

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

Date of Meeting: 10 December 2014

Subject: INFORMATION REPORT

Petitions relating to:

1. Elgin Avenue, Belmont - objection to proposed CPZ (first)
2. Elgin Avenue, Belmont objection to proposed CPZ (second)
3. Bellamy Drive, Belmont – Opposed to CPZ
4. Somervell Road, Roxeth – Request for traffic calming measures
5. Lloyds Court, Pinner – objection to proposed CPZ
6. Ashridge Gardens, Pinner – objection to proposed CPZ
7. Pinner Bridge Club – objection to proposed CPZ
8. Rochester Drive – Concerns regarding proposed CPZ
9. St Anslems Church, Westfield Park, Hatch End – Request for changes to Hatch End CPZ
10. Augustine Road, Harrow - Traffic issues
11. Long Elmes, Harrow Weald (western end) - Traders requesting CPZ
12. Bush Grove, Canons Park - Objection to proposed CPZ

13. Locket Road, Wealdstone - Request for zebra crossing
14. Welbeck Road – Objection to CPZ proposals
15. Somerset Road, North Harrow – request to be included in CPZ

Responsible Officer:	Caroline Bruce - Corporate Director, Environment & Enterprise
Exempt:	No
Wards affected:	Belmont, Roxeth, Pinner, Hatch End, Wealdstone, Canons Park
Enclosures:	Appendix A – Somervell Road – speed survey results

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

Petitions 1 and 2 - Elgin Avenue, Belmont – Objection to Belmont Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) proposals

- 2.1 A petition dated 6th September 2014 from residents of Elgin Avenue containing 104 signatures from 96 addresses was received on 16th September 2014. The petition was received during the statutory consultation period for the Belmont Circle CPZ scheme. The petition states:
- *“We strongly support the proposal for “at any time” waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) to be introduced on Elgin Ave at the bend adjacent to 115 Elgin Ave”.*
 - *“We strongly object to the proposed CPZ (i.e. 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday) only for the stretch of Elgin Avenue which runs*

from the bend adjacent to 115 Elgin Ave to 60 & 63 Elgin Ave. Our objection does not concern the short stretch of Elgin Avenue running from the junction at Kenmore to the Bend”.

- *“We strongly object to the CPZ daily time frame of 8.30am – 6.30pm Mon – Sat because:*

- a) Your proposal is trying to fix a problem that we do not have.*
- b) Your Proposal would create a new parking problem*
- c) Your proposal would only cause further day time congestion at the south end of Elgin (from 63/60 to 2/1) where no CPZ is proposed and where car parking would now be more concentrated”.*

2.2 As a part of the petition two alternative proposals were put to the residents of Elgin Avenue to choose from:

- *Option 1: No CPZ at all is introduced on Elgin Ave from the bend (at 115) to house numbers 63/60.*
- *Option 2: A CPZ is introduced from the bend at 115 to 63/60 for only ONE hour per day (e.g. 10am to 11am) and only from Monday to Friday (and not on Saturdays)*

2.3 Of the 104 people that signed the petition, 80 supported option 1, 14 supported option 2 and 12 supported both options.

2.4 The petition will be considered as part of the Belmont Circle Area parking review proposals report included on the agenda for this panel meeting

2.5 A second petition dated 10th September 2014 from residents of Elgin Avenue containing 34 signatures from 33 addresses was received on 16th September 2014 (an addendum to Petition 1). The petition stated the same reasons and the same options as the first petition.

2.6 All the residents that signed the second petition supported option one.

2.7 This petition will also be considered as part of the Belmont Circle Area parking review proposals report included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 3 - Bellamy Drive, Belmont – Opposed to Belmont CPZ proposals

2.8 A petition with an accompanying letter dated 16th September 2014 containing 79 signatures from 73 addresses from residents of Bellamy Drive was received on 17th September 2014. The petition was received during the statutory consultation period for the Belmont Circle CPZ scheme. The petition states:

“We, the undersigned residents oppose the creation of restricted parking in Bellamy Drive, HA7”.

2.9 The accompanying letter outlined the following reasons for the objection:

- *The proposal for the CPZ during the day will not solve our problems which only occur during the evenings and at weekends. It will instead incur added cost which we deem unnecessary.*
- *We dispute the idea that restrictions on Belmont Circle will cause a problem due to the knock-on effect during the day, meaning that the purchase of permits and visitors tickets would be an unnecessary burden, one which we do not wish to take on. The circle is not a busy shopping area and there isn't a station nearby. There are also 2 free car parks.*
- *The argument relating to the pubs and restaurants is irrelevant since the need for extra parking mainly takes place in the evenings when the CPZ would not be operational anyway. In the day time there aren't many cars in the road, and a few temporarily parked, if that were to arise, would not be problematic.*
- *We object to having to pay for relatives and visitors to park when there is no need. The urgency to provide a ticket will cause stress, especially to elderly residents. We could accept this if there were real problems, but this is not the case and we do not envisage great changes.*
- *Paying for a permit is not even a guarantee of a space, so there is no benefit for the residents of Bellamy Court.*
- *In conclusion we do not wish to have any controlled parking in our street.*

2.10 The petition will be considered as part of the Belmont Circle Area parking review proposals report included on the agenda for this panel meeting

Petition 4 – Somervell Road, Roxeth – Request for traffic calming measures

2.11 A petition from residents of Somervell Road containing 32 signatures from 27 addresses was received on 22nd September 2014. The petition states:

"We the undersigned wish to have introduced to Somervell Road where traffic is speeding well above the 30 mph in certain sections of the road, traffic calming in some form. Speed reduction is very necessary as other roads nearby have this facility. We must stop this unnecessary killing of our pets which one day could be our children.

2.12 The funds available to the council for traffic calming schemes are limited and therefore TARSAP has agreed a set assessment method for considering and prioritising requests for speed reducing measures which takes into account a range of different factors including personal injury accidents and severity over a three year period, traffic and pedestrian

flows, traffic speeds and road layout. The Metropolitan Police provides local authorities with details of all reported personal injury accidents to help with monitoring and assessing the need for safety measures.

- 2.13 This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise roads so that the worst accident and traffic problems can be dealt with first. In terms of road safety this has helped us to become one of the safest London boroughs.
- 2.14 The council's road safety programme is developed on a yearly basis from the assessed priorities and is funded entirely by Transport for London. Where investigations and analysis show that a scheme is justified it is added to the appropriate priority waiting list until finance is available for its implementation. Our road safety programme is targeted at reducing the number of killed and seriously injured accidents (KSI's) and accords with the Mayor for London's Road Safety Plan.
- 2.15 An assessment of the traffic accidents in Somervell Road has indicated that there have been no personal injury accidents and it is therefore unlikely to be considered for any measures in the foreseeable future. This is because many other roads in the borough have far worse accident levels and are prioritised as more urgent. The accident records are continuously monitored and the programme is reviewed annually and should the situation change this will be considered again.
- 2.16 A recent speed survey conducted in Somervell Road over a one week period indicated that 85% of the speeds of 30 mph eastbound and 31.8mph westbound were recorded. The eighty fifth percentile speed represents the highest speed recorded when excluding the highest 15% of the sample and is the standard nationally, by which traffic engineers assess the representative speed of traffic in a road and consider the level of compliance with the speed limit. Therefore the traffic speeds were at an acceptable level and typical for this type of residential street. **Appendix A** gives details of the results of the speed survey.
- 2.17 Concerns about speeds have been reported previously and the council has introduced a speed activated sign in Somervell Road in recent years.
- 2.18 Taking account of the fact that there have been no personal injury accidents in Somervell Road and the recorded speed of vehicles is not excessive it is therefore recommended that investigations be undertaken to develop a package of low cost engineering measures to address the issues highlighted by the petitioners. These measures could involve introducing traffic signs and road markings to highlight hazards and encourage greater awareness from motorists of the road layout in this location.

Petition 5 - Lloyds Court, Pinner – Objecting to inclusion of Cranbourne Drive and Malpas Drive as part of the Pinner CPZ review

- 2.19 The council received 49 identical pro forma letters from residents in Lloyd Court, Pinner that is being treated as a petition. The letters state:

A CPZ will have a direct impact to Lloyd Court residents on the adjacent road.

- 1) As a result of lack of available parking space, Lloyd Court residents currently experience serious parking problems, which have been highlighted to the council in the past. In our view, the proposed plans would make these issues even worse.*
- 2) As one of the last free parking roads in the area, we believe Lloyd Court would receive a significant influx of displaced parking if a CPZ is introduced in Cranbourne Drive. During the consultation period, we objected to a CPZ on Lloyd court as we believe it wouldn't make a difference to the lack of parking space on such a densely populated street with no off-street parking.*
- 3) Lloyd Court residents would lose the option to park in Cranbourne Drive in the, unfortunately common, occasions when there is no available space in our road. To make things worse, we have been informed that Lloyd Court residents will not have the option to buy resident permits for Cranbourne Drive.*
- 4) Most, if not all, of Cranbourne Drive residents already have off street parking and have already paid the council for their dropped kerbs so the benefits to them are limited compared to the large inconvenience the implementation of the CPZ would cause to Lloyd Court residents.*

Possible solutions

- 1) Residents may consider their own CPZ on Lloyd Court if more parking space was available. This could be achieved by extending the road side to create more parking space into the council owned grass area that is currently unused, which effectively would allow for parking on both sides of the road. It is worth noting that the kerb on Ellement Close (on the other side of Eastcote Road) has already been modified in this way to create more parking space.*
- 2) There is also potential for parking space adjacent to the garages as you enter Lloyd Court. The degraded footpath on the left hand side could be removed as this is currently unusable for pedestrians given it is in such poor state. Funding for this project could be obtained from the CPZ charges.*
- 3) Clearly marked out parking bays would also help the residents use the current limited on-street parking space more efficiently (e.g. a lot of space is sometimes wasted with unnecessarily large gaps in between vehicles).*

2.20 The petition will be considered as part of the Pinner parking review proposals included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 6 - Ashridge Gardens, Pinner – Objecting to the extension of control hours as part of the Pinner CPZ review

- 2.21 A petition containing 31 signatures from 17 addresses from residents of Ashridge Gardens was received on 22nd September 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned residents of Ashridge Gardens would like to object to the Proposed Zone A5 to Ashridge Gardens. We feel that removing Ashridge Gardens from CPZ A and replacing it with Zone A5 which proposes to operate between 8am - 5.30pm, Monday to Saturday, rather than helping us, will be highly disadvantageous to us in the following ways:

1. Currently there are only 7 parking bays in Ashridge Gardens. For a street of thirty six houses of which some have more than 1 car, 7 parking bays will not be enough for residents and their visitors. We the residents and our visitors will be struggling to find a parking bay on our road, given that 6 out of 7 days there will be a parking restriction of 10 hours a day if the Zone is change to A5.

2. Being in our current CPZ A allows us to park in more than 40 streets if we have a valid residents parking permit A during the times of 11am-12pm- This is really helpful for those of us visiting friends or family who also live in the zone A area. Changing to zone A5 restricts this freedom of parking to only two streets whereas the rest of the residents of Zone A will continue to have access to a wider area.

3. We welcome the fact that in the current Zone A we can have families or friends visiting us (outside of the 11am-12pm restriction) without us having to pay for their parking on our road. Changing to Zone A5 effectively penalises us financially for having visitors between the hours of Mon-sat 8am-5.30pm as we have to buy visitors permits for these times. Many of us have visitors during these days and times and it is effectively introduced fees which we currently do not pay. We the residents of Ashridge Garden strongly believe that introducing the Zone A5 will be unfair to the residents of Ashridge Gardens based on the above points. We would like Harrow Council to rethink the proposal and not enforce the proposed zone A5 to our road. Please find attached the signatures for this petition.

- 2.22 The petition will be considered as part of the Pinner parking review proposals included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 7 - Pinner Bridge Club – Objecting to proposed parking measures as part of Pinner CPZ review

- 2.23 A petition containing 113 signatures from 110 properties was received on 23rd September 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned object to the plans to restrict parking around Pinner Bridge Club described in DP 2014-02.”

- 2.24 The petition will be considered as part of the Pinner parking review proposals included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 8 - Rochester Drive, Pinner – Concerns regarding Pinner CPZ Review proposals

- 2.25 A petition containing 22 signatures from 19 properties in Rochester Drive was received on 23rd September 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned residents of Rochester Drive, Pinner, wish to register our severe concerns and reservations to proposals outlined in the Pinner Area Parking Review”

- 2.26 The petition will be considered as part of the Pinner parking review proposals included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 9 – St Anslems Church, Westfield Park, Hatch End – Request for changes to Hatch End CPZ

- 2.27 A petition containing 408 signatures was presented at the TARSAP meeting on 2nd October 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, ask that the parking restrictions be reviewed urgently. We ask that the restrictions are applied just one period a day from 10-11am Monday – Saturday in Westfield Park. Also that the permit holder parking bay is removed from outside the main west doors of the church. We also seek permission for a dropped kerb at the rear of the church so that some cars could be parked off road”

- 2.28 There are currently no parking schemes or reviews planned for this road or in the area. Currently the 2014/15 programme of work is fully committed with a considerable backlog of requests still to be added to a future programme of works in subsequent years.

- 2.29 Therefore this matter will have to be considered at the February 2015 meeting of the panel when consideration will be given to the 2015/16 annual parking programme. The panel will be presented with a report to consider new and existing requests for schemes, any existing commitments and to consider the priority of schemes for the forthcoming year.

Petition 10 – Augustine Road, Harrow – Traffic issues

- 2.30 A petition containing 172 signatures was presented at the TARSAP meeting on 2nd October 2014. The petition states:

“We are residents of Augustine Road and the surrounding area. We are very concerned by the traffic problems in our narrow streets. These are largely the result on inconsiderate parking and conflict between traffic travelling in opposite directions, particularly at peak times. This causes considerable delay and inconvenience to residents driving to and from their homes. It also creates a hostile and dangerous environment for

pedestrians and cyclists. Traffic queuing to enter Theobald Crescent adds to congestion in Long Elmes and causes delay to all four of our local bus routes. We are also worried that severe delays to the emergency services could lead to a tragic situation.

We ask the Council to introduce a one-way system. Traffic would enter the area by Theobald Crescent, travel south-east along Augustine Road and exit by Secker Crescent. To avoid congestion at the exit, right turns into Courtenay Avenue should be prohibited.”

- 2.31 For a one way street to be introduced a traffic regulation order (TRO) is required which involves undertaking detailed consultation, both informal and statutory and would require the support of the emergency services, public transport operators, Transport for London and the local community.
- 2.32 Historically this has proved difficult because a section of one way working may inconvenience some local residents as it would limit access and therefore increase their journey times. Regrettably, vehicle speeds often also increase because drivers know there is no oncoming traffic and this may require the introduction of traffic calming measures in order to combat this which would significantly increase costs.
- 2.33 The funds available to the council for traffic management schemes is limited and therefore TARSAP has agreed a set assessment method for considering and prioritising requests for measures which takes into account a range of different factors including personal injury accidents and severity over a three year period, traffic and pedestrian flows, traffic speeds and road layout. The Metropolitan Police provides local authorities with details of all reported personal injury accidents to help with monitoring and assessing accidents. This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise roads so that the worst accident and traffic problems can be dealt with first. In terms of road safety this has helped us to become one of the safest boroughs in London.
- 2.34 Following the concerns raised officers have examined our most up to date personal injury accident data for this area which revealed that there has only been one slight injury accident reported within the last three years and therefore a proposal in this street would be a low priority for a scheme in the programme.
- 2.35 However, the Council has recently introduced parking and loading restrictions in Theobald Crescent to address congestion issues, particularly those in close proximity to the school, which can be congested at school start and finish times.

Petition 11- Long Elmes, Harrow Weald (western end) – Traders requesting CPZ

- 2.36 A petition containing 172 signatures was presented at the TARSAP meeting on 2nd October 2014. The petition states:

“We live in or trade from properties located in or near the western end of Long Elmes. We are very concerned about the parking problems here. These are largely the result of inconsiderate long-stay parking by people not resident in the area. These include commuters using Headstone Lane station, which we believe is the only station in the Borough without a Controlled Parking Zone. Consequently, residents are unable to park close to their homes and traders are losing business because customers are unable to find suitable parking.

We ask the Council to address this problem by restricting Monday to Saturday daytime parking in the service road outside the shops to no more than two hours and to consult residents and traders on the desirability of a CPZ around the station, including the area bounded by Long Elmes, Courtenay Avenue and the railway.”

- 2.37 There are currently no parking schemes or reviews planned for this road or in the area. Currently the 2014/15 programme of work is fully committed with a considerable backlog of requests still to be added to a future programme of works in subsequent years.
- 2.38 Therefore this matter will have to be considered at the February 2015 meeting of the panel when consideration will be given to the 2015/16 annual parking programme. The panel will be presented with a report to consider new and existing requests for schemes, any existing commitments and to consider which the priority schemes are for the year.

Petition 12 – Bush Grove, Canons Park – Objection to Canons Park CPZ review proposals

- 2.39 A petition containing 49 signatures from residents of Bush Grove was received on 4th October 2014. The petition states:
- “We the undersigned object to this proposal for the following reasons; the knock on effect of the above proposal in conjunction with the proposal of a CPZ in Wemborough Road will result in commuter traffic parking along the remaining section of Bush Grove. These vehicles will cause a problem to that section of Bush Grove as vehicles are likely to park there all day especially Monday to Friday. Consultation results Appendix B ask if residents of Bush Grove experience parking problems in their street. The majority said no and the overall support level was 28%. However this question is misleading as those who replied to the questionnaire were clearly happy with the status quo. The above mentioned proposal will change the status quo and cause the problems already mentioned as those vehicles that currently park during commuter hours along Wemborough Road and from 19-33 Bush Grove will have to park elsewhere probably from number 33 Bush Grove onwards. We therefore ask you to reconsider this proposal.”*
- 2.40 The petition will be considered as part of the Canons Park Area parking review proposals report included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 13 – Locket Road, Wealdstone – Request for zebra crossing

2.41 A petition presented jointly by a local councillor and a local resident containing 258 signatures from residents in the vicinity of Belmont School, Wealdstone was received on 20th October 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned call upon Harrow Council to install a Pedestrian crossing at the junction of Locket and Hibbert Road so that pupils of Belmont School can cross safely”.

2.42 The Council is aware of the issues in this area and have recently implemented measures to support pedestrians crossing Locket Road by introducing two raised speed platforms. These speed platforms form part of a package of road safety measures including a 20 mph zone in the roads surrounding Belmont School. There is also an existing school crossing patrol that operates at the junction of Locket Road and Hibbert Road.

2.43 The council receives many requests each year for new controlled pedestrian facilities such as zebra crossings and because the funds available to the Council is limited TARSAP has agreed a set assessment method for considering and prioritising requests for measures which takes into account a range of different factors. The main factors measured are the number of people crossing the road, the volume and speed of traffic and the number of personal injury accidents on the road near to the proposed site. Other factors to consider include, site geometry, the width of the road and the proximity of local amenities such as hospitals, schools and shops.

2.44 Investigations are undertaken on all requests to assess the level of need and prioritise requests so that we can decide which schemes are taken forward. Each site is surveyed and the results compared with national criteria to identify the most suitable locations. This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise measures so that the worst cases can be dealt with first. In terms of road safety this has helped us to become one of the safest boroughs in London.

2.45 A prioritised list of sites is put together and contributes toward the development of a works programme which is funded by Transport for London (TfL) as a part of the Local Implementation Plan programme of investment.

2.46 In recognition of the issues raised in the petition this request will be included on our list of sites for investigation to see if a case can be made for a zebra crossing.

Petition 14 – Welbeck Road, South Harrow - Objection to Welbeck Road CPZ proposals

2.47 A petition containing 37 signatures from residents of Welbeck Road was received on 21st November 2014. The petition states:

“We the undersigned, object to Harrow councils plan to introduce a controlled parking zone along Welbeck Road.”

- 2.48 The petition will be considered as part of the Welbeck Road area parking review proposals report included on the agenda for this panel meeting.

Petition 15 – Somerset Road, North Harrow – include road in CPZ

- 2.49 A petition containing 38 signatures from residents of Somerset Road was received on 24th November 2014. The petition states:

“We the residents of Somerset Road, Harrow petition the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel to include Somerset Road in the Controlled Parking Zones (“CPZ”) recommended in October 2014.

The proposal to introduce Controlled Parking Zones in the neighbouring roads in North Harrow will be to the detriment of the residents of Somerset Road. Given the original proposal that we were consulted on has now changed to the current proposal which we were not consulted on, we demand that the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel include Somerset Road in the Controlled Parking zone.”

- 2.50 Members may recall that the statutory consultation results for the North Harrow CPZ were reported to the Panel meeting in October. At the meeting members made a recommendation to the Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety (PH) not to include Somerset Road based on the statutory consultation responses received.
- 2.51 At the public consultation stage there was clear support for a scheme in the road, however, the results of the statutory consultation indicated a shift in public opinion with 12 residents in support and 12 opposed. In addition there was a petition received in the area, opposed to the scheme, which included some Somerset Road residents as signatories. This matter was discussed with ward councillors and the Chair of the Panel prior to the Panel meeting in October to consider the most appropriate way forward. In this road it was decided not to proceed with the scheme.
- 2.52 The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Crime and Community Safety agreed with the recommendations of the Panel and a decision to proceed with the implementation of the scheme was made on 15th November. Therefore at this stage it is not possible to include Somerset Road because a formal decision has already been made.
- 2.53 The new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) will almost certainly change parking trends in the North Harrow area and it is possible that the Council may have to review any issues that arise from the introduction of the scheme and this will be monitored once the scheme is introduced.
- 2.54 Any requests for new CPZs or CPZ reviews are considered annually in February by the panel in order to develop a programme of work for the forthcoming financial year. A prioritised list of roads or areas of the

borough where parking issues have been identified are put forward for consideration by the Panel and a programme of work recommended to the PH for approval. Somerset Road will be added to the list for the Panel's consideration in February.

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 current corporate guidance if members subsequently decide that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions.

Section 6 – Council Priorities

- 6.1 The funds allocated by TfL and Harrow for transport improvements will contribute to achieving the administration's priorities:
 - Making a difference for the vulnerable
 - Making a difference for communities
 - Making a difference for local businesses
 - Making a difference for families

Section 7 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man



on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 24/11/14

Ward Councillors notified:

YES

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 documents and results