

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	21 June 2005
Subject:	Uxbridge Road, Hatch End – Road Safety Scheme
Responsible Officer:	Andrew Trehern, Director of Area Services, Urban Living
Contact Officer:	Steve Swain, Transportation Manager
Portfolio Holder:	Environment and Transport
Key Decision:	No
Status:	Part 1

## Section 1: Summary

### Decision Required

**That officers be authorised to take all necessary steps to implement the proposed Local Safety Scheme shown at Appendix A including advertising the traffic orders detailed at Appendix E and consult the frontages where yellow line waiting restrictions are proposed between Milne Field and Rowlands Avenue and at Grimsdyke Road, Cornwall Road, Woodriding Close, Westfield Park and Dove Park in parallel with advertising the traffic orders and to implement the scheme subject to consideration of objections (if any).**

### Reason for report

To gain approval to implement the proposed scheme. The road safety benefits of the scheme, particularly the expected reduction in accidents and severity, would help towards the achievement of the Council's accident reduction target for killed and serious injury casualties as required by the Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA).

### Benefits

- Road safety improvements
- Pedestrian facilities
- Speed reduction
- Fewer injury collisions (a Best Value Performance Indicator [BV99])
- Traffic flow improvement
- Cycle facilities

- Statutory duty

### **Cost of Proposals**

The estimated cost of the scheme is £50,000. This will be funded from the agreed LPSA Road Safety Capital Budget under a Local Public Service Agreement between Harrow Council and the Government. The total funding agreed for the road safety schemes is £380,000 which will be used to implement three further road safety schemes.

### **Risks**

- Objections may be made to the proposed traffic orders.
- Insufficient staff time has resulted in slippage. Further slippage could prejudice implementing scheme this financial year when the LPSA funding arrangement is available.

### **Implications if recommendations rejected**

- LPSA accident reduction target may be affected
- Possible loss of LPSA funding facility
- Possible loss of additional LPSA funding

## **Section 2: Report**

### **2.1 Brief History**

- 2.1.1 Uxbridge Road (A410), Hatch End is on the Local Safety Schemes programme for implementation in this financial year. It is one of four schemes included in the Local Public Service Agreement in which the Council has agreed to stretch its road traffic Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) casualty target to below the national target of 93 by 2005. The agreed target is 90 KSI.
- 2.1.2 There have been 36 recorded injury accidents on this section of the A410 in the three year period (to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2002). The percentage of killed and serious injury accidents for the route is almost double that for similar roads in Borough.
- 2.1.3 The percentages of pedestrian, pedal cyclist and powered 2-wheeler casualties are similar to those recorded in the Borough as a whole. The number of accidents occurring in darkness or wet road conditions are significantly higher than in Harrow overall. The lighting has been upgraded recently and the section of road prone to wet road accidents was re-surfaced last year. These measures should reduce these types of accidents.
- 2.1.4 This length of the A410 is approximately 1.4 kilometres. The section east of Grimsdyke Road forms part of the London Cycle Network (LCN), and is a well used bus route. Hatch End underground station and Hatch End Shopping

Centre are the main generators of pedestrian traffic, particularly with the large number of restaurants in the area.

## **2.2 Options considered**

- 2.2.1 The principle objective of the scheme is to reduce accidents. It is proposed to install measures to reduce speeds, minimise conflicts, improve surface skidding resistance, and improve facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, it is proposed to introduce gateways at both approaches to the Hatch End shopping area.
- 2.2.1 In the shopping area, the scheme would change the character of the road by gateway treatments, cycle lanes, buff anti-skid surfacing, and double yellow line waiting and loading restrictions at Grimsdyke Road and Cornwall Road junctions (see Appendix A). The proposed gateway treatments (at entry points to the shopping area) consist of red road surfacing with imprinted SLOW road markings and gateway signs on both sides of the entry lanes. The proposed sign is shown at Appendix B. The consultation leaflet for the shopping area (see Appendix C) also included parking controls in the service roads. Further yellow line waiting restrictions are proposed at Woodriding Close, Westfield Park and Dove Park to deter obstructive parking and to improve visibility. These were not included in the consultation leaflet and it is proposed to consult the frontages in parallel with the statutory consultation.
- 2.2.2 Outside of the shopping area the scheme would include the provision of central hatching and cycle lanes to create narrower carriageway lanes. A build-out at the existing pelican crossing outside the station is also proposed.
- 2.2.3 There have been a number of “damage only” collisions at the Milne Feild/Safeway roundabout recently which has caused concern amongst the local community. A number of measures are proposed to improve the safety of the roundabout. These include a vehicle activated roundabout sign with a ‘SLOW DOWN’ message on the westbound approach (see 2.2.5), an illuminated roundabout ahead warning sign on yellow backing board on the eastbound approach and larger chevron boards on the roundabout. Recent resurfacing at the roundabout has improved skid resistance as well.
- 2.2.4 The scheme also includes a further electronic vehicle speed-activated message sign. This would be on the two lane westbound approach to the shopping area (see appendix A). These signs display a ‘SLOW DOWN’ message, and include an electronic display of the speed limit roundel, which are triggered when drivers exceed a set threshold speed. The sign face would remain blank when not activated. The vehicle speed activated roundabout sign would operate similarly. Appendix D shows an example of a vehicle speed activated sign.
- 2.2.5 Parking on both sides of Uxbridge Road between Milne Feild and Rowlands Avenue creates obstruction and delays affecting buses and general traffic. Complaints have been received in this respect and in response to the consultation. Yellow line waiting and loading restrictions are proposed on the north side to deal with the problem as shown at Appendix A (see 2.3.6)

## **2.3 Consultation**

- 2.3.1 Three stages of consultation have been carried out. The first stage of the consultation, on the complete package of proposed measures, was with key stakeholders, which included ward councillors, residents' associations, road user groups, disabled users and pedestrian representatives, the emergency services and London Bus Services.
- 2.3.2 The second stage of consultation was with each property (residential or business) adjacent to any proposals that directly affect residents or businesses. Two separate consultations were carried out, one throughout the Hatch End shopping area, and one between Milne Field and Rowlands Avenue. These were carried out by leaflet delivery, detailing the proposals, and included a prepaid reply envelope (see Appendix C). A total of approximately 300 leaflets were distributed in the Hatch End shopping area and 33 (11%) written responses have been received.
- 2.3.3 Consultation documents were sent to the Hatch End ward councillors for comment. Responses received included a comment on the lack of parking enforcement causing problems near Grimsdyke Road, and a suggestion that, rather than provide an additional pelican crossing, the existing crossing should be replaced with signal-control at the Grimsdyke Road junction. These comments are addressed at paragraphs 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.7.
- 2.3.4 The results from Hatch End Centre show a mixed response. The majority of the respondents stated that they were in favour of the road safety elements of the scheme with one or two exceptions. The main concern was the notion of parking controls in the service roads. Whilst it would be desirable to improve turnover, parking controls are not critical to the road safety scheme. As an overwhelming number of traders who responded were against, this element of the scheme has been dropped from the proposals. The proposed pelican crossing east of Grimsdyke Road was also opposed by the frontages because of problems it may cause with deliveries. Additionally, concerns were expressed about the possible delays it could cause to traffic. The area is already severely congested at peak hours and a further crossing a short distance away would compound the problem. Therefore the proposal has been dropped. There was one comment about the lack of cyclists (presumably to justify cycle lanes). The section east of Grimsdyke Road is on the London Cycle Network. A safe cycle network is necessary to encourage cycling and cycle use is expected to increase as more of the network is completed. The proposed cycle lanes visually narrow the traffic lanes which achieves lower speeds. There were no comments on the other road safety measures proposed. The responses have been placed in Members' Library.
- 2.3.5 The respondents support the proposed double yellow line waiting and loading restrictions at Grimsdyke Road and Cornwall Road junctions. However, the extent of the restrictions shown in the consultation leaflet for Grimsdyke Road is inadequate. It is therefore proposed to extend the proposed restrictions to the entrance to the car park with loading restrictions operating 8 am to 6.30

- pm, Monday to Saturday as shown at Appendix A. The existing 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Saturday waiting restrictions are not effective as loading and unloading is permitted. Parking by orange badge holders in particular has been identified as a problem and the proposed loading restrictions coupled with enforcement should deter obstructive parking. It is proposed to consult the frontages in parallel with statutory consultation.
- 2.3.6 A separate leaflet (see Appendix C) delivered to residents of Uxbridge Road between Milne Feild and Rowlands Avenue included a questionnaire, asking if the residents supported the introduction of double yellow line waiting restrictions along the north side of the road. A total of 37 questionnaires were delivered and 20 (54%) were returned. Of these 11 (55%) were “not in favour” and 9 (45%) “in favour”. As a result it is proposed to downgrade the proposal to no waiting from 8 am to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday with peak hour loading restrictions operating from 8 am to 10.00 am and 4pm to 6.30 pm, Monday to Friday. It is proposed to re-consult the frontages on this option (see Appendix A) in parallel with the statutory consultation.
- 2.3.7 During the first two stages of the consultation, there were several requests for traffic signals at the junction of Uxbridge Road and Grimsdyke Road. It was suggested that this could replace both the existing pelican crossing and the further pelican crossing proposed in the consultation leaflet. An investigation was carried out to assess the feasibility of this suggestion. The traffic modelling exercise undertaken showed that a signal controlled junction would have a substantially detrimental effect on traffic flows through Hatch End, and could not be justified on these grounds.
- 2.3.8 The third stage of the consultation involved an invitation to ward councillors to review the revised scheme which has been modified in light of consultation. Two ward members were able to take up the offer and their further suggestions have been incorporated in the proposals.
- 2.3.9 The emergency services support the proposed scheme.
- 2.3.10 The road safety benefits of the scheme, particularly the expected reductions in accidents and severity, would help towards the achievement of the Council’s accident reduction target for killed and serious injury casualties as required by the LPSA. It is therefore recommended that the scheme be implemented.

## **2.4 Financial Implications**

- 2.4.1 See cost of proposals.

## **2.5 Legal Implications**

- 2.5.1 The proposed parking controls can be introduced under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

## **2.6 Equalities Impact**

Not applicable.

### **Section 3: Supporting Information/ Background Documents**

Appendices:

Appendix A – Plan of Proposed Local Safety Scheme

Appendix B - Gateway sign

Appendix C – Consultation Leaflets

Appendix D – Example of Vehicle Speed Activated Sign

Appendix E - Schedule for traffic order making purposes

Supporting Information:

Background Documents: Local Safety Schemes Programme, accident records, consultation, consultant's report, LPSA.