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

Date of Meeting: 23 October 2019

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**
 Petitions

1. Melrose Road and Kingsley Road – Request for CPZ
2. Weald Lane – Request for 20 mph zone
3. Nugents Park- Bus stand obstruction at entrance
4. Orchard Close – Request for footway parking
5. Wychwood Avenue – Petition for Controlled Parking Zone
6. Lorne Road (north of Locket Road) – Request to be included in zone J)
7. Clitheroe Avenue – Opposed to proposed CPZ
8. Spring Lake – Request for extended CPZ hours
9. Kingshill Avenue – Opposed to proposed road closures as part of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme
10. Alicia Avenue / Alicia Close – Request to extend double yellow lines

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: | Pinner, Canons, Wealdstone, Kenton West, Hatch End |
| Enclosures: | None |

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

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

Recommendations:

None, the report is for information only.

Reason:

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 – Melrose Road and Kingsley Road – Request for CPZ

- 2.4 A petition containing 29 signatures was referred by Cabinet to TARSAP in June 2019. The petition states:

“We the residents of Melrose Road and Kingsley Road, petition the council to apply restricted parking hours to the area to prevent non-residents from parking.

There is insufficient parking for the residents of Melrose Road and Kingsley Road during the day due to parents and teachers of St John Fisher School using the area to park in all day, and this has become increasingly worse over time.

I request Harrow Council begin a consultation period with the residents to come to a solution to the problem as swiftly as possible”

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

Petition 2 – Weald Lane – Request for 20 mph zone

- 2.7 A petition containing 49 signatures was referred by Cabinet to TARSAP in June 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned residents of Weald Lane, call upon Harrow Council to introduce a 20 mph zone on our road in order to prevent speeding and increase road safety.”

- 2.8 The panel may be aware that Transport for London (TfL) funds all of the council’s 20 mph zones. Schemes are prioritised and agreed with them well in advance of delivery. Requests for funding for new 20 mph zones or for roads to be included within existing ones are detailed within the councils Local Implementation Plan (LIP).
- 2.9 The latest version of our LIP has been agreed for the financial year 2019 - 20 and the council’s 20 mph zone programme has already been established and agreed.
- 2.10 The council will be reviewing the 20 mph zone program in February 2020 for the following financial year and this request will be assessed and considered further at that time.

Petition 3 – Nugents Park – Bus stand and obstruction at entrance to Nugents Park / Uxbridge Road

- 2.11 A petition containing 12 names and addresses was referred presented to TARSAP on 25th June 2019. The petition states:

“We the residents of Nugents Park Hatch End request the council urgently to review the bus stand arrangements for the H14 bus at the end of our road as the present position is very dangerous for residents trying to exit their road in face of fast moving traffic in both directions. The bus stand was designed for single deck bus operation but now that the H14 service is double deck throughout the day the position is positively dangerous. Often there are two buses squeezed into a single bus stand and the sight line for oncoming traffic becomes impossible and creates a real danger for residents entering and exiting the road. Additionally the H14 buses do not always park next to the kerb and the rear of the bus jutting into the road the exiting process becomes even more dangerous”

- 2.12 This issue was raised with a representative from London Buses at the Traffic Liaison meeting in June and a site meeting was convened on site in August.
- 2.13 Following the meeting TfL agreed to structure their arrangements so that only one bus would park in the bus stand at a given time. Also bus drivers would be advised to wait on the current bus stop prior to Nugent Park and will be encouraged to pull forward as far as possible so as not to obstruct the junction. TfL has agreed to monitor the situation in consultation with ourselves.
- 2.14 It was suggested that the council ban the right turn out of Nugents Park into Uxbridge Road as a safety measure. A check of the personal injury accident (PIA) database however revealed there has been no recorded PIA at this location within the last three years. As the councils criteria for safety schemes is heavily weighted towards reducing killed and seriously injured accidents this site would unfortunately not meet our criteria for intervention.

Petition 4 – Orchard Close – Request for footway parking

- 2.15 A petition / letter containing 29 signatures was presented to TARSAP on 25th June. The petition states:

“The residents of Orchard Close HA8 7RE formally request that Orchard Close be designated an area in which pavement parking is permitted.”

- 2.16 In London there is legislation in force that prohibits all parking on footways and verges that was originally created by the Greater London Council under the General Powers Act 1974. These restrictions have been maintained through a number of subsequent changes in legislation. Currently the only way in which parking on the footway can be permitted is through the introduction of a footway parking scheme which would require a traffic regulation order to be made, the correct traffic signing

and road markings to be put in place, strengthening of the footways to be undertaken and the scheme designed in such a way that sufficient room for pedestrians is maintained. There are no exemptions that can be granted outside of this process.

- 2.17 Site visits have confirmed that in Orchard Close the carriageway is not wide enough to physically accommodate vehicle parking on-street without causing extreme difficulty for large vehicles to gain access and manoeuvre, such as for emergency service vehicles. Additionally the footways are already at a minimum width to facilitate pedestrian movement and so a footway parking scheme would not be possible as vehicles parking on the footway would reduce width for pedestrians to a sub-standard level and have a serious impact on vulnerable road users.
- 2.18 Road users do have a responsibility to respect parking restrictions and park appropriately and the Council also has a responsibility to enforce these restrictions in the public interest and so this situation is not easily resolved.
- 2.19 The primary purpose of a highway is to provide access for the travelling public. Facilitating parking on the highway is only a secondary function which is permitted at the discretion of the highway authority if access for road users is not compromised.
- 2.20 The only way to physically make space for parking in this location would be to widen the carriageway by removing a part of the central island. However, this would be expensive to undertake and currently there is no budget available for this work as we do not prioritise measures that encourage on-street parking.
- 2.21 This panel will be aware that currently the Council's transport policies and those of the London Mayor are focussed on changing travel patterns towards sustainable transport modes and not to encourage greater private car ownership and use. The Council's transport budgets are provided by TfL are only intended for delivering on our approved LIP programme of investment.

Petition 5 – Wychwood Avenue – Request for a Controlled Parking Zone

- 2.22 A petition containing 47 signatures was presented to TARSAP on 25th June 2019. The petition states:

“We the undersigned request a Harrow Council to implement a controlled parking zone between 11:00am and 12:00 pm or between 2pm and 3pm from Monday to Friday.

This is to prevent congestion and bottlenecks on the road particularly on weekdays whereby cars are parked by non-residents to walk to Stanmore and Canons Park stations. Furthermore it will help increase visibility so that people and children in particular can cross the roads safely.”

- 2.23 The request will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. For consistency all requests for new parking schemes are dealt with in this way. All requests are then scored and ranked in order of priority and a suggested parking programme presented to the panel in February for their consideration for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 6 – Lorne Road (north of Locket Road) – Request for a parking review to include this section of Lorne Road in CPZ Zone J

- 2.24 A petition containing 26 signatures was received in July. The petition stated:

“We would like to have a review of the restricted hours on our part of Lorne Road to bring them into line with zone J.”

- 2.25 The request will be assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. For consistency all requests for new parking schemes are dealt with in this way. All requests are then scored and ranked in order of priority and a suggested parking programme presented to the panel in February for their consideration for the forthcoming financial year ahead.

Petition 7 – Clitheroe Avenue- Opposed to proposed CPZ

- 2.26 A petition containing 10 signatures was hand delivered to the Council in July 2019. The petition stated:

“Approx 15 yrs ago RESIDENTS of Clitheroe Ave and Lucas Ave DISAGREED WITH A PARKING ZONE but OXLEY ROAD agreed an it was installed.

Harrow council say they received a petition from neighbours 70% wanting the in 2017, it was said that a list was drawn up knocking on doors in afternoon with most people at work few had any knowledge

I sent e mail requesting a copy of the list but had no reply week ago. I have come to civic ctr to get copy for residents to view. With 100 houses Poss 2 cars per house you have only provide 50 bays that will not be enough.

I have visited 20 houses today 21.7. and have completed a survey most rejecting the scheme Suggest council re ask the 80 other householders. Houses 1-20 Clitheroe Ave

Agree 2 residents Disagree 11 residents.”

- 2.27 In April 2017 the council received a petition from residents in Clitheroe Avenue requesting that the council introduce a new controlled parking zone (CPZ) to help address their parking/safety concerns contributed to by commuters leaving their vehicles in Clitheroe Avenue. The petition

referred to parked vehicles causing congestion, impeding sightlines and safe access to and from driveways.

- 2.28 At the February 2019 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel (TARSAP) meeting the Panel agreed to undertake a consultation with the residents and businesses within the agreed consultation area to introduce a CPZ in Clitheroe Avenue.
- 2.29 Given the level of support for the parking controls in the petition (75%) the council went straight to statutory consultation with the agreement of the Portfolio Holder and local councillors. The Statutory consultation was undertaken over a 21 day period in July.
- 2.30 All the comments and objections were collated and along with this petition were reported to the Portfolio Holder and local ward councillors who decided given the wider level of support for the scheme a CPZ would be implemented in Clitheroe Avenue as advertised.

Petition 8 – Spring Lake – Request to change the hours of existing CPZ

- 2.31 A petition containing 5 signatures was received by the Council in July. The petition states:

“To whom it may concern:

As a result of the severe traffic and parking issues we have had to endure over the past few years, directly caused by the parents of children attending the St John’s School, Stanmore Hill, and as a result of the existing parking restrictions being continually ignored by these parents, despite the Council’s efforts to enforce them.

We, the residents of Spring Lake, Stanmore, request the council to agree to introduce to the road a longer period CPZ from 8am through to 6pm, Monday to Friday, including a resident permit option to accommodate residents’ visitors.”

- 2.32 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 included on the February 2020 agenda. As members are aware all requests for parking controls are assessed against standard assessment factors agreed by TARSAP. The schemes are then ranked in order of priority and a suggested programme of schemes is presented to the panel for their consideration and prioritisation for the forthcoming financial year.

Petition 9 – Kingshill Avenue – Objection to proposed low traffic neighbourhood

- 2.33 A petition containing 133 signatures was received by the Council in July 2019 in response to a public consultation regarding a low traffic neighbourhood scheme. The petition states:

“We say no to all road closure options set out in the Kingshill Avenue area low traffic neighbourhood proposals.

We the undersigned strongly oppose ALL the road closure options proposed by the council. Whilst we accept that the aims of the scheme have merit, we strongly feel that the proposals will have dire consequences for ALL residents.

1. IT HAS ALREADY BEEN TRIED ONCE BEFORE, ENDING UP IN A CHAOTIC SITUATION.

Some years ago, a full road closure of Kingshill Avenue was made, but it did not work as traffic became chaotic on the main roads bordering the area, with long tailbacks and traffic jams. So it was opened again and a lot of taxpayers’ money was wasted. With the road closures, there will be fewer roads for the same level of traffic to flow.

2. IT WILL GREATLY INCONVENIENCE THE RESIDENTS WHO ARE THE MAIN USERS OF THE ROADS.

Journey times and distances will increase for the resident’s south side of Kingshill Avenue.

On option 1, return journeys from frequently visited places like Harrow Leisure Centre, Civic Amenity Centre, Harrow Weald Train Station etc. will be horrendous and involve going all the way via Kenton Lane and Kenton Road.

On option 2, it is even worse as the journeys will be horrendous both ways. Under both options, a return journey normally taking 5 minutes could take 20 minutes and massively add to congestion and pollution.

Examples of roads particularly affected under both options are: Hillbury Avenue, Mayfield Road, Becmead Avenue, Willowcourt Avenue, Addiscombe Close, Kingshill Avenue.

3. IT WILL NOT NECESSARILY DETER THE RAT RUN

It will create considerable congestion and traffic build ups on the “access” roads such as Elmsleigh Avenue, Alicia Avenue (part) and Kingshill Avenue (South) which in turn will only further affect the local residents.”

- 2.34 All responses to the public consultation were collated and presented to the PH and local councillors. After careful consideration the PH decided to approve the 20 mph zone element of the scheme and omit the road closure options from the proposals.

Petition 10 – Alicia Avenue / Alicia Close – Request to extend existing double yellow lines

- 2.35 A petition from local residents containing 12 signatures was received by the Council in September 2019. The petition states:

“We, the undersigned are residents of Alicia Close who urge our Traffic and Road Safety Team to act now to extend the double yellow lines on

Alicia Avenue by an additional 15 - 20m to the east and west of the Alicia Close / Alicia Avenue junction.”

- 2.36 The request to extend the existing double yellow lines will be assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP) using an assessment criteria previously agreed by this Panel. If the threshold score required for intervention is met a scheme will be added to the programme and will be batched and then progressed through design, consultation and the implementation phase. Typically this process takes between 3 - 6 months to complete.

Ward Councillors' comments

- 2.37 No ward councillor's comments have been sought for this report as it is for information only.

Staffing/workforce

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

Performance issues

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

Environmental Implications

- 2.40 The LIP underwent a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the programme of investment. The main benefits are in improving air quality and public health. No negative environmental issues were identified as part of the SEA.
- 2.41 Key air quality benefits identified were from reducing car travel, encouraging greener vehicles and reducing congestion.
- 2.42 Key population and human health benefits identified were from reducing casualties, encouraging active travel, health walks and as a result of improving air quality. The benefits associated with increased active travel and health walks are reduced diabetes and obesity levels.

Risk Management Implications

- 2.43 Risk included on Directorate risk register? No
- 2.44 The development of any schemes arising from a petition would be subject to separate risk assessments.

- 2.45 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

- 2.46 There are no legal implications.

Financial Implications

- 2.47 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

- 2.48 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.
- 2.49 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 which has 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

- 2.50 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 listed below:
- Building a Better Harrow
 - Supporting those most in need
 - Protecting vital Public Services
 - Delivering a Strong Local Economy for All
 - Modernising Harrow Council

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Man



on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 09/10/19

Name: Patrick Kelly



on behalf of the
Monitoring Officer

Date: 09/10/19

Name: Paul Walker



Corporate Director,
Community

Date: 08/10/19

Ward Councillors notified:

**NO, as it impacts on all
Wards**

EqIA carried out:

YES, as a part of LIP3

EqIA cleared by:

**Dave Corby, Community -
Equality Task Group (DETG)
Chair**

Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Barry Philips
E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports
LIP3
Decision Records
Public and statutory consultation documents highlighted in the report
Petitions
PH Reports