

**REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety
Advisory Panel**

Date of Meeting: 29th November 2012

Subject: **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

Responsible Officer: Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director, Environment & Enterprise

Exempt: No

Enclosures: Appendix A - Weald School, plan of revised measures

Appendix B - Southbourne Close, existing waiting restrictions

Appendix C – High Street, Pinner parking proposals

Section 1 – Summary

This report sets out details of the petitions that have been received since the last meeting of TARSAP and provides details of the Council's investigations and findings where these have been undertaken.

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Weald School - Objection to 20 mph zone

2.1 A petition was sent to the council by a local resident of Chestnut Drive. The petition contained 75 signatures and states:

1. *“Whilst overall we are not against a proposed 20 mph zone (signs at the beginning of both streets will remind drivers that they should pay more attention to pedestrians and reduce their speed (if required), we are not in favour of speed humps. Speed humps could cause “weaving”, thus creating additional hazards. Also they do not necessarily slow down most of standard cars (saloons and estate cars), and 4x4’s and van’s speed is not affected by humps at all.*

There is no speeding issue on both Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise. During the school-run hours, when the road is merely congested, you can only drive at 10-15 mph speed. These two streets are not “through” roads, they are short and only used by resident’s delivery vehicles and parents bringing their kids to school. Excessive speeds in these roads are almost impossible during school-run hours and rarely possible outside school hours because of parked cars.

One resident even mentioned that he has lived here for 70 years now and no traffic incident occurred at all within this period. This confirms that both streets have a very good safety record.

Speed humps will only be an irritant to residents, creating unnecessary noise in these streets which are very quiet outside school-run hours.

The proposed raised table with tactile paving outside the school could create a hazard as children will see it as an extension to the footway.

2. *We are not in favour of the proposal for a one-way system in Robin Hood Drive. The situation in all three roads will be made*

worse if there is no escape for vehicles that enter Chestnut Drive from the Avenue other than turning round.

The danger to pedestrians will dramatically increase by vehicles backing and doing three points U-turns causing a backup of the traffic existing Robin Hood Drive, which will encourage turnarounds in Weald Rise creating further danger.

The problems will continue outside school times with service vehicles and cars having to perform U-turns to exit a heavily parked Chestnut Drive.

The original road layout was designed to avoid these issues and works well.

3. *Applying yellow lines on roads around White Gate Gardens will reduce parking facilities for parents bringing kids to school, thus creating more school traffic via Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive.*
4. *The voluntary one-way system works well if it is adhered to. Should the school keep educating the parents to leave their cars home or further away from school (on main roads), there would be no heavy traffic on both streets during school-run hours.*
5. *Could “access for residents only” be implemented on both Chestnut Drive and Weald Rise? Will these affect parent drivers that bring kids to school?*
6. *Because the funds are already secured from TFL, there are plenty of potholes in these two roads, plus on The Avenue. They do create additional danger for pedestrians as drivers try to avoid them, swerving. Re-doing the tarmac on these roads would be a good investment and an improvement of the road safety.*

The pathways need attention in several places on both streets. Broken and raised slab edges create walking hazard and because more than 50% of the residents are elderly people (including disabled people), greater attention should be paid to this matter.”

2.2 This area is currently subject to the development of a 20mph zone scheme in the current financial year which includes these roads. A public consultation on proposals was undertaken recently. Responses to the various points are provided in order.

2.3 Point 1 - The views expressed by local residents are noted with regard to the speed of traffic in Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive. Independent speed surveys carried out in both these roads over a one week time period (24 hours / day) indicated an 85% ile speed of 24.6 mph northbound and 26.2 mph southbound in Weald Rise and 26.6 mph northbound and 25.9 southbound in Chestnut Drive. These figures are slightly above the threshold when considering whether traffic calming measures are required within a 20 mph zone and therefore speed

cushions were considered necessary in order to make the zone self-enforcing. There will be a further opportunity for residents to express their views about the proposals at the statutory consultation stage.

- 2.4 Point 2 - The one way proposals have been omitted from the revised scheme following discussion with the Portfolio Holder.
- 2.5 Point 3 - The yellow lines are being proposed at junctions to reiterate the well established principles in The Highway Code which require that a vehicle should not park within 10 metres of a junction. The effects of parking at undesirable locations can impact on drivers, pedestrians and those with mobility difficulties.
- 2.6 Point 4 - Officers will work with the School to promote the advisory one way scheme which operates at morning and afternoon peaks in the vicinity of the school via the school travel planning process.
- 2.7 Point 5 - It is not possible to introduce “*access for residents only*” as Weald Rise and Chestnut Drive are both public highway.
- 2.8 Point 6 - TfL provide an allocation to London boroughs each year to implement identified schemes within the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme of investment and the boroughs confirm to TfL the actual projects and associated budgets within that allocation. The development of a LIP is a statutory requirement of all boroughs required to show how the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy is delivered at a local level therefore the money has to be used on the implementation of a 20 mph zone and not for highway maintenance.

Parking in Southbourne Close

- 2.9 At the panel meeting on 3rd October 2012 a petition was presented by the lead petitioner. The petition, containing 20 signatures representing 20 households in the Close and states:
- “We the residents of Southbourne Close, Pinner, request that the Council provide Parking Controls in Southbourne Close to ensure clear access at all times into and to the end of the close. This is required because of inconsiderate parking by nonresidents who have often prevented refuse vehicles getting down the close to empty bins and furthermore, potentially more serious, causing an impediment to emergency vehicles when needed.”*
- 2.10 The background is that in June 2010 the Council consulted residents of Southbourne Close to establish if there was support for:
- the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)
 - for the introduction of double yellow lines in the turning head and also for the extension of double yellow lines on one side close to the junction with Village Way
- 2.11 The consultation results were reported to the September 2010 panel meeting. There was no majority support at this time for inclusion in a

CPZ and a number of negative comments were received about the extent of the yellow lines in the turning head. These proposals were subsequently amended with reduced lengths of yellow lining in the statutory consultation.

- 2.12 The results of statutory consultation were reported to the June 2011 panel meeting. This included a petition with 6 signatures from 6 households objecting to the double yellow lines outside 22-28 and 23-29. Some residents raised concerns about the reduction in parking capacity in the turning head and displacement to the narrow section of the road. These proposals were subsequently amended with reduced lengths of yellow lining. The scheme shown in Appendix B was implemented in December 2011.
- 2.13 During consideration of the statutory consultation results at the October 2012 panel meeting regarding some re-consultations agreed by the panel it was agreed that officers be instructed to review the yellow lining for Southbourne Close in order to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to gain access.
- 2.14 Subsequently a site meeting was held with the lead petitioner and a member of the Panel on 25th October. A number of options were discussed and residents are now considering the best way forward. Once a decision has been made by residents then the necessary formal processes will be put in place to implement the measures which will include statutory consultation. To avoid any delays it is intended to report any formal objections directly to the Portfolio Holder for Environment & Community Safety for a decision.
- 2.15 Any significant progress made after the preparation of this report will be verbally reported at the meeting.

Church Lane, Pinner - objection to parking proposals

- 2.16 A petition has been received containing 35 signatures from people associated with Pinner Parish Pre-School. This is in response to a statutory consultation regarding a scheme to introduce parking controls. The pre-school operates from the church Hall at Pinner Parish Church on Church Lane.
- 2.17 The background is that ward councillors have made a number of comments about parking problems at the junction of Church Lane, Grange Gardens and the High Street.
- 2.18 The Panel will be aware that a review of parking at Pinner has been included on the programme of schemes for a number of years but has not been allocated funding for the active part of the programme. Unfortunately when the Panel last considered the programme in February 2012 it was not possible to fund the review at Pinner for a start in 2012/13. With this in mind ward councillors identified the above site as one of two they would like to see double yellow lines progressed using Neighbourhood Investment Scheme (NIS) funding.

- 2.19 Ward councillors would have preferred to include other adjustments to parking in the area but this would have involved considerable work and was outside the scope of a project that could be tackled using NIS funding. A scheme for at any time waiting restrictions (double yellow lines), shown on the plan in Appendix C, has now been approved for NIS funding and an informal public consultation subsequently undertaken.
- 2.20 The public consultation results were discussed with ward councillors and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety who agreed that the scheme should proceed to statutory consultation. No comments were received from the pre-school at the informal consultation stage although there have been discussions between an official of the church and officers to clarify the ability to load and unload goods or passengers on double yellow lines. There was general support for the measures and respondents highlighted the problems with visibility and obstruction that had been indicated to ward councillors.
- 2.21 The representation from the pre-school has supporting information that states the pre-school has operated at the Church Hall since 1966 and offers vital years care and education to 2-5 year olds. The facility operates from 9.30 to 12.30 Monday to Friday and the church hall has no private parking
- 2.22 The statutory consultation period finishes on 31st October 2012 and it is intended to discuss all submissions and objections received including the above petition with ward councillors and the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety
- 2.23 Due to the timing of receipt of the petition and preparation of this report a verbal update will be given at the meeting.

Section 3 – Further Information

- 3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting. No updates on the progress made with dealing with petitions will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

Section 4 – Financial Implications

- 4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report that require further investigation would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

Section 5 - Equalities implications

- 5.1 Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No.
- 5.2 The petitions raise issues about existing schemes in the transportation works programme as well as new areas for investigation. The officer's

response indicates a suggested way forward in each case. An equality impact assessment (EqIA) will be carried out if members subsequently decide that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions.

Section 6 – Corporate Priorities

- 6.1. Any suggested measures in the report accord with our corporate priorities:
- Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
 - United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
 - Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
 - Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 13/11/12		

Section 8 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Barry Philips, Team Leader - Traffic and Road Safety
Tel: 020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Paul Newman - Team Leader - Parking and Sustainable Transport
Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622,
E -mail: paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports
LIP programme of investment 2012/13