

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	30 November 2005
Subject:	Proposed 20 MPH Zone - Kings Road Area, Rayners Lane
Responsible Officer:	Steve Swain, Interim Head of Public Realm Infrastructure
Contact Officer:	Paul Edwards, Principal Engineer, Transportation Department – Urban Living
Portfolio Holder:	Environment and Transport
Key Decision:	No
Status:	Part I

Section 1: Summary

Decision Required

That, subject to the consideration of any formal objections to the advertised statutory notices, the panel recommends that the Portfolio Holder for environment and transport instructs officers to take all steps necessary to introduce a 20 MPH zone in the Kings Road area of Rayners Lane, as shown on the plan at APPENDIX A.

Reason for report

The purpose of this report is to inform members of the result of the public consultation and to seek approval to introduce the scheme in the current financial year.

Benefits

20mph zones are a means of improving road safety for pedestrians, cyclists and local residents therefore encouraging these more sustainable modes of transport.

They are particularly beneficial in areas around schools where they can reduce accidents and encourage walking to school.

There are two schools in the vicinity of the proposed zone (Newton Farm First and Middle School, and Roxbourne First School).

Cost of Proposals

The estimated cost of the scheme is £ 120,000. This estimate includes all costs including those associated with the traffic order making and staff design time.

Risks

Some motorists might perceive the introduction of road humps as unnecessary and inconvenient.

The safety benefits of road humps has to be weighed against their disadvantages to all vehicles, including buses and emergency vehicles, in terms of longer journey times and discomfort for passengers.

Implications if recommendations rejected

The loss of an opportunity to improve the levels of highway safety in residential areas, centred on schools, and to reduce numbers of injury accidents and levels of severity.

Loss of Transport for London funding.

Section 2: Report

2.1 Brief History

- 2.1.1 The Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel agreed a five-year programme of implementation of 20 MPH zones which was subsequently submitted to Transport for London (TfL), in September 2002, as part of the 2003/04 Borough Spending Plan bids. Following a revision of the TfL qualifying criteria this scheme, with others, was re-submitted in July 2003 and funding was approved for the financial year 2005/6.
- 2.1.2 Kings Road is an important local route and forms part of the local bus network and, together with other nearby roads some of which run parallel to Kings Road, attract high traffic flows. Also, residents have reported vehicles travelling at inappropriately high speeds.
- 2.1.3 In 1996, following consultations with local residents and businesses, speed cushions were introduced in Kings Road. Recently these were removed to accommodate carriageway resurfacing works. The replacement of the humps was postponed to enable required changes to the original scheme to be included in the consultation of the proposals the subject of this report.
- 2.1.4 The changes to the original Kings Road speed cushions mentioned in paragraph 2.1.3 above were necessary to accommodate revised bus stop positions. The Council have received reports of bus travellers tripping on the speed cushions whilst getting on and off buses. Also the opportunity is being taken to modernise the cushion design, this is principally a reduction of the height of the humps.
- 2.1.5 Kings Road and the surrounding area was included in the 20 mph zone programme principally because there are two local schools, Newton Farm First and Middle School, and Roxbourne School (refer plan at **APPENDIX A**).
- 2.1.6 Some of the roads in the proposed 20mph zone have speed-cushions provided by an earlier scheme and, subject to the results of the consultation, these will remain enabling the roads to be included in the new 20mph zone.
- 2.1.7 The formulation of the proposals, led by the need to address residents' concerns relating to traffic speed and road safety, require solution of problems generated by the 'school-run' around the local schools and through-traffic travelling at inappropriate speed. The speed reduction measures proposed will include gateways, road humps, a speed table and a school safety zone (Keep-clear zig-zags).

2.2 Options considered

- 2.2.1 20mph zones must be self-enforcing, that is physical measures must be provided that will either make it difficult for drivers to drive at speeds greater than 20 mph or will slow drivers making it more likely that drivers will drive at speeds less than 20mph.
- 2.2.2 Available options for the reduction of vehicle speeds to 20mph include high profile signage and carriageway markings, road humps or speed cushions, rumble strips, raised junctions and mini-roundabouts at junctions and chicanes or carriageway narrowing.
- 2.2.3 Responsibility for the implementation of speed cameras rests with Transport for London who follow a strict criteria laid down by the Department for Transport. These criteria are not satisfied by conditions on the roads within the zone and therefore speed cameras are not an option.
- 2.2.4 Mini-roundabouts and raised junctions were considered but because they do not reduce speed between junctions and are relatively expensive they were discounted. The provision of Chicanes and narrowing were discounted because of the road area that would be required with consequential loss of resident parking capacity and adverse impact on the street scene. Rumble strips have negligible effect on speed and the noise generated often causes residents to complain and leads to the eventual removal of the strips.
- 2.2.5 Following a comparative assessment of the options for self-enforcing traffic calming it was decided to prepare proposals based on the provision of speed cushions with entry treatments (gateways) and road markings at perimeters of the zone.

2.3 Consultation

- 2.3.1 The draft consultation document was amended with the benefit of suggestions from ward councilors before finalization and delivery.
- 2.3.2 Consultation on the proposals has been carried out with the stakeholders, which included the emergency services, London Buses, North West London Chamber of Commerce, Harrow Public Transport Users Association and the local schools. None of which tendered objections to the proposals.
- 2.3.3 Copies of the consultation document were delivered to 2,434 properties in the area of the proposed 20 mph zone. Six hundred and sixty two residents responded which represents 27% of those consulted. Seven hundred copies of the document were given to local schoolchildren for delivery to their parents, nineteen of whom returned questionnaires.
- 2.3.4 The respondents' answers to each of the questions on the questionnaire are tabulated on a street-by-street basis at **APPENDIX B**.

2.3.5 A total of 681 responses were received, this figure includes responses from 19 parents of local school children who live outside the area. Eleven of the respondents used the council's web site to respond. The 662 that responded who live inside the area represents 27% of those consulted.

2.3.6 The consultation document included preliminary design drawings and described the proposals and the background to the scheme and included a questionnaire to enable local residents and businesses to have their say.

2.4 Results of Consultation

2.4.1 In the following paragraphs the respondents' answers are analysed and discussed.

2.4.2 **Questions 1 to 6 requested respondent's name and address.**

2.4.3 **Question 7 asked if the respondents supported the retention of the existing traffic calming scheme.** This question refers to road humps that exist in five roads within the new zone, although the humps in Warden Avenue and Kings Road have been temporarily removed to accommodate carriageway-resurfacing works.

Table A shows how the residents of each of the roads that have existing humps responded to question 7.

Road	Yes	No	No view
Torbay Road (between Malvern Avenue and Widdicombe Avenue)	20	17	4
Exeter Road	33	18	0
Lynton Road	18	16	3
Kings Road	47	24	3
Warden Avenue (between Alexandra Avenue and Kings Road)	8	2	0
Total	126	77	10

Table B shows how, in aggregate, the residents of the roads in the area, that do not currently have humps, responded to question 7.

Road	Yes	No	No view
All roads	264	142	53

Tables A and B demonstrate support for the retention of the road humps on the five roads where they currently exist.

2.4.4 **Question 8 asked if the respondents supported the implementation of a 20 mph zone.** Reference to Column 'Q8' at **APPENDIX B** indicates that the majority of the residents of each road consulted support the introduction of a 20 mph zone.

Table C shows how, in aggregate, the remaining residents, that is those whose roads do not currently have humps, responded to question 8.

Road	Yes	No	No view
All roads	466	163	49

Table C indicates strong overall support for the implementation of a 20 mph zone. It should also be noted that, on a road-by-road basis, the residents of all the roads consulted were in favour of a 20mph zone.

2.4.5 **Question 9 asked the respondents if they were in favour of the relocation of the speed cushions in King Road.**

Table D shows how, in aggregate, the residents of all of the roads in the area responded to question 9.

Road	Yes	No	No view
All roads	359	184	81

Table D indicates strong overall support for the relocation of existing humps in Kings Road but it should also be noted that, on a road-by-road basis, the majority of residents in four of the roads consulted, as shown in column 'Q9' of **APPENDIX B**, were marginally against the relocation of the humps.

2.4.6 **Questions 10 to 16 asked if the respondents supported the construction of 'gateways' at seven junctions on the perimeter of the zone.**

Table E shows, in aggregate, how the respondents of the whole area responded in respect of each road.

Road	Yes	No	No view
Torbay Road	345	185	109
Warden Avenue	371	183	86
Malvern Avenue	361	194	96
Thistledene Avenue	311	199	136
Leamington Crescent	328	204	120
Kings Road	358	209	94

Merlins Avenue	308	199	128
Totals	2382	1373	779

Table E shows that there is overall support for the gateways in all seven junctions. Examination of the tabulated results, as shown at columns 'Q10 to Q16' **APPENDIX B**, indicates some local disagreement with the overall view.

2.4.7 Questions 17 to 27 asked respondents if they supported the implementation of road humps in each of the roads in the notional 20 mph zone.

2.4.7.1 Questions 17 to 27 were addressed to all the residents of the proposed zone giving them the opportunity to state which roads they considered should have humps. The greatest weight should be placed on what residents consider is necessary in their own road. For this reason the responses to questions 17 to 27 are separated into two tables. **Table F** lists answers given in respect of the road that the respondents live in whilst **Table G** lists those of all residents in respect of all roads in the zone.

Table F shows how the residents of each of the roads have responded to questions 17 to 27 in respect of their own roads. The response from roads that have existing road humps, listed in **Table A** above, are not replicated here. However the parts of Warden Avenue and Torbay Road that do not currently have humps, omitted from Table A, are listed here.

Road	Yes	No	No view
Beriton Road	0	3	1
Capthorne Avenue	19	11	4
Drake Road	21	10	3
Lulworth Gardens	5	12	2
Ovesdon Avenue	12	6	3
Perwell Avenue	4	2	1
Ravenswood Crescent	12	19	8
Spinnells Road	1	4	0
Waverley Road	16	28	12
Yeading Avenue	23	24	10
Torbay Road (between Widdicombe Avenue and High Worple)	20	17	4

Warden Avenue (between Kings Road and Torbay Road)	8	2	0
Total	141	131	48

2.4.7.2 These results have been illustrated, on a street-by-street basis, on the plan at **APPENDIX C**.

Table G shows how residents of all roads have responded to questions 17 to 27 in respect of each the road in the zone. Again the roads with existing humps the subject of questions 7 and 9 have been omitted from this table.

Road	Yes	No	No view
Beriton Road	227	276	142
Capthorne Avenue	252	307	110
Drake Road	268	294	125
Lulworth Gardens	NOT AVAILABLE		
Ovesdon Avenue	223	286	140
Perwell Avenue	209	287	148
Ravenswood Crescent	245	263	138
Spinnells Road	209	293	141
Waverley Road	250	277	122
Widdicombe Avenue	226	300	132
Yeading Avenue	237	276	138
Torbay Road (between Widdicombe Avenue and High Worple)	256	270	116
Warden Avenue (between Kings Road and Torbay Road)	NOT AVAILABLE		
Total	2,376	2,829	1,320

Although **Table F** shows that the majority of residents in the area are generally in favour of humps being provided in their own roads, **Table G** demonstrates that the majority of residents in the area do not support the provision of humps in roads, other than their own, in the zone. These results have been illustrated on the plan at **APPENDIX D**.

2.4.8 **Question 28** asked respondents if they were in favour of making the existing school safety zone outside the rear entrance of Roxborough School legally enforceable between 8.30 and 9.30am and 3.00 and 4.30pm. Reference to column 'Q28' of **APPENDIX B** indicates that the majority of the residents of each road consulted support the making of the school safety zone enforceable.

Table H shows how, in aggregate, the residents of the roads in the area responded to question 28.

Road	Yes	No	No view
All roads	548	51	54

Table H shows that the majority of the residents are in favour of making the existing school safety zone outside Roxborough School legally enforceable.

2.5 Consideration of Results

- 2.5.1 In the following paragraphs the phrases “majority of residents” or “the residents” should be understood to mean “the majority of residents and businesses that responded”.
- 2.5.2 The consideration of the consultation results is, for the most part, done in two stages, the first to consider what the residents have indicated in respect of their own street, the second to consider their response in respect of other roads in the zone.

Retention of Existing Humps

- 2.5.3 The results, as discussed at Paragraph 2.4.3, indicate that the residents are in favour of retaining the existing road humps (cushions). This is demonstrated whilst considering the responses over the whole area and on a street-by-street basis

20mph-zone

- 2.5.6 The results as discussed at Paragraph 2.4.4 indicate that the residents are in favour of proposals to provide a 20mph zone. This is demonstrated whilst considering the responses over the whole area or on a street-by-street basis.

Repositioning of Humps in Kings Road

- 2.5.7 The results as discussed at Paragraph 2.4.5 indicate that the residents are in favour of the proposed changes to the location of road hump proposed. This is demonstrated whilst considering the responses over the whole area and on a street-by-street basis, with the exception of four roads.

Gateways

- 2.5.8 The results as discussed at Paragraph 2.4.6 indicate that the residents are in favour of proposals to provide gateways in seven roads as proposed.

Road humps

- 2.5.9 Referring to Paragraph 2.4.7 it is shown that the residents of most of the roads in the zone have said they were in favour of humps being provided in their roads. However the residents of 6 roads said they were not in favour of road humps being provided in their roads. The plan at **APPENDIX C** indicates where the residents of roads are in favour of humps in their own road and where they are not. The plan at **APPENDIX D** indicates which roads, other than their own, should have humps. **Tables J1** tabulates the results for the 6 roads, discussed in paragraph 2.5.9 above, where residents did not want humps in their roads.

Table J1

Road	Yes	No	No view
Spinnells Road	1	4	0
Berriton Road	0	3	1
Lulworth Gardens	5	12	2
Ravenswood Crescent	12	19	8
Waverley Road	16	28	12
Yeading Avenue	23	24	10
Totals	57 (32%)	90 (50%)	33 (18%)

- 2.5.10 To assist in the consideration of the results of the consultation officers arranged a meeting with four of the ward councillors and the portfolio holder. At the meeting officers made members aware of the strong indication that in all roads residents were in favour of a 20 mph zone in principal but that in some roads the residents had not supported the proposals to implement road humps.
- 2.5.11 Members echoed the residents' view that it was not necessary to include Yeading Avenue, Waverly Road, Torbay Road (north of the Widdicombe Avenue), Spinnells Road or Warden Avenue (west of Kings Road) in the scheme.
- 2.5.12 However, the ward councillors felt that Ravenswood Crescent should be included and suggested that the two existing right angled bends in the road supplemented by a new single raised table in the road outside the school gates might enable the road to be included in the 20mph zone. The raised table would also serve as a safer crossing point for children.
- 2.5.13 Ward Councillors also made other comments as follows:
- The report to the Panel should include details of the responses received from the emergency services..
 - Speed cushions are not bus-friendly when cars are parked such that buses cannot straddle them properly.
 - In the interests of passenger safety it is essential that speed cushions are relocated away from bus stops.
 - The proposed speed table at the rear entrance to the Roxbourne School should be retained in the scheme even if the road is not included in the 20mph zone.

2.6 Conclusions

- 2.6.1 It is recommended that, with the exception of Ravenswood Crescent, all of the roads where the residents do not support the provision of humps in their roads be omitted from the scheme. This decision is made in acknowledgement that the residents are best placed to assess the need for humps and that accident records do not indicate highway safety problems over the last 3 years.
- 2.6.2 Although the humps have been omitted from Waverly Road it is recommended that a speed-table be provided outside the rear entrance to Roxbourne School as shown on the plan at **APPENDIX A**.
- 2.6.3 Ravenswood Crescent had been included but because the residents do not support humps the proposal has been modified as shown on the plan at **APPENDIX A**.
- 2.6.4 The plan at **APPENDIX A** has been prepared to illustrate the scheme recommended for implementation and is the scheme that was consulted upon with the roads listed in Paragraph 2.6.1 omitted and the hump layout in Ravenswood Crescent amended.

2.7 Financial Implications

- 2.7.1 The estimated cost of the proposals is £120,000 and will be funded by Transport for London 2005/06 budget.

2.8 Legal Implications

- 2.8.1 (a) The 20 mph zone can be made by Notice under section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
(b) The Road humps can be provided by Notice under sections 90A and 90C of the Highways Act 1980.
(c) The enforcement of the School Safety Zone can be made under section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
. * Check RTRA 1984 sections 66 and 67

2.6 Equalities Impact

- 2.6.1 The proposals are of particular benefit to children, people with impaired mobility, the elderly and parents with children.
- 2.6.2 The proposals will be implemented having regard of the Council's Corporate Equality Plan.

2.7 Section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Considerations

- 2.7.1 The proposals have been prepared having regard of good design practice in respect of Section 17 of the above act and the council's partners consulted

2.7.2 The 20mph zone will include the provision of physical measures that will make it difficult and therefore less likely that drivers will drive at speeds above the legal limit of 20mph.

Section 3: Supporting Information/ Background Documents

3.1 Appendices

APPENDIX A	Plan of recommended proposals
APPENDIX B	Table of consultation results
APPENDIX C	Questions 17 to 26 in respect of “own roads”.
APPENDIX D	Questions 17 to 26 in respect of “other roads”

3.2 Background papers that are available on request

Accident statistics
Copy of consultation document
Copies of returned questionnaires

[Note: Appendix A is an A3 map, and has been forwarded to Members of the Panel only. Please contact the Administrator if you require a copy].