

---

**Report for:** **TRAFFIC & ROAD SAFETY  
ADVISORY PANEL**

**Date of Meeting:** 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021

**Subject:** **INFORMATION REPORT**  
Petitions

1. Cody Close and Waghorn Road, Kenton- Request for parking controls
2. Headstone South – Removal of road closures
3. Request removal of all Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in Harrow
4. Request to remove LTN -06 Southfield Park
5. Hilltop Way, Stanmore – Request for double yellow lines
6. Whitchurch Lane car park - Request for staff permits at reduced cost

**Key Decision:** No

**Responsible Officer:** Paul Walker – Corporate Director, Community

**Portfolio Holder:** Varsha Parmar – Portfolio Holder for Environment

**Exempt:** No

**Decision subject to Call-in:** No, the report is for information

**Wards affected:** Headstone South, Belmont, Kenton  
West. Greenhill

**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 (for recommendation):**

None, the report is for information only.

## **Section 2 – Report**

### **Introduction**

- 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 – Cody Close / Waghorn Road, Kenton - Request for yellow lines**

- 2.4 A petition containing 70 signatures was received in October 2020. The petition states:

*“We the undersigned residents (of Cody Close and Waghorn Road) refer to the junction of the Cody Close and Waghorn Road. This junction is very busy coupled with inconsiderate parking restricting access for emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles. The drivers coming off Cody Close really struggle to pass safely as they are completely blinded by the vehicles parked around the junction.*

*This results in abusive and aggressive behaviour of drivers disturbing peace and quiet of the area. In worst case scenario, emergency vehicles from Waghorn Road would be unable to gain access. This is a worrying thought, and we fear it may become a reality resulting in unwanted serious incident.*

*We the undersigned residents, beseech the Harrow Council to evaluate the situation and introduce appropriate measures / controls.”*

- 2.5 The request for double yellow lines will be assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP) using an assessment criterion 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 three to six months to complete.

### **Petition 2 – Headstone South – Removal of road closures**

- 2.6 A petition signed by 64 residents was presented at the TARSAP meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> October regarding the above. The petition states:

*“The following persons are requesting the Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel to cancel the proposed closures between Pinner View and Kingsfield Avenue and the closure between Beresford Avenue and Cunningham Park. We suggest you look at creating a one way system and implement the 20 mph zone”*

- 2.7 All the schemes in the streetspace programme are reviewed on a monthly basis as recommended by this panel in August 2020. The outcome of the review is published on the council’s website. There is a separate item on the agenda to discuss the street space programme.
- 2.8 A 20 mph speed limit has already been introduced as part of the Headstone South LTN scheme.

### **Petition 3 – Request removal of all Low Traffic Neighbourhoods in Harrow**

- 2.9 An online petition containing over 5,500 signatures was sent to the council in October. The petition states:

*“Remove Low neighbourhood Traffic Roadblocks in Harrow”*

- 2.10 In accordance with the Council procedures all petitions with over 2,000 signatures are referred to full Council for their consideration.
- 2.11 The petition was discussed at the full Council meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> November and it was agreed that the petition be referred to the Corporate Director of Community for consideration.
- 2.12 At the meeting a motion to remove all the LTN schemes, cycle schemes and pedestrian space schemes was received on the basis that these temporary schemes were not working, however, the motion was lost.
- 2.13 Members will recall that at the special meeting of TARSAP on 10<sup>th</sup> August it was recommended and subsequently agreed by the Deputy Leader on the 19<sup>th</sup> August that a review of the streetspace schemes would be conducted on a monthly basis and any recommendations made reviewed by the Corporate Director - Community and the Portfolio Holder for Environment to determine the future of the schemes.
- 2.14 There is an information report on the agenda for the streetspace schemes which includes the detailed review reports for all the streetspace schemes for consideration by the Corporate Director - Community and Portfolio Holder for Environment.

#### **Petition 4 – Request to remove LTN-06 Southfield Park**

- 2.15 A petition containing 523 signatures was received by the council in November 2020. The petition states:

*“We, the residents of Manor Way and Priory Way and the surrounding roads in North Harrow object to Harrow Council’s Low Traffic Neighbourhood 06 scheme. We have united to oppose these plans and express grave concerns with regards to the closure of Southfield Park.*

*Whilst we support the overarching objective of reducing traffic, improving the environment and encouraging walking vs. driving, and whilst we also acknowledge that the residents of Southfield Park are our neighbours, it is clear to us that the LTN-06 scheme is NOT fit for purpose, and is actually making things worse.*

*The closure of Southfield Park has diverted traffic onto much narrower roads. The council actually (further) narrowed Manor Way significantly at the Parkside Way end not that long ago. The significant additional traffic since the introduction of LTN-06 has already led to reduced air quality and has added dangers to residents and their children. These two roads are not large enough to support the excess traffic. As a result, in the last few weeks we have witnessed vehicles coming to a standstill, drivers becoming irate, and drivers routinely speeding.*

*Multiple pieces of photographic and video evidence have been gathered of speeding, damage done to grass verges, parked vehicles and trees,*

*trucks mounting the pavements to move through traffic at a standstill on these roads, and even road rage occurring as a direct result of these incidents. This evidence has left us worrying about the safety of our residents, particularly the many small children that live here.*

*The extent of the proposals were not widely published for consultation and therefore we, the residents of these two roads, were not afforded the chance to consider the matter properly. We deem this to be non-transparent, and a complete failure of the Council to serve the community responsibly. This lack of transparency has created much fear and anger throughout Harrow.*

*The implemented plans are totally impractical and contravene the LTN objectives. The traffic at a standstill and increased engine idling with higher fuel consumption has a negative impact on air quality. In particular, the traffic lights at the Pinner Road end of Headstone Lane mean that traffic cannot turn out quickly from our roads on to Headstone Lane which adds to the queues. Traffic waiting to turn onto Manor Way and Priory Way is also causing tailbacks and associated disruption on the adjoining roads.*

*Furthermore, the traffic monitoring on Manor Way was undertaken before implementation of the LTN-06 scheme whilst Priory Way was closed to traffic due to water works. This is therefore false baseline data and cannot be used for comparison.*

*Manor Way and Priory Way are also used as the main route from the H9 and H10 bus stops on Parkside Way for Nower Hill students. Both roads have a considerable number of children crossing over them at peak times on their way to local schools. These were once safe roads for walking on. LTN06 makes these roads less safe and thus counter-productive to the main objective.*

*We understand that a review of this scheme is to be conducted post trial. This will cause six months of stress and chaos for a huge proportion of residents at a time when many are already suffering hugely due to COVID-19. We do not accept that it is democratic for consultations to start only after the scheme/trial has been implemented.*

*Finally, we believe that a scheme that is only partially complete such as this, i.e. one that closes Southfield Park whilst leaving Manor Way and Priory Way open, is demonstrably worse than no scheme having been implemented at all.*

*In summary, whilst we support the overall objective to reduce traffic and improve our environment, we demand an urgent review of the LTN-06 scheme as it has been extremely poorly thought out. There has been a severe deterioration in the safety of our residents and other users of the roads that surround the LTN scheme closure, not an improvement, as a result of its implementation.”*

- 2.16 All the schemes in the streetspace programme are reviewed on a monthly basis as previously agreed at this panel. The outcome of the review is published on the council's website. There is a separate item on tonight's agenda to discuss the street space programme.
- 2.17 Planters on Southfield Park, Kingsfield Avenue and Pinner View (by Bolton Road) were temporarily moved by the Council in response to residents' concerns about congestion caused by essential recent road works to replace gas mains on Station Road in order to alleviate the delays on the road network.

#### **Petition 5 – Hilltop Way, Stanmore – Request for double yellow lines**

- 2.18 A petition containing 26 signatures was received at the cabinet meeting in November and subsequently referred to the panel for consideration. The petition states:
- 2.19 *“We the undersigned residents of Hilltop Way, Stanmore and surrounding properties request the immediate introduction of additional yellow lines outside numbers 11 and 12 to allow residents safe access and exit from their properties and to prevent inappropriate parking which obstructs, hinders and prevents the accessibility of public service and emergency vehicles to all properties ”*
- 2.20 The request for double yellow lines will be assessed as a part of the local safety parking schemes programme (LSPP) using an assessment criterion 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 three to six months to complete.

#### **Petition 6 – Whitchurch Lane car park - Request for staff permits at reduced cost**

- 2.21 A petition containing 72 signatures was presented to cabinet in November 2020 and subsequently referred to this panel for consideration. The petition states:
- “We, signatories of this petition urge you as our elected councillors to reconsider your proposed offer and come up with the solution that will truly reflect and satisfy all parties involved. It is strangely ironic and poignant that the previous 20p per hour tariff, which we thought for a long time was inconsiderate to us as key workers would now be a desirable solution, however we propose that even more affordable tariff is implemented.”*
- 2.22 Last year the Council refreshed its Transport Local implementation Plan (LIP) in response to the London Mayor publishing a new Transport Strategy. This plan contains all of the Council's transport policies including for one for parking. In addition, the Council also amended its

Parking Management and Enforcement Strategy which is complementary to the LIP and sets out the councils parking policies in more detail.

- 2.23 The overriding policy guiding parking and enforcement in the borough is driven by the requirement to help achieve the Mayor of London's transport goals and objectives as outlined in the Mayor's Transport Strategy. Fundamentally the strategy seeks to reduce the reliance on the private car and encourage more journeys to be undertaken using sustainable modes of transport. That is the overarching aim of the strategy. The introduction and cost of car parking charges therefore plays an important role in achieving the aim of the strategy.
- 2.24 Car parking charges across the borough are reviewed annually and are set according to the location of the car park. There are four different cost rates across the borough and rates are set depending on the extent of shopping characteristics, available car parks, existing public transport links and existing leisure facilities.
- 2.25 The parking charges in the car park were introduced in 2017 when Whitchurch School was a part of the school expansion programme. There was a requirement in the revised school travel plan that charges be introduced in the car park to mitigate the impact of the school run and long term parking and to encourage sustainable travel. These changes also were in conjunction with the opening of the Avanti House School which assessed parking levels within their transport assessment. It should also be noted that the car park also serves the playing fields and is also available for short term parking access rather than just all day parking.
- 2.26 The charges introduced in this car park have remained static until this year when they were increased. They have moved from 20p / hour to 50p / hour in the car park and from 10p / 20 minutes to 20p / 20 minutes on-street. This is the lowest tariff for car parks in the borough. Compared with other London boroughs this is still a very cheap charge and reflects the lower demand at a local centre. For example, Brent and Ealing charge is £1 an hour, Brent is £1 for 30 minutes and Hillingdon is £1.50 for 2 hours.
- 2.27 In light of the pandemic the council offered a temporary concession in recognition of the schools concerns of £2.50 for all day parking within Whitchurch Lane car park. This was a gesture of good willing on the part of the council in appreciation of the difficulties being faced currently by staff in light of the ongoing health crisis. We believe we have acted responsibly in this matter and have listened to their concerns.
- 2.28 Offering staff permits longer term at a reduced cost would not accord with the councils agreed policies as highlighted above and therefore for the reasons given above we would not be able to grant their request for lower parking charges.

### **Staffing/workforce**

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

### **Ward Councillors' comments**

- 2.30 Ward councillor's comments have not been sought for this report because it is for information only.

### **Performance issues**

- 2.31 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims, objectives and performance 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**

- 2.32 The development of any schemes arising from petitions would support the wider aims and objectives of the current Transport Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The LIP underwent a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This indicated that there are environmental benefits from delivering the programme of investment.
- 2.33 Key population and human health benefits identified were from reducing casualties, encouraging active travel and improving air quality. The benefits associated with increased active travel and healthy lifestyles are reduced diabetes and obesity levels. No negative environmental issues were identified as part of the SEA.

### **Data Protection Implications**

- 2.34 There are no data protection implications.

### **Risk Management Implications**

- 2.35 The development of any schemes arising from a petition would be subject to separate risk assessments.
- 2.36 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.

### **Procurement Implications**

- 2.37 Where needed, consultants and contractors will be procured to investigate, develop and deliver some proposals. This is business as usual. The work will be procured in line with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

## **Legal implications**

- 2.38 There are no particular legal implications to be noted as the report is for information purposes only.
- 2.39 Under Part 3A of the Council's Constitution, the terms of reference of TARSAP is to make recommendations on traffic management, the management and control of parking both on and off-street and the operational aspects of public transport within the Borough but includes other business, such as: petitions, deputations, scheme approval (from existing budgets), including consultation results and authority to make traffic orders and objections to traffic orders.

## **Financial Implications**

- 2.40 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**

- 2.41 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.
- 2.42 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**

- 2.43 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:
- Improving the environment and addressing climate change
  - Tackling poverty and inequality
  - Building homes and infrastructure
  - Addressing health and social care inequality
  - Thriving economy

### **Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Jessie Man**

Signed on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer

**Date: 21 December 2020**

**Statutory Officer: Jimmy Walsh**

Signed on behalf of the Monitoring Officer

**Date: 04 January 2021**

### **Section 3 - Procurement Officer Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Nimesh Mehta**

Signed by the Head of Procurement

**Date: 29 December 2020**

### **Section 3 – Corporate Director Clearance**

**Statutory Officer: Paul Walker**

Signed by the Corporate Director - Community

**Date: 06 January 2021**

### **Mandatory Checks**

Ward Councillors notified: **NO, as the report is for information only**

**EqIA carried out: YES**

**EqIA cleared by: Dave Corby, Community - Equality Task Group (DETG) Chair**

## **Section 4 - Contact Details and Background Papers**

### **Contact:**

Barry Philips – Infrastructure Manager -Transportation  
E-mail: [barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk](mailto:barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk)

### **Background Papers:**

None