

TRAFFIC AND ROAD SAFETY ADVISORY PANEL MINUTES

29 NOVEMBER 2012

Chairman:	* Councillor Mrinal Choudhury	
Councillors:	* Susan Hall	* Mrs Vina Mithani
	* Kairul Kareema Marikar (2)	* John Nickolay
	* Jerry Miles	* David Perry
Advisers:	* Mr A Blann	* Mr A Wood
	* Mr L Gray	
In attendance: (Councillors)	Husain Akhtar	Minute 150
	Mrs Camilla Bath	Minute 150
	Stephen Greek	Minute 152
	Joyce Nickolay	Minute 153
	Bill Stephenson	Minute 149

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

144. Attendance by Reserve Members

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Member:-

Ordinary Member

Councillor Ajay Maru

Reserve Member

Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar

145. Members Right to Speak

RESOLVED: In accordance with Executive Procedure Rule 40.1 – Part 4D of the Constitution, the Panel agreed that the following Members could speak at the meeting:

Councillor Husain Akhtar, Councillor Camilla Bath, Councillor Stephen Greek, Councillor Joyce Nickolay and Councillor Bill Stephenson.

146. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 6 – Information Report: Petitions

Councillor Susan Hall declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she sat on the Board of the London Fire Brigade. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 10 – Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme

Councillor Mrinal Choudhury declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Local Authority appointed governor at Elmgrove Primary and Nursery School and Ward Councillor for Burnt Oak. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Mrs Vina Mithani declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was Ward Councillor for Kenton West. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

147. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

148. Public Questions

RESOLVED: To note that the following public question was received:

Questioner: Question submitted by Mr Edward McAlister on behalf of Mrs Sheila Manning

Asked of: Councillor Mrinal Choudhury, Chairman of the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

Question: In relation to the section of Buckingham Road between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens, all but two of the houses have off street parking facilities and the proposed parking restrictions would not therefore affect them unduly. The residents of the two houses without off street parking would, however, be severely disadvantaged because, apart from weekends, the proposals would prevent internal all day parking by such residents

within a reasonable distance of their homes. Does the Panel agree that the scheme should be deferred to allow consideration of permit bays to cater for these residents, or that they should be eligible to apply for the proposed parking permits in Torbridge Close.

**Answer
(provided by
the
Chairman):**

Thank you for your question.

The background to this situation is that the Council carried out a public consultation between December 2011 and January 2012 to see what parking measures local people would support. This was initiated following complaints over many years about the detrimental impact of commuter parking raised by local residents and a residents' association. Residents suggested a number of options which included yellow lines, permit bays or doing nothing.

The consultation indicated that a majority of Torbridge Close residents supported permit bays whilst in Buckingham Road, between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens, the majority of residents supported a single yellow line operating from 2.00 – 3.00 pm Monday to Friday. Less than 15% of residents overall supported permit bays.

Taking forward the single yellow line proposal to statutory consultation was supported by this panel in February 2012 and approved by the Portfolio Holder. It is these results that are being considered in the report on the agenda of this Panel meeting. It is always a difficult task to try to meet the wishes of all residents, however, we have tried to make the proposal reflect the majority view.

Whilst I fully sympathise with your predicament, unfortunately, it would not be possible to allow you to obtain a permit to park in Torbridge Close as the traffic orders that have already been advertised cannot now be modified to allow this. However, it is for the panel to consider the detailed officer's report on this item and to decide what they recommend to the Portfolio Holder.

The officers in their report have highlighted a number of differing views in locations across the consultation area and consequently they have recommended that a review be carried about 6 months after the scheme is implemented. This would allow residents a further opportunity to make their views on residents' parking bays known and for that to be considered.

If the proposals on Buckingham Road are not implemented the street would be subject to additional pressure from parked vehicles displaced from other locations where measures are implemented. The wait for a review and for additional consultation would mean that no measures could be implemented for a further 9-12 months at the earliest.

If you would like to investigate the possibility of providing your own off street parking I would be happy to ask officers to give you assistance.

Supplemental Question: Is it right that a scheme that is intended for the amenity of residents should be implemented when it is detrimental to some of those residents?

Answer (provided by an officer): We develop schemes taking on board the views of all relevant stakeholders. The final scheme is formulated as a result of extensive public and statutory consultation. We are obliged to proceed with the proposals in their current form, however, a review of the scheme will be carried out in six months' time.

149. Petitions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions or deputations were received at this meeting.

RECOMMENDED ITEMS

150. Pinner Road/County Roads Controlled Parking Zone - Proposed Phase 2 Extension

The Panel received a report which set out the results of the Statutory Consultation carried out in July-August 2012 on Pinner Road - County Roads, proposed Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) U extension, and the proposals to regulate parking along Neptune Road with a variety of parking controls. An officer advised that:

- following representations from stakeholders, these streets were re-consulted this year;
- Devonshire Road, at its northern end had a proposed CPZ with residents bays on the Eastern side but free bays on the Western side. Following petitions and analysis of results it was proposed that residents would be re-consulted on having residents bays on both sides of road and the results would be reported to the Panel;

- Dorset Road now had majority support for the CPZ, however, results and comments from the consultation showed that there was support for only a partial extension of the CPZ in Oxford Road near Pinner Road;
- Rutland and Bedford Roads showed no support for the CPZ and therefore no additional parking controls would be implemented there;
- Neptune Road, which had a mixture of both residential and retail units, suffered from displaced commuter parking and residents and traders had complained about not being able to load and unload their vehicles. Officers were proposing a mixture of measures comprising yellow lines, double yellow lines, pay and display bays and loading bays, whilst complying with Transport for London's request for clear emergency access to the railway lines.

Following questions from Members of the Panel, an officer stated that:

- his team had not been made aware that 6 disabled residents had been moved into the Neptune Point development by the Council and that currently there were only 2 disabled parking spaces available within the building basement parking area. He undertook to look into the possibility of further disabled bays being implemented outside the development;
- only the northern end of Devonshire Road would be re-consulted regarding the implementation of a CPZ on both sides.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, stated that he was grateful to officers for their hard work, courtesy and professionalism in progressing the scheme and for taking on board the views of residents and traders. Parking problems in the area of the scheme had been a long-standing issue in his ward and although the CPZ would not resolve all parking related issues, it would reduce commuter parking, which would benefit local residents. He requested that the scheme be implemented as soon as possible and the re-consultation of Devonshire Road be prioritised.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the parking scheme be implemented as set out below:

- (1) the Controlled Parking Zone U permit parking for residents operating Monday to Friday, 11.00 am - 12 noon be extended to incorporate the following roads:
 - Oxford Road (up to and including property numbers 28 & 33)
 - Dorset Road
- (2) the Controlled Parking Zone U permit parking for residents operating Monday to Friday, 11.00 am - 12 noon be extended to Devonshire Road subject to a separate statutory consultation in this road be

undertaken and the results of consultation be considered by the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Community Safety;

- (3) shared use resident / pay & display bays operating Monday to Friday, 9.30 am to 5.30 pm and Saturday 9.30 am to 1.30 pm, be introduced at the western end of Neptune Road;
- (4) pay & display bays operating Monday to Friday, 9.30 am to 5.30 pm and Saturday 9.30 am to 1.30 pm, be introduced at the eastern end of Neptune Road;
- (5) free parking bays be introduced at 6 locations on Neptune Road;
- (6) waiting restrictions be introduced on Neptune Road operating Monday to Saturday, 8.30 am to 6.30 pm and Sunday 10.00 am to 6.00 pm;
- (7) no waiting at any time' restrictions be introduced at strategic locations along Neptune Road to aid through movement/access;
- (8) 3 loading bays be introduced on Neptune Road operating Monday to Friday, 7.00 am to 7.00 pm and Saturday 7.00 am to 2.00 pm;
- (9) the Service Manager - Traffic & Highway Network Management be authorised to take the necessary steps to implement the above recommendations;
- (10) residents within the consultation area be informed of this decision.

Reason for Recommendation: To implement an amended scheme for Controlled Parking Zone U, having considered the results of statutory consultation. To introduce measures to regulate parking on Neptune Road with a variety of parking controls designed to accommodate residents and businesses requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and also maintain road safety and accessibility for all traffic.

151. Canons Park Area Parking Review Statutory Consultation

The Panel received a report which set out the results of the statutory consultation regarding parking proposals for the Canons Park area undertaken in August 2012. An officer advised that the proposals had taken into account feedback from extensive stakeholder meetings and both a public and statutory consultation. He added that:

- officers had received reports that parking problems outside the station parade had been exacerbated by the Hitchin lane development, where there was currently a one hour parking ban and officers were proposing the introduction of Pay and Display (P&D) bays there;
- restrictions would apply Monday to Saturday in Donnefield Road, which would ease parking for residents and avoid further displacement of vehicles from Hitchin Lane development into the road;

- only those proposals that had been part of the statutory consultation could be progressed;
- some streets would have the new style CPZs, where conventional bays and lines were omitted in favour of clear signage stating that there was resident parking only and set out the times. These had been introduced in Stanmore and West Harrow and were deemed to be successful;
- in Buckingham Road a CPZ had not been progressed as residents had requested single yellow lines in order to deter commuter parking;
- congestion issues around Bromefield and Honeygot Lane shops would be assisted by double yellow lines and would alleviate the concerns of the fire brigade about emergency access;
- double yellow lines would be implemented on all corners and junctions with slight amendments, which took into account vehicle tracking evidence, and any concerns raised by the emergency services, traders and residents.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, the officer advised that:

- the new style CPZs were already in place in some areas and were now nationally approved. These were used mainly in short roads and cul-de-sacs. Both Enforcement and observation exercises had not revealed any infringement of these by motorists. The officer undertook to carry out further surveys to ensure that signage regarding these was clearly visible and whether these were being adhered to;
- the levels of engagement with a public consultation were generally much higher than with a statutory consultation. This was because there was far more open engagement with all relevant stakeholders at the public consultation stage, and those consulted were able to both comment and influence the formulation of the proposals. Therefore any proposals contained in the statutory consultation documents were formulated on the basis of feedback from the public consultation, and were a means of informing residents about which proposals would be implemented. The officer report highlighted any concerns raised by consultees and officers had carried out a technical appraisal of the concerns raised and had amended the proposals where appropriate.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, made the following points:

- the residents in his ward had reported that officers had been helpful and could see the rationale behind the proposals. However, they had requested that officers and the Panel should carefully consider any effects of the scheme being implemented;

- Canons Park recreation ground was a well-used and valuable local resource and the Council had a responsibility to ensure this continued. Currently there was no parking available in the vicinity of the park, which had the following three access points: Donnefield Avenue and the lower end of Canons Drive, both of which had parking restrictions already, and Cheyneys Avenue, which did not, but may require restrictions to be imposed in the future;
- enforcement of restrictions was also an issue, and the double yellow lines on Whitchurch Lane were frequently flouted and he requested that more resources be made available to enforce existing restrictions and to monitor parking pressure points in other areas where there was displaced parking due to restrictions;
- some residents were disappointed that the maximum area of a CPZ was limited by Section 106 regulations;
- the residents of Dalkeith Gardens had reported issues of speeding and reduced access for motorists and emergency vehicles and requested that this street be included in the CPZ.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, suggested that reflective signs be used for the simplified CPZs as this would ensure greater visibility and compliance.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That the following measures be implemented in:

- (1) Donnefield Avenue – “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) along the full extent of the eastern kerb line and in the northern turning area. A Permit zone, including one disabled bay at the entrance to the park, operational Monday to Saturday, 8.00 am - 6:30 pm;
- (2) Torbridge Close – Permit zone operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm;
- (3) Station Parade, Whitchurch Lane –
 - i) one disabled bay and 19 shared permit holder / pay and display bays operational Monday to Saturday, 8.00 am - 6:30 pm on the northern side of the front service road;
 - ii) waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Saturday, 10.00 – 11.00 am and 2.00 – 3.00 pm on the southern side of the front service road;
 - iii) “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and through narrow sections and waiting restrictions (single

- yellow lines) through the remainder operational Monday to Friday, 12 noon – 1.00 pm on the rear and eastern service road;
- iv) no loading controls operational Monday to Saturday, 8.00 am - 6:30 pm on the eastern service road;
- (4) Cheyneys Avenue between the southern property boundaries of 52 and 106 - waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm;
 - (5) Du Cros Drive – waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday between 3.00 pm – 4.00 pm;
 - (6) Buckingham Road between Whitchurch Lane and Buckingham Gardens – various sections of “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm;
 - (7) Buckingham Gardens – “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends and in the turning head;
 - (8) Parr Road between the junction of Garland Road and the eastern turning head – “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on the southern side of the carriageway;
 - (9) Bromefield / Bush Grove / Maychurch Close – “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on bends, junctions, roundabouts and through narrow sections and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm;
 - (10) Bramble Close – “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) extended along narrow access and waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm;
- (a) Honeypot Lane Shopping parade –
 - i) waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) operational Monday to Friday, 2.00 pm – 3.00 pm in the front service road;
 - ii) “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) on junctions, bends and through narrow sections at the rear of the parade on Brick Lane;
 - iii) waiting restrictions (single yellow lines) in remaining locations operational Monday to Friday, 12:00 pm - 1:00 pm at the rear of the parade on Brick Lane;
 - (b) “At any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) in various locations as detailed in appendices C and F at junctions, in

turning heads, along narrow sections of carriageway and at bends in accordance with the well established rules of the Highway Code;

- (c) that the Service Manager - Traffic & Highway Network Management be authorised to take the necessary steps to implement the above recommendations;
- (d) residents and businesses throughout the consultation area be informed of the outcome of the statutory consultation and Portfolio Holder decision;
- (e) any significant issues arising from the final agreed scheme a minimum 6 months after implementation be reported to the panel for consideration of a review.

Reason for Recommendation: To control parking in the area surrounding Canons Park Station as well as the surrounding roads as detailed in the report. The measures were in direct response to resident requests for changes to the existing parking arrangements in their area and in order to maintain road safety and accessibility for vehicular traffic.

152. Transport Programme Entry Procedure

The Panel received a report of the Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise which set out a comprehensive method of assessing and prioritising works in order to ensure that the borough developed work programmes that met its statutory duties as well as targeting areas of greatest need. An officer stated that formalising the process for prioritising works would enable a clear audit trail and therefore make the process more open and transparent as well as enable better performance monitoring of the programme.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, the officer advised that:

- the programme entry prioritisation system was based on a number of key categories, each with its own set of operational criteria, which would then be used to develop ranking lists;
- once a service or work request was received, it would be assessed and ranked against these criteria. Those with the highest rankings would be included in a future work programme;
- the assessment process would enable officers to take a strategic long-term and balanced approach to developing future works programmes. It would also provide guidance to officers, Members and the public about a consistent set of priorities which accorded with the Council's Local Implementation Plan and Corporate Plan;

- in respect of the programme category criteria it was clarified that the category 'vulnerable road users', included a wide variety of people who might require assistance, for example, the disabled, elderly, children, and did not specifically relate to cyclists for example;
- in respect of the performance monitoring and targets it was agreed that bullet point 5 on page 207 of the agenda would be re-phrased to make it clear that the aim was to reduce the number of motorcycle accidents, the other performance targets would also be clarified in a similar way;
- in respect of road safety education it was clarified that officers regularly went into schools in Harrow to give out road safety advice. The Council also offered cycle training for both adults and children, undertook regular road safety poster campaigns and worked in partnership with sports organisations, the police, neighbouring boroughs and TfL to raise awareness about pedestrian and road safety;
- an officer clarified that the TfL funding for Harrow schemes in 2011/12 included an allocation of £1,000,000 for the Mollison Way area based scheme but that in 2012/13 there was no allocation for area based schemes and the overall funding level was significantly less in comparison as a consequence.

Resolved to RECOMMEND: (to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety)

That

- (1) the programme entry procedure be introduced for prioritising all works programmes;
- (2) programme entry guidance be made a publicly available document on Harrow's website; and
- (3) any changes to the programme entry procedure be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

Reason for Recommendation: The Council received many requests for works to be undertaken and difficult decisions needed to be made to determine which schemes provided the greatest benefits to the borough due to the limited funding available. The programme entry procedure would enable the Council to be consistent and transparent about how decisions were made and to demonstrate that the schemes of maximum benefit for the borough were always prioritised.

RESOLVED ITEMS

153. **INFORMATION REPORT: Petitions Relating to 1. Weald School - objection to 20 mph zone 2. Parking in Southbourne Close Rayners Lane 3. Objection to parking proposals Church Street, Pinner**

The Panel received a report of the Divisional Director, Environmental Services which set out details of the petitions that had been received since the last meeting of the Panel and provided details of the Council's investigations and findings where these had been undertaken.

Officers made the following points about the petitions listed below:

Weald School - Objection to 20 mph zone

The informal consultation relating to this scheme had been reported to the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel meeting in September 2012 and residents would have a further opportunity to express their concerns at the statutory consultation stage.

Petitioners had raised a number of concerns and officers had made a number of revisions to the scheme:

- speed surveys had revealed that vehicle speeds in the roads proposed to be included in the 20 mph zone were above the recommended threshold and therefore speed cushions were considered necessary in order to make the zone self-enforcing;
- the one way proposals outside the school entrance in Robin Hood Dive had been omitted from the revised scheme;
- yellow lines were being proposed at junctions to prevent vehicles from parking within 10 metres of a junction, which was a well established principle of the Highway Code;
- officers would work with schools to promote the advisory one way scheme, which operated in the vicinity of the school at peak times;
- it would not be possible to introduce resident only access to roads that were public highway;
- it was not permitted to use LIP funds for highway maintenance projects.

Speed surveys carried out by officers had revealed higher speeds than specified, and traffic calming measures such as speed cushions were considered as these were effective in reducing speeds in residential areas and had proved successful in other parts of the borough.

Following questions and comments from Members of the Panel, an officer advised that:

- the petition had been received during the public consultation stage and prior to the statutory consultation. Several of the signatories to the petition had indicated their agreement with the proposals for a 20 mph zone in their consultation responses;
- speed tables were more expensive than speed cushions and officers were operating within a budget;
- a 20 mph zone was only effective when there was self-regulation by motorists as well as enforcement. These zones were targeted in areas around schools and officers had accommodated feedback from residents and had made amendments to the scheme on the basis of this feedback.

An advisor to the Panel stated that it might be more practicable to implement a single speed cushion on each road, rather than two or three as this would make access for emergency vehicles easier. He also requested that yellow lines be implemented on either side of the cushion to prevent vehicles being parked there.

An officer advised that the design and size of a cushion was dictated by the width of the road where it would be implemented. He added that residents of the Avenue had requested to be included in the statutory consultation, and that there had been some objections to the proposal to introduce double yellow lines in the area. However, officers needed to balance multiple needs. The scheme had been approved by the portfolio holder and would proceed. He undertook to explore the possibility of implementing a single cushion on relevant roads.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, made the following points:

- he had attended numerous meetings attended by residents, schools representative, parents and local Ward Councillors;
- the petition provided a good indication of residents views;
- residents of Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise were against the proposals in these roads, but were in favour of the rest of the scheme;
- the suggestion of a single cushion would be preferable to two or three cushions;
- a 20 mph zone and a speed table was in operation outside Whitefriars School. There were no major speeding issues in the vicinity of the school and surveys had shown that there was good self-regulation by motorists in this area. Speed cushions would cause inconvenience and aggravation to motorists;

- Weald School would be part of the second phase of school expansion programme, and the introduction of speed cushions might cause additional problems in the future;
- residents had complained to him about the violation of yellow and zig zag lines and inconsiderate parking in the vicinity of schools, and several residents had requested white lines be implemented across driveways in the area;

An officer advised that:

- 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones were different. Speed zones were generally implemented in the vicinity of schools and require self enforcing measures;
- survey evidence indicated that some motorists did not comply with 20 mph limits and they were generally not supported by the Police because of the resource implications associated with the enforcement of these zones ;
- officers would look into implementing design changes to the scheme where they were feasible.

Following questions from Member of the Panel, an officer advised that under the current decision making procedure for traffic related schemes, some decisions that were deemed non-controversial, were delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety, and that he in turn had delegated some of these to officers, which was in keeping with the provisions of the Constitution. These decisions were not subject to call-in. This procedure allowed approval of a large programme of work. He added that large projects such as CPZs took the form of Recommendations to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety with any key decisions being referred on to Cabinet for approval. The officer added that an information report had been submitted to the Panel in September 2010 clearly setting out this procedure.

The informal consultation results were reported to the Panel in September, which demonstrated support for the scheme.. The Panel tended to give greater weight to the results of the Statutory consultation, as this gave consultees all relevant information relating to a scheme and contained individual responses. The scheme had been amended following the formal consultation stage as explained earlier.

An adviser to the Panel stated that in the past, some planning applications considered at the Planning Committee had overlooked traffic related issues. He requested that officers look into the possibility of major development projects in the borough, particularly those which had traffic and road safety related issues, being considered at TARSAP prior to being considered at Planning Committee. An officer undertook to look into this.

Parking in Southbourne Close

A petition had been submitted by those who were now in favour of additional parking controls and requested that a re-consultation be carried out and this had been agreed by the Panel. An officer and Panel Member had met with some of the petitioners to discuss alternative options. Subsequently, the lead petitioner had been consulting local residents and trying to agree proposals with them. A Member thanked officers for their efforts to accommodate residents in relation to this scheme.

Church Lane, Pinner - objection to parking proposals

This project had been initiated by Pinner Ward Councillors, however, there were no Harrow Capital funds currently available to the Panel to progress this. Residents had expressed concerns to Ward Councillors regarding obstructive and inconsiderate parking in Church Lane and therefore Neighbourhood Investment Scheme funding had been agreed by Ward Councillors. A public consultation revealed some other concerns but additional funding would be required and these concerns could not be considered at present. The scheme had been to statutory consultation regarding the implementation of yellow lines. The petition and other comments had been taken into consideration. The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety had recently agreed the scheme, which would be implemented as advertised.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

154. INFORMATION REPORT: Traffic and Parking Schemes Programme update

The Panel received a report of the Divisional Director, Environmental Services which provided an update on the progress with delivering the 2012/13 programme of traffic and parking schemes, including schemes funded by Transport for London (TfL) and those included in Harrow's Capital Programme.

An officer made the following points about some of the schemes:

Stanmore Broadway - linking of traffic signals

There had been a slight delay with TfL validating the scheme and officers had recently met with residents of Green Lane to discuss a road closure. Any closure would have a potential impact on the Stanmore Hill junction.

Accident remedial scheme - Old Redding

- Personal injury accident (PIAs) figures for this road were of concern. There had been several motorcycle accidents and it was noted that motorcyclists often tended to drive through the gaps in speed cushions at high speed. The accident cluster was on a section of road near to the bends in Old Redding. Officers had liaised with fire brigade who had indicated that speed platforms were easier for fire engines to negotiate. Therefore, the height of speed humps on Old Redding had

been reduced to 50 mm or 2 inches, which was the minimum legal requirement for vertical deflection. Speed cameras and time over distance cameras were not feasible on this road for various reasons and a number of safety measures introduced four years ago had proved less effective in reducing either vehicle speeds or the number PIAs.

A Member, who was not a Member of the Panel, made the following points about the area around Roxbourne School with regard to proposals for a 20 mph zone in the roads around the school:

- barriers had been erected on three sides of Tolgate Road, at the end near Widdecombe Avenue had the road, which had made it safer;
- the end of Malvern Road near Field End Road was a busy junction and traffic queues frequently backed up along it and it would benefit from similar barriers;
- local parents were opposed to the implementation of single yellow lines and restrictions outside the school;
- the current restrictions should be changed from Monday to Saturday 8.30 am - 6.30 pm to Monday to Friday 8.30 am - 4.30 pm;
- two of the streets in the scheme, Widdecombe Avenue and Clovelly Way had no houses on them;
- residents were also opposed to speed humps on access roads such as Yeading Avenue, which was busy at school times and quiet at other times;
- officers should carry out vehicle speed monitoring exercise on roads with speed humps to see if these were successful in reducing vehicle speeds;
- the consultation questionnaire could be made more explicit and be amended to read: 'Are you in favour of the proposed 20 mph zone? If yes, then which form of traffic calming measure would you prefer?'
- minimal traffic calming measures had been implemented in the vicinity of Welldon Park, Earlsmead, Longfield, Cannon Lane, Newton Farm Schools and the same policy should apply in the Roxbourne school area;
- officers and Panel Members should carry out a site visit which would help them to understand traffic issues in the area and inform their decision-making.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

155. Termination of Meeting

In accordance with the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 48.2 (Part 4D) of the Constitution:

RESOLVED: At 9.59 pm to continue until 10.10 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 10.07 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MRINAL CHOUDHURY
Chairman