

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**AGENDA ITEM**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**

**TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL**

**WEDNESDAY 18<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2002**

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION**

1. Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone Review - Objections to the Traffic Orders for the Flambard Road Area
2. High Street, Wealdstone Part Pedestrianisation Scheme - Review of Prohibition Hours for Servicing Requirements
3. 20mph Zones – 5 Year Programme

# LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Agenda item: 1

Page no:

<b>Meeting:</b>	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
<b>Date:</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> September 2002
<b>Subject:</b>	Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone Review – Objections to Traffic Orders for the Flambard Road Area.
<b>Key Decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Chief Officer:</b>	Head of Environment and Transportation
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder:</b>	Environment and Transport
<b>Status:</b>	Part 1
<b>Ward:</b>	Greenhill
<b>Enclosures:</b>	Appendix A Consultation results Appendix B Letters of Objection to the Traffic Order Appendix C Petition from residents of Woodway Crescent Appendix D Options considered for Woodway Crescent Appendix E Original and revised proposal plan for Woodway Crescent Appendix F Summary of objections and officer comments

## 1 **Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)**

- 1.1 This report advises on formal objections to the advertised traffic orders concerning a new residents parking scheme in the Flambard Road area (to be called sub-zone S). The Panel is recommended that the objections to the traffic orders be set aside except for the exclusion of part of Woodway Crescent for the reasons set out in the report.

**2. Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder)**

- 2.1 (a) That the objections to the advertised traffic orders to the extension of Harrow Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone to the Flambard Road Area be set aside subject to the amendments made as shown in Appendix E, the objectors and Head petitioners be informed and officers proceed with the order making and implementation; and**
- (b) a review for the whole of Woodway Crescent be carried out in 12 months time.**

**REASON: as stated in Appendix C and F to the Officer Report**

**3. Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)**

- 3.1 The introduction of controlled parking zones are National, Regional and Borough policy in order to protect the local environment and encourage more sustainable use of transport.
- 3.2 An annual review prioritises requests for controlled parking zones (CPZs') one of which is this area. A consultation has been carried out and the Panel received the consultation results by way of an information item, a copy of which is attached at Appendix A. The majority of responses to the consultation were in support and consequently the necessary traffic orders were advertised.

**4. Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 "We will enhance the environment in Harrow". Controlled parking zones encourage the use on more sustainable transport.

**5. Background Information and options considered**

- 5.1 Brent intend to consult their residents in the Northwick Park Area on a CPZ this September. Should this proposal proceed it will have an adverse impact on those roads immediately north of Kenton Road which do not have parking controls. See following Agenda Item on this topic.
- 5.2 Most of this area however has an existing waiting restriction which operates for one-hour, Mondays to Fridays 11am to 12 noon. A minority of residents who do not have off-street or limited parking facilities have been severely disadvantaged and have asked for the provision of on-street resident bays.
- 5.3 Consequently, the residents have been consulted on a proposal to add a limited number of residents bays to the roads in the area to overcome this problem. At the same time Woodway Crescent and Rufford Close which currently do not have any parking controls, were added into the schemes because a number of residents wished to see a residents parking scheme introduced in their roads. In particular a petition was received from the Rufford Close residents to this affect. The results of the consultation which were positive are set out in Appendix A. The proposals were slightly modified on the basis of the consultation results and the necessary traffic orders were advertised.

- 5.4 9 letters of objection have been received from 8 households. A copy of the letters of objection to the traffic orders are at Appendix B. (One objector wanted his letter to be considered confidential and is not appended). A 36 signature petition representing 24 households of Woodway Crescent has also been received in response to the advertised traffic order and a sample copy of the petition and covering letter is at Appendix C. The petition opposes the introduction of any restrictions. 3 households who had previously shown support when consulted and 3 who had shown partial support signed the petition. Except for 2 households all the petition signatures come from properties from the middle to the high numbered end of Woodway Crescent away from where complaints had previously been received about parking problems. In the first section of the road (western end) there was both support during the consultation and little support for the petition. There is however opposition from the second two thirds of the road as indicated by the petition signatures. The various options considered regarding proposed restrictions in the Woodway Crescent are set out in Appendix D together with arguments for and against each. **It is therefore recommended that the parking control proposals be implemented in the first section of the road (western end) and along the flank boundaries from Gerard Road at the other end, and that a review for the whole of Woodway Crescent be carried out in 12 months time.** The original and revised proposals are shown at Appendix E.
- 5.5 A number of residents in Gerard Road have asked for amendments to the parking layout. This has been done wherever practicable.
- 5.6 Objections have been summarised together with officer responses and are at Appendix F.

## 6 **Consultation**

- 6.1 The results of the earlier consultation of residents/occupiers has been reported to the Panel on 20<sup>th</sup> June 2002. (See Appendix A)
- 6.2 The consideration of formal objections to the statutory consultation, the advertising of the traffic orders is the purpose of this report.

## 7. **Finance Observations**

- 7.1 The estimated implementation and order making cost of the Flambard Road area scheme is £4,000 for which funding is available from this year's capital programme.

## 8. **Legal Observations**

- 8.1 Controlled parking zones can be implemented under sections 6, 9 and 45 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 subject to the consideration of formal objections to the advertised traffic order which is the purpose of this report.

9. **Conclusion**

- 9.1 Modifications have been made to the proposals as a result of a petition, objections received and comments made where this is considered appropriate.
- 9.2 Despite the comparatively small number of objections to the advertised orders and the petition, the proposals were supported by the majority of residents who responded to the area wide consultation and in all of the individual roads. It is therefore recommended that the scheme is implemented subject to the amendments shown at Appendix E.

10. **Background Papers**

- 10.1 (a) Traffic and Road Safety Panel 17<sup>th</sup> May 2002 Agenda Item 11.13 Appendix 13.3  
(b) Rufford Close petition - Traffic and Road Safety Panel 17<sup>th</sup> May 2000.  
(c) Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel of 20<sup>th</sup> June Information Item 2  
(d) Consultation Results.  
(e) Correspondence with residents concerning the proposals.

11. **Author**

- 11.1 Stephen Freeman, Engineer, Transportation, Tel No. 020 8424 1437  
email: [stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.freeman@harrow.gov.uk)

## APPENDIX D

### WOODWAY CRESCENT - OPTIONS CONSIDERED

	APPROACH OPTION	ARGUMENT FOR APPROACH	ARGUMENT AGAINST APPROACH
1.	Overrule objections (the petition) and implement as advertised	The Council's consultation showed a clear majority 16:8 for these proposals. The Council does not know what arguments were made to collect petition signatures or what pressures if any were put on people to sign the petition, some of whom voted in favour in the original consultation.	The petition shows opposition from 24 out of 46 households. To ignore this expression of opinion may appear unreasonable.
2.	Accept view of petitioners and omit all of Woodway Crescent from the scheme.	Majority of households supported this proposal in the petition.	The Council does not know what arguments were made to collect petition signatures or what pressures were put on them. There were no grounds for objection given. This ignores the results of the Council's consultation and calls from residents of Woodway Crescent for measures to address parking problems in the first section of the road and concerns about emergency access supported by the Fire Service around the two sharp bends.
3.	Reconsult all of road before proceeding	May clarify what peoples views really are as some have voted both ways.	Would lead to significant delay in implementing the whole scheme and may well not provide uncontested result.

4.	Implement proposals for first section of road where there is clear majority support.	This will address where present parking problems occur and will directly affect frontages of only a few who oppose the proposals. Is a compromise which allows scheme to proceed.	Does not completely conform to majority view in petition. Ignores majority support in Council consultation even from excluded section of the road. Will lead to displaced parking further into Woodway Crescent, (which will be addressed at the review stage).
----	--	---	---

## APPENDIX F

### HARROW TOWN CENTRE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE - FLAMBARD ROAD AREA SCHEME

	GROUNDS OF OBJECTION	OFFICER RESPONSE
1.	Imposition of parking bays in Gerard Road goes against majority response.	The objectors have misunderstood the results. In fact, 8 supported the proposals or wanted even more bays than proposed. 7 wanted fewer or no bays at all (see Appendix A). The bays are being provided for a minority of residents who have no or limited off-street parking facilities and to cater for visitors.
2.	A 60m parking outside of 10, 12 and 12a is unwanted and will be dangerous.	The objectors have misheard a description given in a telephone conversation. There was a 16m bay proposed which following representations has been reduced to 5.5m. This would further improve the visibility for vehicles leaving 12 and 12a This modification does not require a change to the traffic order.
3.	Objections to change from status quo (no waiting 11am to 12 noon Mon-Fri) which has addressed problems of parking, through traffic and accidents.	Current restrictions were only introduced as an interim measure until the Council had resources to investigate the parking problems. The bays are being provided for a minority of residents who have no or limited off-street parking facilities and to cater for visitors. Some of these residents have been severely disadvantaged.
4.	Don't want parking bay outside of my house, place outside of those who supported scheme.	The scheme has been modified to meet individual requests of this kind wherever possible. These modifications do not require a change of the traffic order.
5.	Introducing a residents parking scheme in Rufford Close will force me to reposition my vehicle in the middle of the day. The parking spaces order should apply 24 hours/day.	As a resident within the sub-zone, the objector will be able to buy a permit to enable her to park continuously throughout the day in a residents parking bay. The provision of bays within the sub-zone can be adjusted to ensure overall demand is met although not necessarily in Rufford Close.
6.	Scheme is unnecessary and will only add to more confusion and control where none is needed.(Objections from Woodway Crescent).	Recommendations are to leave the objectors section of Woodway Crescent out of the current scheme.

7.	Payment for parking is essentially a tax and is too high/unfair.	Only those residents who wish to purchase a resident or visitor permit need to. Most properties have adequate off-street parking. The fees charged are Borough wide. The cost of a resident permit largely covers the administration cost of running the scheme. The cost of a visitor permit is set at a level to minimise abuse.
8.	Will cause problems for large “get-togethers”	A one hour scheme has been proposed to minimise the impact on “lifestyles”. Visitor permits are available. Large “get-togethers” can cause parking problems for other residents and their visitors. Scheme will encourage more sustainable use of transport such as car share where this is practicable.
9.	Proposed layout in Rufford Close in is inaccurate.	The development currently under construction will not be shown on the Ordnance Survey maps for many years. Parts of Rufford Close are not Public Highway and therefore no parking controls are possible for these areas.



LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Agenda item: 2

Page no:

<b>Meeting:</b>	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
<b>Date:</b>	18 September 2002
<b>Subject:</b>	High Street Wealdstone Part Pedestrianisation Scheme – Review of Prohibition Hours for Servicing Requirements
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Chief Officer:</b>	Head of Environment and Transport
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder:</b>	Environment and Transport
<b>Status:</b>	Part 1
<b>Ward:</b>	Marlborough
<b>Enclosures:</b>	None

1. **Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)**

- 1.1 The prohibition hours in High Street, Wealdstone have been reviewed and no change is recommended.

2. **Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder)**

- 2.1 **That the Panel recommends that the prohibition hours into High Street, Wealdstone do not change.**

**REASON: To promote a higher environmental standard for shoppers.**

3. **Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)**

- 3.1 See Section 5 of report.

#### 4. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 "We will enhance the environment in Harrow". The part pedestrianisation of High Street, Wealdstone will promote a higher environmental standard for shoppers.

#### 5. **Background Information and options considered**

- 5.1 The Wealdstone Regeneration Steering Group discussed the effect of implementing the rising bollards at either end of Wealdstone High Street, as part of the proposal to introduce two-way buses back into the High Street. The bollard at the northern entrance into the High Street will be on a timer and will lower to allow access to the High Street for vehicles wishing to load and unload between the hours of 7am to 10am and 4pm to 6.30pm, Monday to Saturday. Some members of the Steering Group expressed concern that these hours would be insufficient for the loading requirements of businesses in the High Street.
- 5.2 The permitted loading hours were decided by the Panels predecessor in 1990 and reviewed in 1995 and by the Traffic and Road Safety Panel on 7<sup>th</sup> March 2002. It was resolved not to alter the hours of access. The introduction of two-way buses has not affected the hours of prohibition but the rising bollards will ensure that it is enforced. The only vehicles currently allowed to load and unload outside these hours are the bullion carriers to some of the businesses where it is necessary to vary delivery times for security reasons. These carriers currently have a permit to exempt them from the restrictions and they will continue to have access.
- 5.3 It is feasible to relax the hours of access for delivery purposes but the objective of the original proposal was to improve the environment for shoppers during the core period of business activity, between 10am and 4pm. The improved shopping environment was seen as key to the vitality and viability of the town centre.
- 5.4 Restrictive loading hours in town centres are not unusual. As well as similar schemes elsewhere aimed at enhancing the shopping environment loading is regularly restricted to off-peak hours in order to maintain peak hour traffic flow capacity.
- 5.5 Unrestricted loading/unloading would result in service vehicles and servicing activity in the part-pedestrianised area during peak shopping hours. This would undermine the objectives of improving the shopping environment for pedestrians and lead to bus delays.

#### 6. **Consultation**

- 6.1 None

#### 7. **Finance Observations**

- 7.1 None

#### 8. **Legal Observations**

- 8.1 None

9. **Conclusion**

- 9.1 The objectives have not changed since the scheme was introduced and last reviewed. To allow unrestricted loading/unloading would adversely affect the shopping environment and cause bus delays. Restrictive loading hours in town centres are not unusual. It is therefore recommended that the prohibited access hours are not changed.

10. **Background Papers**

- 10.1 Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub- Committee (7 March 1990)  
Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub- Committee (28 February 1995)  
Traffic and Road Safety Panel (7 March 2002)

11. **Author**

- 11.1 Elaine Wyatt, Principal Engineer (Central Area), Traffic Management  
Tel. 020 8424 1548      Email: [elaine.wyatt@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:elaine.wyatt@harrow.gov.uk)

trsap0902

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Agenda item: 3
Page no:

<b>Meeting:</b>	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
<b>Date:</b>	18 September 2002
<b>Subject:</b>	20 mph Zones – 5 Year Programme
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Responsible Chief Officer:</b>	Head of Environment and Transportation
<b>Relevant Portfolio Holder:</b>	Environment and Transport
<b>Status:</b>	Part 1
<b>Ward:</b>	All
<b>Enclosures:</b>	Appendix A – Proposed 20 mph Zones 5 year Programme

2. **Summary/ Reason for urgency (if applicable)**

- 2.1 To agree the proposed five-year programme for 20 mph zones, submitted to Transport for London as part of the Borough Spending Plan.

<b>2. Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder)</b>
<b>2.1 To agree the 5 year programme for 20mph zones as set out in Appendix A</b>
<b>REASON: To set the priorities should funding become available.</b>

3. **Policy Context (including Relevant Previous Decisions)**

- 3.1 None

4. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

- 4.1 "We will enhance the environment in Harrow". The 20 mph zones will promote a higher environmental standard by reducing the speed of vehicles and the number of accidents.

## 5. **Background Information and options considered**

5.1 Local Authorities have been invited to bid for 20mph zones as part of the Borough Spending Plan submission to Transport for London for 2003/04 onwards. The bid submitted in June 2002 regarding 2003-08 included an indicative programme, subject to approval. This report seeks that approval. In the event that the Panel and/or Portfolio Holder agree changes to the programme, officers will liaise with Transport for London about amending the detail of the bid.

5.2 The proposed programme is split into three sub-divisions, school zones, urban/town centre zones and other residential zones.

### School Zones

5.3 These are 20mph zones in residential areas, which centre on schools. The proposal includes using physical traffic calming measures to reduce speeds in the roads in the immediate vicinity of the chosen school. It is also intended that a more holistic approach will be taken to review and address other traffic management and environmental issues in the area.

5.4 The following factors were considered when identifying and programming the sites;

- Schools with significant vehicle/pedestrian conflict areas and/or where there has been a demand for a school crossing patrol.
- Schools that have an entrance on a road that is already awaiting treatment under the agreed traffic calming priority list.
- The road casualty figures over a five year period within the proposed 20mph boundary.
- The implementation risk - the roads within the zone have to be suitable for traffic calming.
- Co-ordination with other programmes such as Safer Routes to School.

5.5 The proposed programme is detailed in Appendix A. Vaughan, Cedars and West Lodge schools have been identified for commencement in 2003/04. Vaughan School has been the subject of a Safer Route to School project, which identified a 20mph zone as part of the study. Cedars School is awaiting funding for the implementation of schemes under the school safety zone and footway parking programmes which can be brought together in a co-ordinated scheme under the 20mph zone programme. West Lodge School has an entrance on West End Lane, which is currently in 9<sup>th</sup> place on the traffic calming priority list.

### Urban Zones

5.6 Although the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (Amendment) Act Order 1999 removes the consent requirement from the Secretary State for 20mph speed limits, the Traffic Advisory Leaflet 9/99 states that "If observed 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds are above 24mph, then it is unlikely a 20mph speed limit would be appropriate, unless traffic calming measures can be provided."

- 5.7 This proposal relates to reducing speed limits in areas with high activity levels for both pedestrians and vehicles in urban centres. These tend to be strategic roads and bus routes that would be unsuitable for traffic calming. This approval is being sought through a Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) and the programme may be subject to revision following discussion with the Department for Transport.

#### Other Zones

- 5.8 This category covers other zones identified and funded through other sources. For example a developer funded proposal via a Section 106 legal agreement. Under this category Learner Drive is included in the proposed 2003-4 programme.

#### 7. **Consultation**

- 6.1 None.

#### 7. **Finance Observations**

- 7.1 A bid has been submitted to TfL. Implementation will depend on the settlement received, to be announced this autumn.

#### 8. **Legal Observations**

- 8.1 None

#### 9. **Conclusion**

- 9.2 The 20mph zone programme will contribute to the safety of road users and to the achievement of accident reduction targets. It will co-ordinate with and compliment other programmes such as Safe Routes to School to ensure that a comprehensive traffic management approach is taken to improve the quality of life in urban communities.

#### 10. **Background Papers**

- 10.1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (Amendment) Act Order 1999

Traffic Advisory Leaflet 9/99

Borough Spending Plan 2003/4 – 1007/8

#### 11. **Author**

- 11.2 Elaine Wyatt, Principal Engineer (Central Area), Traffic Management  
Tel. 020 8424 1548, Email: [elaine.wyatt@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:elaine.wyatt@harrow.gov.uk)

**APPENDIX A: Proposed 20mph Zone Programme 2003/4 – 2007/8**

Year	Type	Site	Measures proposed	Links to other initiatives	Funding Source	Estimate
2003/04	School zone	Vaughen school	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)	Identified under Safe Routes to School initiative	TfL	£78,000
		Cedars School/Whittlesea Road	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)	Identified under the School Safety Zone and Footway Parking programmes	TfL	£51,000
		West Lodge School	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£75,500
	Urban zone	Stanmore Hatch End Rayners Lane South Harrow	Variable message signing, gateway treatment, signs and lines	To co-ordinate with LPSA bid	TfL	£300,000**
	Other	Learner Drive	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)	S106 agreement	S106	Developer funded
2003/04 Sub Total (TfL 20mph school zone bid only)						£204,500
2004/05	School Zone	Glebe F&M and Kenmore F&M schools Cannon Lane F&M school	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£61,000
	Urban Zone – continuation of 2003/04 programme		Variable message signing, gateway treatment, signs and lines		TfL	£103,000
2004/05 Sub Total (TfL 20mph zone bid only)						£164,000

2005/6	School Zone	Earlsmead School	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)	To co-ordinate with Safe Routes to School programme	TfL	£107,000
		Priestmead School	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£46,000
2005/06 Sub Total (TfL 20mph zone bid only)						£153,000
2006/07	School Zone	Harrow on the Hill	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)	To co-ordinate with review of measures introduced in 2001/02	TfL	£122,000
		Marlborough F&M school	Review of existing traffic calming		TfL	£34,000
		Stag Lane F&M school	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£51,000
		Whitfriars F&M school	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£31,000
2006/07 Sub Total (TfL 20mph zone bid only)						£238,000
2007/08	School Zone	Canons High School	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£56,000
		Bentley Wood High School	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£61,000
		Grimsdyke F&M school	Traffic calming (road humps, speed cushions, chicanes etc.)		TfL	£82,000
2007/08 Sub Total (TfL 20mph zone bid only)						£199,000
2003/08 Total (TfL 20mph school zone bid only)						£958,500

Note: \*\* The Urban Zone bid is under review and funding arrangements will be separate from the school zone bid.

trsap0902



