

## TARSAP

10 August 2020

### Supplementary report

1) There is a statement in the TARSAP report which requires clarification:

*We want to encourage people to walk or cycle where previously they may have used the car. So these improvements will try to support those that are able to walk where distances are less than 2 km (a 10 minute walk) or cycle if the journey is under 5 km.*

10 minutes is the average time for a person to walk 1 km, therefore the report should have stated 10 minutes for a 1km walk. Obviously different people will walk at different speeds and some will not be able to walk this distance. This paragraph should have read:

*We want to encourage people to walk or cycle where previously they may have used the car. So these improvements will try to support those that are able to walk where distances are less than 2 km (average time to walk 1km is 10 minutes) or cycle if the journey is under 5 km.*

- 2) We have received several emails relating to the schemes and these are included in Appendix 1 of this supplementary report.
- 3) Over the last few weeks, officers have held meetings with ward councillors to seek their comments in respect of the schemes in their wards. Table 1 provides the Panel with the comments officers have gathered.
- 4) There were some important themes expressed by councillors throughout the engagement process.
- a. Consultation- the programme hasn't provided suitable levels of consultation and this has caused difficulties with residents.
  - b. Councillors welcomed the opportunity to discuss the details of the schemes with officers but felt the process should have commenced before the schemes were applied for, they recognised this wasn't possible on this occasion but would like to see a different approach used in future.
  - c. Communication- the portal doesn't provide enough opportunity for communication, a much wider programme with more channels should be provided.
  - d. Purpose- councillors were not always persuaded as to the overall aim of the scheme and better clarity of the aims should be provided.

- e. Cycling schemes- local schemes in the context of the whole borough were not easily understood, greater clarity is required as a significant number of councillors don't see the current cyclist traffic requiring such schemes.
- f. Cycling Schemes- concern expressed that existing and proposed cycle routes join up and do not create unintended pressure on highway network.
- g. Pedestrians- councillors not persuaded on the benefits for the increases in pavement space when removing parking for local shops.
- h. Business- a number of councillors expressed concerns over the impact from the schemes on the business community so soon after COVID19.
- i. Honeypot Lane- across ward concerns over the design benefits of Honeypot Lane and an urgent request to review the scheme.
- j. Review period- widespread support for a post implementation review process for schemes that don't meet the design expectation.

Officer response to the themes: The use of residential roads as short cuts by vehicles and the high volume of vehicles on main roads acts as a significant deterrent to cyclists. The exposure of risk to a collision with a vehicle is one of the main barriers to people taking up cycling. Reducing the amount of through traffic or providing segregation between cyclists and vehicles will remove this barrier and encourage more cycling. Currently the level of traffic on the roads is still below the levels seen prior to the coronavirus pandemic and so there is still capacity in the road network to accommodate the proposed changes from road closures, restrictions and cycle lanes. This situation would be monitored very carefully during any of the trials because traffic conditions are currently hard to forecast due to the variability of the health and economic impacts of the crisis on travel.

The main impact to businesses is the economic impact of the health crisis and the government social distancing requirements and this has had the greatest affect on trade. The provision of parking has been shown over many years to be a less important factor in influencing trade.

The fast track nature of the development of schemes and consultation process has been driven by the requirements from Government and Transport for London to meet challenging timescales to provide an emergency response to the health crisis. Funding awards were only confirmed in June and delivery of all schemes is required to be completed by the end of September. The normally high standard of engagement and consultation that councillors and the public have become accustomed to could not be provided within this 4 months window. Officers recognise the difficulties the funding process has caused and will ensure that all the themes are accounted for in any future programmes and will undertake reviews on schemes at the earliest opportunity in line with the report recommendations.

- 5) Summary of ward councillor consultation
  - a. Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes
    - i. Supported = 4

- ii. Not supported = 3
  - 1. LTN01 Kingshill Avenue
  - 2. LTN 05 Green Lane
  - 3. LTN 08 Dennis Lane
- iii. Conditional support = 2
  - 1. LTN 07 Byron Road
  - 2. LTN 09 Princess Drive
- b. Strategic Cycling
  - i. SC10 George V Avenue is a scheme across two wards one supporting and one not supporting but may if changes can be made
- c. School Streets
  - i. Four schemes all supported with a conditional support on SS03 Marlborough School

Table 1

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Overarching view.</b>
<b>LTN01 – Kingshill Avenue</b>	Kenton West	none	Similar scheme had been rejected by the community.  The local business impact is considered to be negative.	Not supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN02 – Pinner View area</b>	Headstone South	Supportive of the scheme and were keen to ensure emergency services had been advised		Supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN03 – Francis Road area</b>	Greenhill	Supportive of safer streets, reduced speeding, several requests over the years for traffic calming  Would like to see the scheme made permanent if possible	Not overly keen on increases in traffic.	Supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN 04 – Vaughan Road area</b>	West Harrow	Very comfortable with the approach, especially with a clear review after 6 months.		Supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN05 – Green Lane area</b>	Stanmore Park	Councillor expressed a preference for this scheme if having to choose either Green Lane or Dennis Lane, but don't support both together	Traffic impacts on Wood Lane/ Stanmore Hill, councillors are reporting a 2,000+ petition against scheme, negative impact on Green Lane, restricting access to school.	Not supportive of the scheme

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Overarching view.</b>
<b>LTN06 – Southfield Park area</b>	Headstone South	Supportive of the scheme and were keen to ensure emergency services had been advised		Supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN07 – Byron Road area</b>	Marlborough	Support for scheme subject to review and impact assessment	Concerns over the possible impact on the regeneration programme  Would require clarity on all three schemes and don't support all three together. LTN07, LTN 09 and SS 03	Conditional support.
<b>LTN08 – Dennis Lane area</b>	Stanmore Park  Canons		Traffic impacts on Stanmore Hill, councillors are reporting a 2000+ petition against scheme, no additional benefit as cyclists don't use route, it's a steep hill so wont aid walking.	Not supportive of the scheme
<b>LTN09 – Princes Drive area</b>	Marlborough	Conditional support for the scheme subject to post implementation review.	Concerns about the wider impact on the network  Would require clarity on all three schemes and don't support all three together. LTN07, LTN 09 and SS 03  Too much change at once.	Conditional support.  Would require clarity on all three schemes and don't support all three together.
<b>SC 10 – George V Avenue</b>	Hatch End  Headstone North	Consider the scheme to be a good idea and will further reduce the impact of traffic on the area		Supportive of the scheme  Not supportive of
			The impact on the local school just as they are	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Overarching view.</b>
		Could see a possible solution if the scheme could be modified (shortened)	returning to school, impact on local businesses and amenities, displacing the commuter parking into other residential streets, concerns raised by residents about additional parking pressures and no real need for the scheme as no real numbers of cyclists using it.	the scheme unless changes are made.
<b>SS-01 – Grimsdyke School</b>	Hatch End	In favour of the scheme as part of the overall development of traffic calming in the area	Not supportive of any future CPZ scheme	Supportive of the scheme
<b>SS-02 – Newton Farm School</b>	Rayners Lane  Roxbourne	View the schemes as being a great idea, too many drivers blocking streets  Councillors on holiday but supportive of scheme	None	Supportive of the scheme  Supportive of the scheme
<b>SS-03 – Marlborough School</b>	Marlborough	Supportive of scheme in general	Concerned over the overall collective impact of the three schemes in the ward.	Conditional support and would require clarity on all three schemes and don't support all three together.
<b>SS-04 – Park High School</b>	Belmont	See the scheme as a positive to reduce the daily traffic issues in both roads and well as sponsoring more walking		Supportive of the scheme