

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

Date of Meeting: 15 July 2014

Subject: INFORMATION REPORT

Petitions relating to:

1. Kenton Park Avenue - Objection to double yellow lines
2. Chapel Lane - Request for road safety measures
3. Tenby Road – Request for speed humps
4. Rayners Lane Estate – Against the possible introduction of yellow lines / CPZ on Rayners Lane
5. Whitmore Road (Porlock Avenue to Bessborough Road) – Clarification of times of operation of previously requested CPZ

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

Exempt: No

Wards affected: Edgware, West Harrow, Harrow on the Hill

Enclosures: None

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

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

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Kenton Park Avenue, Kenton- objection to double yellow lines

- 2.1 A petition containing 30 signatures from residents of Kenton Park Avenue was received in February 2014 and was unfortunately received too late to include in the Petitions Information report presented to the Panel in February. The petition states:

“We the undersigned present the following reasons in opposition to petition dated 12th December 2013.

- 1. The current proposal of double yellow lines between house number 41-55 (outer bend) will in effect create **greater possibility of accidents**. Introducing double yellow lines will enable motorists to approach the outer bend at **higher speeds**. This will **reduce safety** of residents, pedestrians, cyclists and motorists.*
- 2. Implementing double yellow lines on the outer bend will create **poor visibility** because car will be parked on the inner bend. This will create a **blind corner** hence dramatically affecting the safety of motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.*
- 3. There is already a shortage of parking on the road; forcing residents and shoppers to use all available spaces. Introducing a large section of double yellow lines between houses 41-55 (outer bend) will **make the situation worse**. The proposal will **impact local shops and other businesses** including Solicitors and Funeral Services. This will also force residents and visitors to park on other parts of the street.*

- 2.2 The council has a small programme for introducing waiting restrictions, generally double yellow lines for safety or access reasons called the Local Safety Parking Schemes (LSPS) programme. The demand for new or changed restrictions far exceeds the resources available to introduce them due to the lengthy and expensive legal process required before the physical change. We therefore have developed assessment criteria in order to select the priority locations for processing.

- 2.3 The request has been assessed under the LSPS programme, however, the assessment did not prioritise this location. Priority is generally given to locations on main roads where speeds, traffic flows, pedestrian flows and accidents are more frequent.
- 2.4 We are therefore not able to take forward a scheme in this location. This site will, however, be kept under review so it can be considered for inclusion in any other scheme that may be programmed in the vicinity in the future.

Chapel Lane, Pinner – request for road safety measures

- 2.5 The council received 50 identical pro forma letters from residents in Chapel Lane, Pinner that is being treated as a petition. The letters state:

To whom it may Concern at Harrow Council

The people who have signed these forms wish to bring to your attention that we feel that Chapel Lane in Pinner has become over the years a very dangerous road mostly because of the speed some cars and lorries using it travel down it. The lane is not very wide and has a blind bend in the middle. I'm sure was never intended to have such a volume of traffic racing through it. Also the pavement in parts is so narrow that two people can-not pass with out one of them stepping into the road.

Chapel lane for its size is over used by the traffic and is a disaster waiting to happen. We hope not, but someone one day is going to be seriously injured Therefore we feel the lane would benefit from either a 20 mph road sign or road bump (sleeping policeman) or better still, both. This would not stop the traffic, but slow it down. Which is all we want.

- 2.6 Police provides the council with details of all reported personal injury accidents across the borough to help us monitor and investigate accidents. Road safety improvements are generally carried out at locations where the number of accidents involving personal injury is higher than average and where an analysis of the accident trends and patterns indicates that changes to the road layout could improve the situation. This information is used to assess the need for safety measures and develop a list of priorities where remedial measures can be taken forward.
- 2.7 The priority of the schemes on our annual road safety programme, is determined by an objective method of assessment, which takes into account traffic and pedestrian flows, the frequency of personal injury accidents and the severity of casualties over the most recent three years, traffic speeds and the site layout.
- 2.8 Where investigations and analysis show that a scheme is prioritised it is added to the appropriate priority list until finance is available for its implementation. Our road safety programme is therefore developed to target roads which satisfy key criteria and target killed and seriously injured accidents in line with the Mayor for London's Road Safety Plan.

The road safety programme is developed on a yearly basis and is funded entirely by Transport for London. Personal injury accident records are monitored by the TfL, the council and the Police and as a result the council's road safety programme is continuously being reviewed.

- 2.9 Officers have assessed the accident record in Chapel Lane which has no recorded accidents and it has consequently not been prioritised. This is because there are many other roads with accidents which have already been assessed as a higher priority and more likely to be included in a future works programme.

Tenby Road, Edgware – Request for road humps

- 2.10 A petition containing 58 signatures from residents of Tenby Road was received in March 2014. The petitioners request that to reduce speeding and ensure road safety speed humps be continued along the cul- de- sac part of Tenby Road.
- 2.11 The funds available to the council for speed control schemes using traffic calming measures are limited and therefore the council has agreed a set assessment method for considering these requests which takes into account the frequency of personal injury accidents and the severity of casualties over the most recent three years, traffic and pedestrian flows, traffic speeds and road layout.
- 2.12 The council's speed control programme is developed on a yearly basis and is funded entirely by Transport for London. Where investigations and analysis show that a scheme satisfies the assessment criteria and is a priority it is added to the appropriate priority list until finance is available for its implementation. The programme is weighted to target killed and seriously injured accidents (KSI's) in line with the Mayor for London's Road Safety Plan. The Metropolitan Police provides the council with details of all reported personal injury accidents across the borough for monitoring accident levels. This information is used as part of the assessment process to assess the need for safety measures.
- 2.13 This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise roads so that the most high priority locations can be dealt with first. In terms of road safety this has helped us to become one of the safest London boroughs.
- 2.14 We have checked the personal injury accident record in this road which has no recorded accidents and it has consequently not been prioritised. This is because there are many other roads with accidents which have already been assessed as a higher priority and are more likely to be included in a future works programme.

Rayners Lane Estate – against the possible introduction of yellow lines / CPZ on Rayners Lane

- 2.15 A petition containing 265 signatures from residents of Rayners Lane Estate was received in March 2014 during the informal consultation stage

associated with the Welbeck Area parking consultation. The petition states:

1. *Neither residents nor the neighbourhood representatives body (RLETRA) were consulted as stakeholders prior to the development of the consultation on the controlled parking zone.*
 2. *Neither the residents nor the visitors have any problems that merit the introduction of a CPZ and we are against the introduction of any CPZ by extension through the consultation questionnaire. A CPZ is no guarantee of a parking space outside our house or nearby on our street, in fact the council sells more permits than there are parking spaces, and a CPZ reduces available spaces for parking. So individuals will be paying at least £64.90 per year over and above my council tax for no discernible improvement in parking.*
 3. *Our concerns about road safety measures in the neighbourhood i.e. pedestrian cross for children attending Grange School and the introduction of a one way traffic flow around the children play area on Swift Close has been declined for lack of funds, yet there is fund for a non priority issue of a possible CPZ in the estate.*
- 2.16 This petition relates to the public consultation for the Welbeck Road area parking review which is considered in another report on the agenda for this Panel.
- 2.17 The Welbeck Road area was included in the 2013/14 Parking Management programme by the Panel in February 2013. This was because residents indicated there were significant parking problems in this area connected with businesses in The Arches. Many of the businesses undertake vehicle repairs, servicing and currently make use of local residential roads for on-street storage.
- 2.18 It is the council's policy only to introduce parking controls in areas where there is majority support demonstrated. The Welbeck Road area parking review report on this agenda sets out clearly the responses to the consultation on a road by road basis and indicates where there is support. Only Welbeck Road and parts of Coles Crescent in close proximity to The Arches have indicated support and so the vast majority of the petitioners in the surrounding areas will not have parking controls recommended.
- 2.19 The funds allocated for this project are only provided to progress the parking review and so the requests for zebra crossings or one way streets could not be considered as a part of this project. The requests have been reviewed against standard assessment criteria to see if they would merit inclusion in another works programme, however, they did not meet the threshold for intervention.

Whitmore Road (Porlock Avenue to Bessborough Road) – Clarification of times of operation of previously requested CPZ

- 2.20 A document containing 43 signatures from residents of the section of Whitmore Road between Porlock Avenue and Bessborough Road and 2 signatures from corner properties in Bessborough Road was hand delivered to officers by Councillor Gawn on the 14th May 2014. The signatories were clarifying what times they would like controlled parking to operate in their section of road.
- 2.21 The area was subject to public consultation in 2010 when 54 % of respondents supported controlled parking. A subsequent statutory consultation was carried out in 2012 and only 36% support for the scheme was demonstrated with 23 statutory objections received. Consequently the Panel did not recommend that controlled parking be installed in the road.
- 2.22 A previous petition has been received from residents of Whitmore Road and was considered by the previous panel in February 2014 requesting controlled parking in Whitmore Road. This area was included in the list of schemes for consideration as part of the annual parking review report on the agenda at the same meeting, however, this was still not prioritised for inclusion in this year's work programme by the Panel.
- 2.23 There is therefore no planned follow up review of parking in the area. The panel is asked to note this situation and reconsider the matter at the February 2015 meeting when the 2015/16 annual programme will be considered.

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 previous 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 traffic and 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 in accordance with the revised guidance issued in January 2014 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 The funds allocated by TfL and Harrow for transport improvements will contribute to achieving the corporate priorities:

- Making a difference for the vulnerable
- Making a difference for communities
- Making a difference for local businesses
- Making a difference for families

Ward Councillors notified:

YES

Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man



on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 24/06/14

Section 8 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Barry Philips

Tel: 020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports

Public and Statutory Consultation Results