

**REPORT FOR: TRAFFIC & ROAD
 SAFETY ADVISORY
 PANEL**

Date of Meeting: 31 October 2018

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**
 Petitions

1. Wynlie Gardens, Pinner – Request for Controlled Parking
2. Camrose Avenue junction with A5 Edgware Road – Request for pedestrian crossing
3. Merrion Ave area – Various traffic and parking requests
4. Methuen Close- objecting to the CPZ hours
5. Stag Lane School – Request for parking enforcement
6. The Highlands – HGV Traffic
7. Rayners Lane – Heavy vehicles causing vibration
8. Eaton Close – Objection to double yellow lines and request for CPZ
9. Sudbury Court Drive – Request for signal timing review
10. September Way – Request for parking controls
11. Whitchurch Gardens area – CPZ consultation
12. Wealdstone Square – Objection to loss of parking
13. Ellement Close – Request for

- parking controls
14. College Avenue – Request for traffic calming measures
 15. Courtenay Avenue – Request for CPZ
 16. St Margarets Avenue – Objection to double yellow lines
 17. Clitheroe Avenue – Request for CPZ

Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer :	Paul Walker - Corporate Director, Community
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Varsha Parmar - Portfolio Holder for Environment
Exempt:	No
Decision subject to Call-in:	No, report is for information
Wards affected:	Edgware, Pinner, Roxbourne, Canons, Harrow Weald
Enclosures:	None

Section 1 – Summary

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.

Recommendations:

None, the report is for information only.

Reason: (For recommendations)

None, the report is for information only.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

- 2.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting of TARSAP and the current status of any investigations and findings undertaken.
- 2.2 No updates on the progress made with previous petitions will be reported because officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any further updates.

Options considered

- 2.3 This report is provided only to update members on the status of petitions received by the Council that are within the terms of reference of TARSAP.

Background

Petition 1 – Wynlie Gardens - request for controlled parking zone.

- 2.4 A petition containing 13 signatures was received by the Council on 17th June 2018. The petition states:

“Non-residents are increasingly using Wynlie Gardens, a cul de sac, as a car park both in the day and at night. Security and overcrowding are concerns. Often no spaces remain in which residents may park. Is it possible for you to enforce parking restrictions to limit non-residents?”

- 2.5 The request has been added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which will be considered at the meeting scheduled for February 2019. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the year ahead.

Petition 2 – Camrose Avenue junction with A5 Edgware Road – Request for pedestrian crossing

- 2.6 A petition containing 218 signatures was received by the Council in July. The petition states:

“We the undersigned are concerned about lack of pedestrian crossing at the junction of Camrose Avenue with Edgware Road. Crossing this road is very dangerous and risky, as there is no pedestrian crossing and vehicles come from all directions. Traffic lights are designed to allow vehicles from different directions into and out of Camrose Avenue. This leaves no space or time for pedestrians to cross the road and have to

simply take chance in between the change of light and risk their life. This makes it even more dangerous for elderly and less able persons. We call upon the council and Mayor for London to give this matter their attention and put pedestrian crossing at this junction.”

2.7 The London Borough of Barnet would be responsible for evaluating the request and for promoting and taking forward any scheme to include a pedestrian crossing phase at these signals in consultation with Transport for London who own, operate and maintain traffic signals across London. A copy of the petition has been sent to Barnet for their attention.

2.8 We received the following response from Barnet Council:

“We have since considered that there could be merit in considering whether an improvement for pedestrians might be made without providing additional junction capacity (seeking only to not significantly worsen the existing situation, which would introduce other issues for pedestrians and others at this location and in surrounding roads). However, this would require further feasibility work, with no guarantee that a viable solution will result. We have included this one as one of the many proposals to be considered for next year. Further work to assess priority will take place later this financial year.”

Petition 3 (a) – Merrion Avenue – Request for double yellow lines

2.9 Five separate petitions relating to the Merrion Avenue area were presented to the council in July each are summarised below. The first petition states:

“We the undersigned request Harrow Council to implement double yellow lines opposite the construction site on Merrion Avenue from the junction of London Road to Sandymount Avenue to restrict parking at all times. This is to prevent bottlenecks, particularly on event days and on other days once the new development is complete.”

2.10 This request will be assessed as a part of the congestion programme using assessment criteria previously agreed by the Panel. The assessment criteria for all such requests includes such factors as traffic flows/speeds, pedestrian flows, occurrence of personal injury accidents, the degree to which parking affects access/visibility and the nature of the request. If the threshold score required for intervention is satisfied a scheme will be added to the programme and will be batched and then progressed through design, consultation and implementation phases.

Petition 3 (b) - Merrion Avenue – Request for double yellow lines

2.11 The second petition states:

“We the undersigned request Harrow Council to implement double yellow lines from 141 Merrion Avenue to the junction of Du Cros Drive to reduce the bottleneck at this junction.”

- 2.12 This request will be assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSP) using assessment criteria previously agreed by the Panel. The assessment criteria for all such requests includes such factors as traffic flows/speeds, pedestrian flows, occurrence of personal injury accidents, the degree to which parking affects access/visibility and the nature of the request. If the threshold score required for intervention is satisfied a scheme will be added to the programme and will be batched and then progressed through design, consultation and implementation phases.

Petition 3 (c) – Merrion Avenue – Request for speed bumps

- 2.13 The third petition states:

“We the undersigned request Harrow Council to implement road safety bumps to reduce excessive speeding along Merrion Avenue”

- 2.14 This request was assessed against factors agreed by TARSAP. The assessment criteria considers factors such as personal injury accidents (most heavily weighted, usually accounting for some 60% of the total points), traffic flows, traffic speeds, number of heavy goods vehicles, sensitive land uses, road widths (e.g. schools, parks) and whether the street is on the cycle network.

- 2.15 Our assessment revealed that there were no speed related personal injury accidents there within the last three years. A three-year period of study is the standard nationally, by which traffic engineers assess the frequency of road accidents and identify particular accident trends for the purpose of assessing road safety and for making comparisons with other areas and therefore this request would have a low priority.

Petition 3 (d) – Merrion Avenue – Request for change in hours of parking controls

- 2.16 The fourth petition states:

“We the undersigned request Harrow Council to change the timings of the existing parking restrictions on Merion Avenue to restrict parking in the morning from 8am – 9am”

- 2.17 This request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2019 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes or changes to existing ones received during the year will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in Merrion Avenue can then be reviewed.

Petition 3 (e) – Du Cros Drive – Request for change in hours of parking controls

2.18 The fifth petition states:

“We the undersigned request Harrow Council to change the timings of the existing parking restrictions on Du Cros Drive between the bridge and Howberry Road to restrict parking in the morning from 8am to 9am to prevent bottlenecks”

2.19 This request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in February 2019 when the annual parking management report is considered. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes or changes to existing ones received during the year will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. The priority for a scheme in Du Cross Drive can then be reviewed.

Petition 4 – Methuen Close – objecting to the parking controls

2.20 A petition containing 30 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition states:

“We the undersigned residents of Methuen Close, Edgware HA8 seriously object to the very stringent parking restrictions imposed by yourselves. We do not believe the majority of the residents were consulted properly, did not understand the plans, or responded either way.

Whilst we agree that congestion is not a good thing we would prefer to have these times changed. 8. 30 pm is too late and Saturday is very anti-social indeed.”

2.21 An informal consultation exercise was undertaken with residents in Chandos Crescent, Overbrook Walk 1-42, Methuen Road, Methuen Close and Milford Gardens in September 2017 to gauge opinion on whether there were parking problems in the area and suggest hours of operation in order to address these issues.

2.22 Overall the responses indicated an extremely high level of support for the introduction of parking controls (81% in favour) of those resident 67% of respondents preferred parking controls to operate Monday to Saturday 8.30am – 8.30pm.

2.23 On that basis the Portfolio Holder (PH) for Environment agreed that the scheme should progress to the legal notification stage (statutory consultation) on the proposal that Chandos Crescent, Overbrook Walk 1-42, Methuen Road, Methuen Close and Milford Gardens could be included within a new CPZ (O) operational Monday to Saturday between 8.30am to 8.30pm.

- 2.24 Legal notification was carried out between 18th January 2018 and 7th February 2018 and all comments and objections were taken into consideration by the PH before the PH decided to proceed to implementation. The scheme was implemented in June and there are no further reviews planned for this area in the near future.

Petition 5 – Stag Lane School – Request for parking enforcement

- 2.25 A petition containing 14 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition states:

“We the undersigned are concerned about parking congestion and indiscriminate parking by parents of Stag Lane School. Parents park their cars anywhere on the road and they regularly block residents drive ways. Quite often they are abusive when told to move their car. It has reached breaking point. Parking for residents has become a significant issue. It is neither appropriate nor safe for school children as quite often cars are also parked on double yellow lines or zig zag lines near the school gates. We request Harrow Council to address this issue and take appropriate actions.”

- 2.26 The council employs Civil Enforcement Officers who can only deal with parking contraventions (yellow lines, school zig-zags etc) and parking on the footway and not vehicle obstruction. The Council deploys a CCTV vehicle and staff to patrol schools each day but with over 80 schools in the borough it takes time to work through the list. It is unfortunate that some schools appear to be much more pro-active than others in dealing with school related parking issues however in light of the concerns raised the Parking Operations team will be advised of the concerns raised and requested to review current operations.

Petition 6 - The Highlands – HGV Traffic

- 2.27 A petition / letter containing 25 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition / letter states:

“Dear Residents the HIGHLANDS

I am collecting a petition to improve our (THE HIGHLANDS) local road safety and the environmental conditions within the area for which I will be grateful for the support of the residents.

From 1993 the our council management has changed where the London Borough of Harrow has taken over from Brent Council due to boundary changes implemented during that time. Since then our area particularly area The Highlands, Burnt Oak Broadway, Park Way and the area between the Highlands to Stage Lane has been completely ignored and neglected by the local authority because the area was previously a part of Brent Council.

Recently I have raised the matter with the local government and ombudsman, where the ombudsman has upheld my complaint and provided the local authority with the recommendations for improvements. Unfortunately the local authority is still ignoring and failing to act on the ombudsman's recommendations.

I am collecting a petition from our local residents and help support the following two main factors:

Traffic – Environment Health and Safety

I request the immediate implementation of the ombudsman recommendation since 1993 local residents have been complaining to the local authority about traffic which is the big impact on the road. Our previous complaint were completely ignored and denied any actions by the local authority due to the fact that area was previously Brent Council.

The Highlands residents have lived with very high volume of traffic through the road on a daily basis especially during the morning and evening and throughout the whole day of the weekends.

Heavy goods vehicles are using the Highlands as bypass from Edgware Road A5 to Mollison Way and this was accepted by the local authority. Signs displayed are not suitable for heavy goods vehicles and they have no impact on the traffic volume whatsoever. The traffic from Edgware Road is still using the Highlands, Burnt Oak Broadway service road and park way to avoid A5 traffic.

The junction between The Highlands, A5 and park way are used as a access to point (to park way, Vancouver Road, bacon lane, stage lane, mollision way etc). Due to very high volume of traffic pedestrian safety is being put at risk. The Park ways one way traffic system is also being ignored by the drivers avoiding the A5 traffic.

I have raised this matter regarding traffic with majority of the local residents and they have provided the following feedback:

- No access should be granted from A5 through the Highlands*
- From Park Way to the A5 there should be a one way system implemented.*
- Width restrictions should be applied to the junction between the park way and The Highlands should be applied to the junction between the park way and the Highlands.*

Similar to our road situation was dealt by the authority recent months taken necessary action.

- 1) Stone Grove Service Road implemented as one way traffic due to High Volume of traffic*

2) *Kenton Lane, Grange Road implemented as one system No access via Uppingham Drive to Kenton Lane due to volume of traffic flow from Crowshott Avenue to Kenton Lane.*

Environmental Issue

Since 24 hours off licence was granted by the local authority our local area has become unhealthy living environment which is having a big impact on our daily lives and the property value.

The Highlands and Park way has become a meeting place for drunks on the street, who dump all kinds of rubbish on the pavements and make the area unhygienic by urinating spiting and littering.

The traders have no respect towards the local residents or the local area as they dump rubbish on the pavement and in the streets.

The local authority has failed in their duty of care towards the public, neglecting the both the health and safety of local residents.

The local authority has repeatedly failed take the necessary legal action to stop the traders who is deliberately abusing the system and are using tax payers money on clearing up the traders rubbish daily on a daily basis. Therefore I am requesting the implementation of ombudsman's recommendation immediately by the local authority and stop wasting council funds on cleaning up failures of acts."

2.28 The ombudsman's report summarised the issues raised by local residents and listed the complaints recorded as follows:

- Incidents of road rage and arguments
- Illegal road users – unsuitable vehicles causing property damage
- Speeding
- Illegal activities such as burglary / drug dealing or prostitution
- Fly tipping
- Noise from local traders
- Urinating, drinking in the street and abuse.

2.29 The ombudsman's report lists the outcomes sort as the following:

- Speed restrictions
- CCTV
- Legal notice warning
- Hot Spot areas installed lighting
- Warning to traders.

2.30 Following the ombudsman's report in 2016 a scheme to extend the existing Bacon Lane 20 mph zone to include the Highlands was put forward as part of the programme of local transport schemes funded by Transport for London which is considered annually by this panel.

- 2.31 Members subsequently agreed at the February 2016 meeting of TARSAP to include the Highlands within the Bacon Lane 20 mph zone and following public consultation the scheme was implemented later that year. As part of the 20 mph zone speed cushions were introduced in order to reduce vehicle speeds.
- 2.32 In addition “Unsuitable for HGV” signs were erected at the entrance to the Highlands at the junction with Stag Lane. The other environmental issues were referred on to the relevant departments within the council for their attention.
- 2.33 Following the concerns raised in the petition the Council has commissioned a transport consultant to conduct an assessment in the Highlands to establish the extent of the perceived problem with regards to the number of HGV’s using the Highlands in order to avoid the Stag Lane / A5 junction and suggest any interventions for future consideration.

Petition 7 – Rayners Lane – Heavy Vehicles causing vibration

- 2.34 A petition / letter containing 104 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition / letter states:

“Heavy Vehicles are causing serious and severe vibrations to properties in Rayners Lane. Additionally no speed limits are in place to reduce fast speeding vehicles approaching the roundabout. Inspection of our road structure has not been undertaken on a regular basis following previous work to widen this road. The problem of vibrations have exacerbated following these road works on Rayners Lane. Both speeds and weight limits are ignored.

We the undersigned residents of Rayners Lane request Harrow Council, Transport for London and the Police to protect our homes taking measures to reduce property damage through surveillance and enforcement of speed and weight limits for vehicles passing through Rayners Lane, South Harrow.”

- 2.35 This request will be assessed in line with the council’s criteria for the provision of traffic calming measures and arrange for a traffic surveys to be undertaken in Rayners Lane on the approach to the roundabout. The assessment criteria considers factors such as personal injury accidents (most heavily weighted, usually accounting for some 60% of the total points), traffic flows, traffic speeds, number of heavy goods vehicles, sensitive land uses, road widths (e.g. schools, parks) and whether the street is on the cycle network.
- 2.36 The council notes the concerns raised in the petition by residents in the section of Rayners Lane outside number four on the approach to Roxeth Green Avenue, regarding vibration to properties. It should be noted that on some occasions airborne vibration may be generated by traffic which can cause windows to rattle. This could lead to a subjective impression of structural damage, although airborne vibration is not a cause of potential

damage or cracking to buildings as a result of the type of vehicle or speed of traffic.

- 2.37 The Highways Team have carried out a structural survey of the road conditions at this location and found no faults in the road. Generally the advice given to residents where they feel that that damage has been done to a property because of traffic noise / vibration is to discuss this with their insurance company, provide evidence to support their claim and submit a claim to the council's insurance team.
- 2.38 With regard to road noise there is no legal requirements for councils to monitor general traffic noise.
- 2.39 The Police are responsible for enforcing speed limits on the public highway and the Traffic Police have advised that localised speeding issues should be referred to the Police Safer Neighbourhood team for their attention.

Petition 8 – Eaton Close and Hall Farm Close – request for CPZ

- 2.40 A petition containing 52 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition / letter states:

“We the undersigned respectively request that the council tackles the increasingly problematic commuter parking issues by introducing a controlled parking zone with resident permit bays in both roads.

- *Eaton Close requires restricted parking at all times.*
- *Hall Farm Close requires restricted parking from 10am -11am and 3pm-4pm.*

Both these schemes should apply every day including Sundays which will assist with match day event problems”

- 2.41 As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes or changes to existing ones received during the year will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP and this request will be prioritised accordingly.

Petition 9 – Sudbury Hill / Sudbury Court Drive / Harrow Road – Request for a pedestrian phase

- 2.42 A petition containing 119 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition states:

“We the undersigned call on Harrow Council to review the timing of the light phasing of the traffic lights at the junction for Greenford Road, Sudbury Hill, Sudbury Court Drive with the aim of extending the phasing of the lights from the current 5 seconds, to a more reasonable length of time to safely accommodate the hundreds of children and parents who travel to and from St Georges School.”

- 2.43 Transport for London (TfL) has responsibility for all traffic lights in London and any changes to the signal timings or phases would need to be agreed with them in order to strike a balance between the needs of all user groups, particularly pedestrians and motorists.
- 2.44 For information following a meeting in July 2017 last year with officer's from the Council, St George's School and a governor of the school TfL agreed to increase the green time for pedestrians by a further second for each phase at the junction. This was considered the maximum allowance that could be given without further modelling on the entire junction being required.

Petition 10 – September Way - Request for parking controls

- 2.45 A petition / letter containing 20 signatures was received by the Council in July 2018. The petition states:

“The residents of September Way and Laurimal Close are facing very arduous time due to the nuisance being caused by some of the students of Stanmore College, which is situated just opposite September Way.

The problems have started from the time the college opened their gate at the rear entrance and students started parking their cars on both sides in the street.

Sometimes it becomes so difficult for the residents to pass through when the cars are parked in a very hazardous way. Even the students stop their cars, chatting with the other students, showing no respect to the residents of September Way when they have to go out or come in.

Students have been eating in the cars and then dispose of their rubbish outside their cars or dropping on the pavement or even on the road. The council has provided the area with litter bins, but no notice is taken by them.

Students have been caught entering the three courts, Seasons, Mentmore Court and Stanley Court in September Way and the garages. This occurs when someone forgets to lock the garages. It is a concern why students feel the need to hide out in this area.

Students have no right to enter the private places in any of the courts or the houses anywhere in September Way.

House holders are fed up with the student's behaviour parking their cars in front of their entrances, sitting on the grass in the front lawns, even trying to peep into their houses, while they are not there.

The students have made September Way more like a car park and play ground, the way they have been driving recklessly and shouting and using abusive language in the street. September Way residents humbly plea that the parking restrictions should be imposed in September Way.

Morning 11am -1pm Afternoon 2pm – 4 pm

The residents of September Way / Laurimal Close can apply for the resident permit if wish so, including the seventeen houses.

There is a blind corner outside Stanley Court. A speed bump should be installed as one cannot see the cars coming from either direction when the big vans are parked there. Drawing double yellow lines there as well would avoid accidents.

We do hope that your kind intervention would yeald favourable results to mitigate the problems of the residents.

- 2.46 The request for a change to the existing controls will be assessed against factors already agreed by TARSAP and ranked against all other existing and new parking requests across the borough and then presented to the February 2019 meeting of the panel for their consideration and prioritisation. This meeting will discuss and decide the parking review programme for the coming financial year.
- 2.47 With regard to the request for a road hump the most up to date personal injury accident data has been examined in Stanley Court which revealed that there were no speed related personal injury accidents there within the last three years. A three-year period of study is the standard nationally, by which traffic engineers assess the frequency of road accidents and identify particular accident trends for the purpose of assessing road safety and for making comparisons with other areas.
- 2.48 The assessment therefore concluded that the site does not meet the criteria for intervention.

Petition 11 – Whitchurch Gardens – CPZ Consultation

- 2.49 A petition / letter containing 63 signatures was received by the Council in August in response to the informal consultation process. The petition / letter states:

“We feel we have to criticise the above consultation. It has not identified nor investigated the true nature of the issues that impact the parking; it has not offered solutions that would address the actual issues and the options offered would adversely impact the residents (whilst not addressing the issues). It is also inappropriate to include in the consultation, Whitchurch Lane, which is already subject to controlled parking and also Queen’s Mead which is a private road and will not be affected by the outcome. We also know of at least two households that did not receive the consultation documents.

The Issues:

- *There is much long term parking by non-residents. Much of this is commercial.*

- *The number of parked vehicles during the evenings and overnight is just as great as during the day indicating that commuters have only a minimal impact in the street.*
- *Although sometimes a little frustrating, residents currently manage to park with visitors often conveniently parking over their own drive.*
- *We have some sympathy for the ambulance drivers based next to Canons Park station who park here. The council should ensure that their employer provides them, as shift workers, with appropriate off street parking. This alone would reduce the parking pressure on the street significantly. The community needs ambulance drivers and their needs are not being considered.*

The Council proposed options:

Only two choices were offered: A permit based CPZ

*Monday – Friday or Saturday 10am – 3pm or
Monday – Friday or Saturday 8:30am – 8:30pm.*

Both sledgehammers to crack a nut, stopping residents having visitors and service visits for significant parts of the waking day, but will not address the evening or overnight parking.

- *Unusually the street has long stretches of kerb that do not run in front of houses. Parking along these stretches has only minimal impact on residents. Optimised use of these areas was not considered.*
- *Only expensive and complex schemes were offered involving residents parking permits and visitors permits.*

The impact of the proposed schemes:

- *Many Whitchurch Gardens residents contribute to a vibrant community life. Amongst those signing below are residents that from time to time host during the day Christian Bible study, a book group, a Jewish group with home based prayer and festival celebrations, an informal yoga mediation gathering, an art and literature appreciation group, a gourmet lunch group, charity trustee and committee meetings and much more. The long hours of the proposed restrictions will in all probability stop the hosting of these life enriching activities.*
- *For one reason or another, many residents are at home during the day including a significant number of pensioners with increasing care needs. They currently benefit from both friends visiting, often for short periods of say 30 minutes, where use of visitor permits would be unreasonable. Also trades people providing services or personal care need to often park for short periods. The long hours of the restrictions will inhibit social contact and services for those who need it most.*

- *Many fear more front gardens will be paved over. Whitchurch Gardens has long maintained its character with interesting planting and greenery in the front gardens. This plan appears to be encouraging residents to destroy this.*

Next steps:

Although we would appreciate some reduction in the parking stress in Whitchurch Gardens and adjoining closes, we appreciate the value of living in a street without parking restrictions and will live with the current situation rather than lose the social contact we enjoy with visitors popping in for, often short, visits, overnight guests etc as described above.

We would be very happy to discuss with you and officers in the council alternative schemes and suggestions of our own that would not impact our quality of life.”

- 2.50 This scheme was included in the annual parking review programme at the February 2018 meeting of TARSAP following an assessment of the request which included a petition received from the residents of Whitchurch Gardens in November 2016.
- 2.51 The comments raised in the petition have been noted and have been considered by the PH and local councillors along with all other representations and comments received during the consultation process.
- 2.52 The PH is in the process of confirming her decision and the formal PH report detailing the comments received and officers responses will be available for inspection on the council’s web site
- 2.53 It should be noted that there is a large number of schemes that operate for 1 or 2 hours per day. The rationale for this is simply that it prevents all day parking and minimises any restrictions on residential parking. However, it creates huge problems for undertaking enforcement because there is a limited resource that is required to oversee a large area of restrictions with only 1 or 2 hours a day to do this. Even with different hours being selected in different areas this still creates problems in scheduling enforcement activities.

Petition 12 – Wealdstone Square – objection to the scheme

- 2.54 An online petition containing 14 names was received by the Council in August 2018 in response to the statutory consultation published as part of this scheme. The petition states:

“We the undersigned object to the plans for Headstone Drive

‘We feel the plan to reduce parking and extend the square will be at the detriment of the residents of Headstone Drive causing further congestion and anti – social behaviour adding to the problems we already experience daily.’

- 2.55 The contents of the petition and the objections / comments received during the statutory consultation period were reported to the Portfolio Holder (PH). A PH report detailing the comments and officers responses was published on the council's web site along with the officer's recommendations. The PH agreed to proceed with the scheme as advertised.

Petition 13 – Ellement Close – Request for controlled parking zone

- 2.56 A petition containing 55 signatures was presented to Cabinet in September. The petition / letter states:

“We, the undersigned residents of Ellement Close, Pinner HAS would like Harrow council to address a lack of street parking on our road caused by (in our opinion):

- the number of road crossings;*
- the granting of planning permission to construct additional properties without an uplift in parking spaces;*
- the sale of 4 council-owned garages, 2 of which were demolished to make way for flats;*
- residents parking on alternate sides of the street, which creates several chicanes and wastes space.*
- Residents from Eastcote Road parking on Ellement Close.*

Because of the lack of space:

- the gap between cars parked on opposite sides of the road can be very narrow. This not only inconveniences drivers of large vehicles such as dust carts and delivery lorries, but also places lives at risk through obstructing the emergency services.*
- Frequently, residents are forced to park with two wheels on the pavement, obstructing the footways.*
- It can be difficult to welcome guests to our homes because of the lack of parking.*

Proposal:

Whilst we recognise that financial resources are tight, we request that the road is widened to include parking bays on the grassed areas between the kerb and footpath. Furthermore, we propose that a controlled parking zone is established by way of a double yellow line on the southern side of the street from numbers 28 to 48.

- The use of available parking space will be fully optimised, allowing up to 15 additional cars to park safely and legally;*
- Residents with road crossings and driveways will enjoy easier access to their property;*
- Visibility along the length of the street will be improved, thereby increasing safety;*
- The risk of obstructing the emergency services or other large vehicles will be significantly reduced;*

- *Residents will no longer feel obliged to park illegally and so the potential for damage to footways and will be reduced;*
- *The expense to the council will be minimal.*

- 2.57 The grass areas within the estate are land owned by the council but are not public highway maintainable by the highway authority. The maintenance and management of these areas is the responsibility of the Housing Department of the Council.
- 2.58 In general the council does not convert existing grass areas on the highway for parking because the approach set out in the council's Transport Local Implementation Plan indicates that measures that encourage an increase in car ownership and use are discouraged and existing parking demand pressures are dealt with by managing the existing road space with parking restrictions and controls.
- 2.59 However, this land is not highway and therefore this matter will need to be highlighted to the Housing Department who would need to consider the case for promoting the construction of parking bays on Ellement Close and to consider the budget implications of doing so.
- 2.60 It would not be appropriate to consider the use the annual parking management budget for any schemes that are not on the public highway.

Petition 14 – College Avenue – Request for traffic calming

- 2.61 A petition / letter containing 40 signatures was received by the Council in September. The petition / letter states:
- “Due to the amount of collisions speeding cars have had with front garden walls and parked vehicles on College Avenue, we`d like to appeal to Harrow Council about initiating traffic calming measures to help prevent future accidents and possible casualties.”*
- 2.62 The problems highlighted in the petition are unfortunately common at a number of locations throughout the borough. As a result the Traffic Team receives a considerable number of requests for measures to address these local concerns. The funds available to the council for traffic / parking schemes are limited and therefore we have a set assessment method for considering these requests.
- 2.63 The assessment criteria considers factors such as personal injury accidents (most heavily weighted, usually accounting for some 60% of the total points), traffic flows, traffic speeds, number of heavy goods vehicles, sensitive land uses, road widths (e.g. schools, parks) and whether the street is on the cycle network.
- 2.64 A traffic survey will be undertaken in College Avenue and this request will be assessed in line with this criteria. An initial assessment of the personal injury accidents has revealed that no Killed or Seriously personal injury accidents have been reported by the Police within the last three years.

- 2.65 It should be noted that damage only accidents where there are no casualties are not taken into account. This is because there are no reliable sources of information about 'damage only accidents' because they do not have to be reported to the Police. We are also aware that there is under reporting of personal injury accidents although drivers are legally required to report all injury accidents.
- 2.66 This information is reported accurately by the Police and is a reliable source of information which engineers can use to assist with the assessment. Other sources of accident information unfortunately are less reliable and are therefore not used.
- 2.67 The Police are responsible for enforcing speed limits on the public highway and we have been advised previously by the Traffic Police that localised speeding issues should be referred to the Police Safer Neighbourhood team for their attention. The Police operate a speed enforcement initiative called community Roadwatch this involves residents and Police working together to target speeding drivers.

Petition 15 – Courtenay Avenue – Request for controlled parking zone

- 2.68 A petition containing 67 signatures was received by the Council in October. The petition / letter states:

“Petition for parking permit in Courtenay Avenue HA3 5JJ

Please sign for application for Permit Parking to be installed in Courtenay Avenue”

- 2.69 The request has been added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which will be considered at the meeting scheduled for February 2019. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the year ahead.

Petition 16 – St Margaret’s Avenue – Objection to double yellow lines

- 2.70 A petition containing 28 signatures was received by the Council in October. The petition / letter states:

“We the residents of St Margarets Avenue South Harrow strongly oppose double yellow lines on our street.”

- 2.71 The double yellow lines located in St Margaret's Avenue were implemented to prevent vehicles from obstructing the turning head at the end of the cul du sac because the road is quite narrow and larger vehicles have difficulty in turning around.

- 2.72 At the legal notification (statutory consultation) stage the council received seven objections to the proposed double yellow lines in St Margaret's Avenue and one comment.
- 2.73 Three objections were received from the same household in Somervell Road three were from separate addresses in St Margaret's Avenue, one from an address in Hounslow. The one comment received was from an unknown address
- 2.74 All the objections were collated and considered by the PH at a meeting on the 7th August 2018 and subsequently overruled.

Petition 17 – Clitheroe Avenue - Request for controlled parking zone

- 2.75 A hand delivered petition containing 77 signatures was received by the Council in October. The petition / letter states:

“The undersigned wish to file a petition to the London Borough of Harrow to implement parking permits on Clitheroe Avenue between the hours of 10 am to 3pm.”

- 2.76 This request will be added to the list of requests to be presented to the panel in the annual parking management report which will be considered at the meeting scheduled for February 2019. As members are aware all of the requests for parking schemes received during the year or already on the list for consideration will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes will be ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the year ahead.

Staffing/workforce

- 2.77 The review of petitions has been undertaken using existing staff resources within the Traffic, Highways & Asset Management team supported by technical consultants as needed.

Performance Issues

- 2.78 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims, objectives and targets in the current Transport Local Implementation Plan 2 (LIP2) and draft LIP3 and help to deliver Harrow's corporate priorities and in particular building a better Harrow.

Environmental Implications

- 2.79 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would accord with the current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP2) and draft LIP3 which have both undergone a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The SEA has indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the proposed programme of investment which includes all of

the current measures and initiatives that could potentially be suggested as mitigations.

- 2.80 Key population and human health benefits include reducing reliance on travel by car, reducing casualties, reducing congestion, encouraging active travel and improving air quality. There are public health benefits associated with increased active travel which can reduce diabetes and obesity levels.

Risk Management Implications

- 2.81 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No
- 2.82 The development of any schemes arising from a petition would be subject to separate risk assessments.
- 2.83 There is a requirement to undertake a design risk assessment during scheme development under the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations in order to manage any potential health and safety risks.

Legal implications

- 2.84 There are no legal implications.

Financial Implications

- 2.85 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.

Equalities Implications / Public Sector Equality Duty

- 2.86 The petitions raise issues about issues that affect the traffic and transportation programmes of work as well as identifying new areas of work for investigation. The officer's response to a petition will indicate a suggested way forward in each case.
- 2.87 If members subsequently suggest that officers should develop detailed schemes or proposals to address any of the concerns raised in the petitions these will accord with the Council's current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP2) or proposed draft LIP3 both of which have been subject to a full Equalities Impact Assessment. These Equalities Impact Assessments have been identified as having no negative impact on any protected equality groups and demonstrate positive impacts on the disability and age equality groups.

Council Priorities

2.88 Any findings or investigations in response to petitions detailed in the report support the Harrow ambition plan and 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 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 17/10/18		

Ward Councillors notified:	YES
EqIA carried out:	NO, a full EQIA has been undertaken on LIP3 which covers this work area. A separate EqIA is therefore not necessary.
EqIA cleared by:	N/A

Section 4 - 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: None

**Call-In Waived by the
Chair of Overview and
Scrutiny Committee**

NOT APPLICABLE

*[Call-in does not apply as the
report is for noting only]*