land, would require 22 plotholders being relocated. If this course of action was to be pursued the report recommended that the views of the plotholders would need to be consulted and a relocation package be offered to affected plotholders.

The deputation from the West Harrow Allotment Holders’ Association updated the meeting on the Association’s success in increasing the number of plotholders at the West Harrow Allotment Site. 80% of plots were now let and only 23 plots were currently vacant. The Association emphasised that the increased take up in lets was the direct result of the work of the Association and further development was impeded by the Council not employing a dedicated allotment officer.

Having considered the proposed consolidation exercise, Members agreed that both the hatched and cross hatched areas of land shown on Plan ES 8923 should be retained for allotment use.

During the course of the debate, the issue of the designation of the West Harrow Allotment site as a proposal site in the UDP was discussed and it was agreed that the Unitary Development Plan and Review Panel be asked to reassess the designation of the whole of the proposal site in the Plan as part of the formal review would be taking place in due course.

It was further agreed that officers would investigate leasing out rotavators under the annual Grounds Maintenance contract.

It was noted that although the Marshalls Allotment site had about a third of its plots uncultivated there was currently no other alternative land use for this site. The report therefore recommended that the take up of lets at this site should continue to be monitored and its future use be considered as part of the UDP review process.

RESOLVED: That (1) the land, shown as the hatched area on Plan ES 8923 Issue A, be retained for allotment purposes;

(2) the land, shown as the cross hatched area on Plan ES 8923 Issue A, be retained for allotment purposes;

(3) the present standard allotment tenancy agreement be retained and leases not be offered to plotholders;

(4) the position in regard to the Marshalls site be noted;

(5) Property Sub-Committee be informed of (1) and (2) above;
(6) a report on promoting Harrow allotments be brought to a future Sub-Committee meeting;

(7) the Unitary Development Plan and Review Panel be asked to reassess the designation of the Ridgeway Playing Fields Proposal Site in the UDP as part of the forthcoming review of the UDP.

102. **Noise Act 1996:** The Sub-Committee examined a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on the discretionary powers which will be available to local authorities under the recently enacted 1996 Noise Act. The report also explained what the financial and other implications would be should the Authority wish to adopt the new powers.

The Noise Act contained discretionary powers for local authorities to adopt various powers to deal with night time noise problems in domestic premises. In addition, the Act clarified the powers for seizure of noisy equipment.

Members were informed that if the powers contained in the Act were implemented, the Council would be required to take reasonable steps to investigate complaints of excessive noise being emitted from a dwelling between 11 pm and 7 am. This would require the new out of hours service that was shortly to be introduced by this Council to be extended so as to cover the whole week. Increasing the out of hours service to a seven day service would have substantial resource implications and would require budgetary growth of over £100,000 on top of the previously agreed budget. The report recommended that any consideration of the new discretionary powers contained within the 1996 Noise Act be deferred until a review of the Council’s own out of hours service had taken place.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) the new discretionary enforcement powers provided in the 1996 Noise Act be noted;

(2) consideration of the new powers be deferred until the proposed review of the out of hours noise complaint service, shortly to be introduced, has been carried out after 6 months of its operation;

(3) the clarification of powers for seizure of noisy equipment when dealing with statutory noise nuisances be noted.

103. **The United Kingdom National Environmental Health Action Plan:** The Head of Environmental Health Services advised the Sub-Committee of the recent publication of the United Kingdom National Environmental Health Action Plan, which set out wide ranging proposals for improving environmental health in the United Kingdom.

The National Environmental Health Action Plan (NEHAP) was essentially a position statement on Government Environmental Health Policy, which for the first time brought all aspects of National Policy on Environmental Health within a single document and this innovation was very much welcomed.

It was noted that NEHAP identified local authorities as having a key role in the provision of environmental health services and thereby being the main implementors of NEHAP. The Plan referred to the experience local authorities had in developing local environmental plans within an overall national strategy, notably as part of their work in promoting sustainable development through the Local Agenda 21 initiative.

Members were advised that the Plan provided a good framework for the development of the Council’s Environmental Health policies, which were set out in the Environmental Health Services Operational Plan and were approved annually by this Sub-Committee. Implementation of the policies contained within the Plan would be helped by the links now established with the Health Authority and other health agencies and those forged with business, voluntary and community sectors during the preparation of Harrow Agenda 21.

**RESOLVED:** That the contents of the United Kingdom National Environmental Health Action Plan and the proposals for addressing the Plan in the Borough be noted.

104. **Harrow Agenda 21 - Progress Report:** The Sub-Committee studied a report of the Head of Environmental Health Services on the progress that has been made since the last Environmental Forum meeting and also how the future co-ordination of environmental action within the Council has been advanced.

It was noted that Policy and Strategy Committee at its meeting on 2 July 1996 agreed that the Council’s commitment to the successful development of Harrow Agenda 21 within the Borough be reaffirmed and confirmed that Policy and Strategy Committee would oversee the co-ordination of the Council’s involvement in the Harrow Agenda 21 process.

Members were also advised on the further developments that had been made in establishing the Environmental Forum. The Environmental Forum at its last meeting on 8 July 1996 agreed to set up six Harrow Agenda 21 topic discussion groups on subjects such as Energy Conservation
and Transport and Air Pollution. It was considered that this would be the best way to prepare action programmes for topic areas that came under the remit of Harrow Agenda 21.

The Forum meeting also made further refinements to their draft constitution. A number of amendments were made, which included reductions in the powers proposed to be delegated to the Executive Committee, less restricted membership criteria and a decision not to have an initial membership subscription fee. The constitution continued to provide for 4 elected members of the Council to be members of the Executive Committee.

Members congratulated everyone who was involved in establishing the Environmental Forum on all the time and hard work that had been spent in setting up the Forum.

RESOLVED: That (1) the decisions made by Policy and Strategy Committee on 2 July 1996 be noted;
(2) the decisions reached by Environmental Forum on 8 July 1996 be noted;
(3) the principles of the revised draft constitution for the Forum for its future operation be endorsed.

105. Walking - An Initiative to Develop a Waymarked Network of Sustainable Footpaths: The Sub-Committee studied a report of the Head of Planning and Transportation on the development of waymarked footpaths which are primarily off the highway and mainly directed through the Borough's "green" areas or "points of interest".

It was reported that currently Harrow has only two off-highway routes identified, waymarked and publicised. Both these routes were located in the northern half of the Borough, on green belt land. However, other potential waymarked routes have been identified in the Borough and would be suitable for inclusion in the West London Waterway Walks (WLWW) network. The WLWW network has been highly successful in establishing a comprehensive system of green walks through the rural and urban environment.

The report identified two walks in Harrow which could be developed to connect into the WLWW network. These walks followed the courses of the River Pinn and the Yeading Brook. It was recommended that a feasibility study should be carried out to ascertain how suitable these routes would be as water way walks. The study would need to encompass such matters as the practical implications of forming a network in terms of public rights of way issues, footpath conditions, physical barriers and safety issues.

Another initiative which Harrow has been involved in was the orbital routes planned for London. These walks were being developed by the London Walking Forum and it was intended to establish a 2000km network of waymarked walks by the year 2000.

Members were informed that Harrow as a member of the London Walking Forum has also been involved in plans to develop 2000km of waymarked walks in the capital by the year 2000. It was intended that most of the network would comprise of individual walks being established by individual local authorities, however it was proposed to create two orbital routes that would bind the network together. The London Outer Orbital path would mainly pass through green belt land in the outskirts of London and an inner orbital walk which encircles the centre of London.

RESOLVED: That (1) the contents of the report be noted;
(2) the aims of the London Walking Forum regarding the implementation of the London Outer Orbital Route and the Capital Ring be supported;
(3) approval be given to a feasibility study being carried out on the development of a network of waymarked walks across the Borough and the benefits of walking be publicised.

106. Petition from Residents of Headstone Road: The Head of Environmental Health Services and the Head of Planning and Transportation reported on a petition, signed by 62 local residents, regarding the number of heavy vehicles using Headstone Road and the excessive noise, vibration and pollution that this usage was creating.

It was reported that the issues raised in the petition had been investigated, however, the Council had no enforcement powers in relation to traffic noise, exhaust emissions or vibration caused by vehicles driving down Headstone Road.

The Sub-Committee was advised that airborne vibrations generated by the flexing of large panels in the bodywork of vehicles was probably causing the rattling windows being observed by the affected householders. The vibration arising from the interaction of vehicle types upon imperfections on the road surface was insufficient, according to national research, to cause structural damage.

A deputation was made by two residents of Headstone Road on the problems arising from the large volume of traffic using Headstone Road.
Members noted that road resurfacing works were due to be carried out in Headstone Road and it was hoped that this might alleviate some of the problems being caused by the interaction of vehicle tyres on the road surface.

Members acknowledged the increasing volume of traffic that Headstone Road was experiencing and the detrimental affect that this was having on the residents' quality of life. It was agreed that Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub-Committee be informed of this Sub-Committee's concern regarding the noise and pollution that residents were suffering.

RESOLVED: That (1) the conclusion of the report be noted;
(2) the principal petitioner be advised that having regard to the status of the road there are no further practical measures that can be taken to help with the matters raised in the petition;
(3) Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub-Committee be informed of this Sub-Committee's concerns regarding the noise and pollution being suffered by residents of Headstone Road arising from the large volume of traffic using this road.

107. Request for Support to Reduce VAT on Home Insulation Products: The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Head of Environmental Services on the request from the Association for the Conservation of Energy for support for a national campaign to reduce VAT on home insulation products to 8% and for grants to elderly people under the Home Energy Efficiency Scheme to be reinstated. The Association also hoped that the Council would ask the local MPs to support an Early Day Motion on VAT reduction.

RESOLVED: To note that (1) the London Borough of Harrow supports the campaign for a reduction of VAT on home insulation products to 8%;
(2) the London Borough of Harrow supports the campaign for the reinstatement of the Home Energy Efficiency Scheme;
(3) instruct the Head of Environmental Services to write to local Members of Parliament to ask them to sign Early Day Motion 702 affirming their support for a VAT reduction;
(4) instruct the Head of Environmental Services to write a letter to the Paymaster General asking him to support the proposed VAT reduction.

108. Light Pollution: The Sub-Committee studied a report of the Head of Environmental Services on light pollution. The report was prepared at the request of one of the advisors to the Sub-Committee and explained some of the background to the problem and commented on the action that was being taken by the Council when replacing the Borough's highway lighting fittings.

Members noted that current finances did not allow old units, which were not designed to minimise light pollution, to be replaced. However, light fittings on new developments, such as the Wealdstone bypass, were carefully selected to ensure that light spillage was kept to a minimum.

It was agreed that a good practice leaflet should be produced for the general public and developers providing advice on suitable lighting arrangements. Furthermore, the report should be referred to Development and Planning Committee to allow the wider planning issues to be considered.

RESOLVED: That (1) officers be instructed to prepare a guidance leaflet for the general public and developers on external lighting good practice;
(2) the report be referred to Development and Planning Committee.

109. Reference from Planning Applications Sub-Committee (East Area) (Development and Planning) - 29 July 1996: Garages Rear of Belmont Circle: The Sub-Committee received a reference from the Planning Applications Sub-Committee (East Area) on the residential redevelopment for the site of the Garages rear of Belmont Circle.

It was reported that a previous application for the commercial development of the site, which was agreed in principle, had involved the taking of a small area of land from the Belmont Line. However, at its meeting on 29 July 1996 Members of Planning Applications (East) Sub-Committee expressed grave reservations about approving a similar proposal and now favoured investigating alternative approaches.

RESOLVED: To agree that no land be taken from the Belmont Line for development purposes.

110. Executive Actions: RESOLVED: To confirm and insofar as it may be necessary, to approve the following Executive Action taken after consultation with the relevant Nominated Members of the Sub-Committee:

Letter to the Secretary of State for Transport Regarding the Parliamentary Select Committee on Transport Proposals for RAF Northolt: Approval was given to the response to the Secretary of
State for Transport which outlined the Council's opposition to the proposals contained in the recent report of the Parliamentary Transport Committee on UK Airport capacity.

Letter to the Assistant Command Secretary (Commitments) Regarding the New Business Aviation Package for RAF Northolt: Approval was given to the response to the Assistant Command Secretary, which explained the Council's opposition to the Government's proposals to expand flight operations at RAF Northolt by business users.

(Note: The meeting, having started at 7.30 pm, finished at 10.03 pm).

(Signed) CLIFF THOMAS
Chairman