

Ref:

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

Report to Individual Portfolio Holder

Subject:	Cedars School / Whittlesea Road 20 mph Zone
Relevant Portfolio Holder:	Environment & Transport
Responsible Chief Officer:	Interim Head of Environment & Transport
Key Decision:	No
Urgent/Non Urgent:	Non urgent
Power to be Exercised:	Extraordinary Council, 28 th May 2002 – Item 6 “Role and Delegated Powers of Portfolio Holders – Sections 8 and 16 (b)”
Status:	Part 1
Ward:	Harrow Weald
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Plan showing final proposals arising from consultation Appendix 2: Copy of letter from the Police Appendix 3: Objection from the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority Appendix 4: Objection from residents of Stafford Road including petition and associated appendix A

1. Summary

- 1.1 Proposals have been developed for a 20 mph school safety zone and footway parking exemption around Cedars First and Middle schools and Woodland and Kingsley schools in Whittlesea Road. One of the main aims of the scheme is to encourage walking to and from the schools by reducing the danger faced when crossing the road. This will be achieved by introducing traffic calming on the approaches to the schools and by introducing waiting restrictions to ease congestion around the school entrances at dropping off and picking up times. The scheme will also ease general access problems caused by cars parked on both sides of the road.
- 1.2 Public consultation has been carried out involving local residents, the parents of school pupils and other interested bodies and organisations. Among the respondents there was very significant support for the measures put forward. A number of minor amendments to the scheme detail have been made to take account of comment received.
- 1.3 Following publication of the statutory orders and notices needed to implement the measures three objections have been received, one backed by a 66 signature petition of residents. The objections have been assessed against design, consultation and safety guidance together with relevant research information and shown to have little foundation.

However a parking issue has been highlighted in Stafford Road that warrants further investigation.

2. Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder).

- 2.1 That the objections to the scheme be set aside for the reasons set out in section 6 of this report and officers proceed with the implementation of:**
- a) a 20 mph zone in Whittlesea Road, Stafford Road and the southern part of Chicheley Road between Whittlesea Road and Langton Road;**
 - b) one-way working in parts of Whittlesea Road, Stafford Road and Chicheley Road as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - c) a bus bay for school coaches between 8.30am and 4.30pm, Monday to Friday inclusive, outside of Cedars Middle School in Whittlesea Road as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - d) no stopping restrictions between 8.30am and 9.30am and between 3pm and 4.30pm, Monday to Friday inclusive, in Whittlesea Road outside of the entrances to:
 - i) Cedars First school;**
 - ii) Cedars Middle school;**
 - iii) Woodland & Kingsley schools;**as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - e) no waiting at any time restrictions in:
 - i) Whittlesea Road/Boxtree Lane junction;**
 - ii) Whittlesea Road outside Nos. 13 to 21;**
 - iii) Whittlesea Road outside No 28;**
 - iv) Whittlesea Road outside Nos. 74 to 78;**
 - v) Whittlesea Road/Chicheley Road junction;**
 - vi) Chicheley Road/Langton Road junction;**
 - vii) Whittlesea Road/Stafford Road junction;**
 - viii) Stafford Road/Langton Road junction;**
 - ix) Stafford Road/Boxtree Lane junction;**as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - f) road humps in the form of speed tables and speed cushions in Whittlesea Road, Stafford Road and the southern part of Chicheley Road between Whittlesea Road and Langton Road as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - g) traffic calming works in Whittlesea Road, Stafford Road and the southern part of Chicheley Road between Whittlesea Road and Langton Road as shown at Appendix 1;**
 - h) footway widening in Whittlesea Road outside of Cedars Middle school as shown at Appendix 1.**
 - i) two wheel footway parking in Whittlesea Road and part of Chicheley Road between Whittlesea Road and Langton Road as shown at Appendix 1**

3. **Consultation with Ward Councillors**

- 3.1 A similar report to this was sent to Ward Councillors to offer an opportunity to comment. The views received are set out below
- 3.2 In a telephone conversation with Councillor Lyne the main points arising and responses given (*in italics*) were as follows:
- a) It was pointed out that a vehicle crossover had recently been agreed for No. 115 Whittlesea Road. *This would be taken into account in the final layout and installed at the same time as the main works if possible.*
 - b) It was noted that the double yellow lines on the east side of the Stafford Road/Langton Road junction were longer than those on the west. *The reason for this was to maintain a clear swept path for school coaches turning right from Langton Road into Stafford Road.*
 - c) Concern was expressed over the width of footway that cars might occupy when footway parking is permitted. *The parking bays would be marked out with a dotted white line and would allow only partial parking on the footway to ensure that there was sufficient clear space for pedestrians. It would be an offence to park beyond the limit of the markings.*
 - d) Councillor Lyne reinforced the view that there was a parking problem in Stafford Road and was pleased to see that there was a recommendation to investigate the issue further.

4. **Policy Context (including relevant previous decisions)**

- 4.1 Traffic, Transport and Road Safety Sub-Committee - 21 May 1997 – minute 254 – School Safety Zones - agreed to proceed with a school safety zone for Cedars School subject to consultation and subject to funding being made available in the following financial year (98/99). Cedars was selected due to the accident record outside of the school in Whittlesea Road.
- 4.2 Traffic and Road Safety Panel - 13 June 2001 – minute 166 – Annual Review of Footway and Verge Parking Schemes - agreed a new priority list of footway parking schemes and agreed in principle to exemptions being made for the roads in that list. The list was drawn together in partnership with the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, who were experiencing difficulties caused by obstructive parking, and placed Whittlesea Road at number 2 in order of priority.
- 4.3 Traffic and Road Safety Panel - 25 September 2001 – minute 183 – Whittlesea Road, Petition for Either a School Safety Zone or Traffic Calming Measures - considered a petition of 281 signatures which called upon the Council to implement either a school safety zone or traffic calming measures in Whittlesea Road. The panel reaffirmed its decision of 21 May 1997 to prepare and consult upon a school safety zone which had been held up by lack of funding. The panel also agreed, at the request of the emergency services, to prepare and consult upon a footway parking zone at the same time. It was noted that Whittlesea Road had been assessed for traffic calming and was placed at No. 16 on the priority list.
- 4.4 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel - 18 September 2002 – Recommendation 3: 20 mph zones, 5 year programme – endorsed by Portfolio Holder on 8/10/02 - agreed a 5

year programme for 20mph zones in order to set priorities should funding become available from Transport for London (TfL). The Cedars school safety zone and Whittlesea Road footway parking proposals were brought together in a coordinated scheme to bid for funding via this 20mph zone programme. The scheme was identified for commencement in 2003/4.

- 4.5 Portfolio Holder Decision PHD 074/03 – 13 February 2004 – considered the response to a public consultation exercise carried out on proposals for a Cedars School/Whittlesea Road 20mph Zone and agreed to make an exemption under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 to allow two wheel footway parking on certain roads and authorised officers to advertise traffic orders and road humps notices associated with the scheme and, subject to there being no objections, to proceed with implementation.
- 4.6 The proposals are in line with current policies of Harrow Council set out within the Interim Local Implementation Plan. Under the strategy for reducing congestion policy MH.5 seeks to ensure that proposals for managing the highway accord with policies for, inter alia, community safety and environmental improvement. A relevant principle guiding road space reallocation under policy Real.3 is the reallocation of space to take account of the need for deliveries and servicing. Parking policy P.17 requires that any parking scheme has regard to the specific characteristics of the particular location involved including projected demands for day-time and night-time residents' car-parking.

5. **Relevance to Corporate Priorities**

- 5.1 The introduction of a 20 mph zone and rationalisation of parking addresses the Council's stated priority of enhancing the environment by improving safety and improving access for emergency and other services.

6. **Background Information and Options considered**

- 6.1 Following a successful bid to Transport for London for funding of the Cedars School/Whittlesea Road 20 mph zone in 2003/4, proposals were developed with the involvement of head teachers and local residents representatives. Two options were prepared which aimed to address the following areas of concern:
- congestion near Cedars, Woodlands and Kingsley schools and surrounding areas at dropping-off and picking-up times
 - vehicles parked inconsiderately at junctions and elsewhere creating access difficulties for coaches taking children to Woodlands and Kingsley schools and creating access difficulties for emergency and refuse collection services generally
 - illegal footway parking
 - danger and difficulties when crossing roads
 - inappropriate traffic speed

Both options included comprehensive traffic calming measures together with stopping and waiting restrictions and footway parking exemptions. They differed only in that one provided a short one-way system using parts of Stafford, Whittlesea and Chicheley

Roads. This maximises access benefits for the Woodland and Kingsley schools which children with special needs and with restricted mobility attend.

- 6.2 Public consultation seeking comment on the two options commenced in April 2003 with the distribution of consultation leaflets to residents and the parents of school pupils. An exhibition displaying the proposals was held on 6th May 2003 at Cedars Middle School where officers were on hand to answer questions. In addition a permanent, unmanned display was placed in the College Library 155/161 Uxbridge Road until the consultation closure date of Friday 16 May 2003.
- 6.3 Respondents to the consultation showed strong support for all aspects of the proposals and expressed a preference for the option incorporating a one-way system. Some amendments to the scheme were suggested and where practicable were taken into account in the detailed design of the proposals. The plan in Appendix 1 shows the resulting layout. Opposition to the proposals was very limited with only the London Transport Users Committee voicing concern. They were of the view that the one-way system and footway parking would, respectively, lead to an increase in traffic speed and be detrimental to users of the footway. However, the criticism did not take account of the positive effects of the traffic calming or the generous footway width available on the roads in the area that would allow footway parking to be provided in a manner that safeguards the convenience and safety of pedestrians. The comment was not therefore seen as applicable in this particular case.
- 6.4 The public consultation response was presented to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport in February 2004 with the recommendation that authorisation be given for the scheme to progress to the advertising of traffic orders and road humps notices. PHD 074/03 concurred with the recommendations and the traffic orders and road humps notices were published on 4 March 2004. Allowing the statutory 21 day objection period gave a deadline for receipt of objections of 25 March 2004.
- 6.5 The publication process generated responses from the following:
- The Metropolitan Police
 - The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
 - The residents of Stafford Road by way of a 66 signature petition objecting to speed humps and 'no waiting at any time' restrictions in that road.

Copies of the responses are attached at Appendices 2,3 and 4 respectively. Each is considered in turn below.

- 6.6 The response from the police appears to be comment rather than an objection. They advise that it is not their policy to routinely enforce 20mph zones and they would expect to see further engineering measure employed to deal with any speed complaints received after the scheme has been implemented. They also have concerns that the road humps will detrimentally affect response times and may lead to vehicle damage.

Officer response - *it is a requirement in the design guidelines for such schemes that they employ sufficient traffic calming measures to ensure that speeds are restrained to approximately 20mph. The measures employed here are in line with those guidelines. Enforcement should not therefore be an issue.*

The roads included in the scheme (Whittlesea Road, Chicheley Road and Stafford Road) cover a very small, self-contained, residential area and could not be considered through routes to other localities. The impact on response times will therefore affect journeys

only to these roads themselves. Given the very limited extent of the scheme, any delay will be minimal.

Flat topped speed tables with a plateau length of 2.5m have been chosen for the scheme. This is equal to or longer than the wheelbase of most cars and will ensure that a car cannot fully straddle them. This has been coupled with a maximum hump height of 75mm, which is less than the ground clearance of most cars, minimising the likelihood of vehicle damage from grounding. It is worth noting that, if the speed tables were replaced by the less effective speed cushions that the letter suggests is the preferred method of control, it is very unlikely that speed would be reduced to 20mph increasing the probability that enforcement difficulties will arise.

- 6.7 The response from the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority is a formal objection to the traffic orders though it should be noted that it was received after the objection deadline of 25 March 2004. The objection is mainly on the grounds that road humps cause delay to appliances attending incidents. They also question the need for such measures on the roads in question.

Officer response - *on the question of whether such measures are needed here - at present the area is so congested, due in part to double parking by residents, that there is not a significant speeding problem and the accident rate is fairly low. In the early stages of the development of a scheme to ease the difficulties around the schools the Fire Service requested that any proposals should include footway parking for residents as they were continually having difficulty with access because of the congestion. This has been taken on board, but freeing up road space in this way, together with providing a one way system to help school access, will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic speed. Traffic calming is therefore needed to counter this. The other types of traffic calming measures that the fire service favours (i.e. horizontal deflections such as chicanes and pinch points) would lead to a significant reduction in parking space and would be strongly opposed by residents. This leaves road humps as the only practical and effective means of speed control.*

With regard to the effect on response times, the second paragraph of the officer response to the police equally applies here. It is worth noting that in 1994 the Department for Transport published guidance on consulting with the emergency services over traffic calming schemes. The main thrust of the guidance was that Local Authorities and the Emergency Services should work together to agree a network of strategic routes that would be kept free of the more severe types of speed reducing measure so that the services would have a set of clearly defined fast response routes. More intensive traffic calming measure could then be introduced on roads off the strategic routes to meet demands from residents for traffic calming safety measures. Harrow Council has repeatedly tried to engage with the emergency services to agree such a network but has always met with the response that all roads in the borough are strategic routes for the emergency services. Such an unhelpful response is both against the spirit of the DfT guidance and guaranteed to lead to conflict with the emergency services when trying to address the legitimate road safety concerns of the borough's residents. As stated above, the roads in question here could not be considered part of a strategic network and the objection to the proposals is therefore unfounded.

- 6.8 The residents of Stafford Road have raised a number of points in their objection:

- the loss of parking space outside of school hours that will result from the introduction of road humps and "no waiting at any time " restrictions will exacerbate current parking problems and severely reduce residential amenity.

- whilst there is no objection to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit, there is no evidence that road humps are needed to enforce such a limit.
- there are concerns about the effect on response times of emergency services and the noise caused by road humps
- because road humps are so unpopular amongst buyers and tenants they have a detrimental effect on property prices

They further go on to remark that the Council has imposed strict parking restrictions on residents by preventing parking on grass verges and point out that many residents have suggested in the past that the width of the grass verge should be reduced to make more road space available.

Officer response - *the road humps themselves do not give rise to a reduction in parking space as it is not an offence to park on or alongside a road hump. The "no waiting at any time" parking restrictions proposed in Stafford Road cover only three very localised areas around junctions (see the scheme plans in Appendix 1). Guidance in the Highway Code stipulates that drivers should not park in such locations (ie within 10 metres of a junction) because of the hazard posed to other road users. The restrictions are therefore simply enforcing the guidance of the Highway Code. The risk posed by parking in such locations exists 24 hours a day, not just at school times, hence the reason for "at any time" restrictions. As well as maintaining adequate intervisibility between the drivers of vehicles the restrictions also ensure good driver/pedestrian intervisibility greatly improving safety for people crossing the road at these key locations.*

Stafford Road is a key approach to the schools in this area and must form part of the 20mph safety zone around them to maximise safety benefits and encourage alternative modes of travel to the private car. In order to reduce congestion and improve access for school coaches and service/delivery vehicles the northerly section of the road is to be made part of a small-scale, one-way system, a measure strongly favoured by respondents during the public consultation. This is likely to lead to an increase in traffic speed which needs to be countered by traffic calming. It is accepted that traffic speed here is already fairly low and, as a result, the number of traffic calming features can be kept to an absolute minimum. Apart from the entry treatments at each end of the road, only two vertical speed-reducing features are proposed on the entire road. The raised entry treatments have the added benefit that they will provide safer crossing points for people approaching the schools on foot.

The issue of emergency response times has already been covered in the second paragraph of the response to the police above.

The Transport Research Laboratory has investigated noise caused by road humps. Their research shows that after the installation of road humps the maximum noise levels from cars and buses are reduced. This is explained by the observation that noise levels decrease with decreasing speed. The reduction in speed that is brought about by the introduction of road humps results in a lower noise level than that generated by the higher speed prevailing prior to installation.

The claim that road humps are unpopular and thereby have a detrimental effect on property prices does not fit the observations and experiences of Harrow Council. The Council receives far more requests for traffic calming than it has funds to implement suggesting that, rather than being unpopular among residents, they are seen as a positive improvement.

The statement in the petition that Harrow Council has imposed restrictions on parking on the grass verge is incorrect. It is an offence under section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 to park on footways and grass verges throughout London. It is not a restriction that has been locally imposed though Harrow Council does have a policy of resisting proposals to pave grass verges to ensure that a high quality of streetside greenness is retained.

Harrow Council has received several letters from residents in the past suggesting that there are parking problems in this area. Stafford Road, at 6.1 metres wide, cannot accommodate parking on both sides of the road without blocking access to any vehicle larger than a car. As a result residents seem to avoid double parking preferring instead to overspill into the surrounding streets. Clearly this is inconvenient for those concerned and also leads to a reduction in amenity on those streets. However, the emergency services have not highlighted an access problem here for large vehicles, unlike on Whittlesea Road where the school entrances are located, and parking measures cannot therefore be justified using funding provided for a school 20mph zone. To address this problem a separate parking scheme needs to be investigated on its own merits. Since funding for facilities of this sort is likely to be limited it will be necessary to investigate a number of options through which parking could be improved, together with their cost, before deciding what measures, if any, were justified. The effect on street side greenness would need to be examined at the same time.

7. Consultation

- 7.1 In line with the relevant regulations, traffic orders and road humps notices were advertised in the London Gazette and Harrow Observer stipulating a 21 day period over which objections could be made to the proposals. Advertisements first appeared on 4 March 2004 and the objection period ended on 25 March 2004. Over the same period the associated legal documents and plans were placed on deposit at the Civic Centre for public inspection and street notices were posted in the affected roads.
- 7.2 Statutory consultees such as the emergency services, Road Haulage Association and Freight Transport Association were given notice by post. Affected local residents were given notice by means of a letter hand delivered to all properties involved in the original scheme consultation.

8. Finance Observations

- 8.1 The estimated cost of the scheme is £145,000. Funding is available by grant from Transport for London.

Signature..... date.....

9. **Legal Observations**

- 9.1 a) A 20 mph speed limit can be provided under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- b) The one-way system, waiting restrictions, school keep clear markings and coach bay can be provided under Section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- c) Road humps can be provided by Notice under Sections 90A and 90C of the Highways Act 1980.
- d) Traffic calming works can be provided under Section 90G of the Highways Act 1980.
- e) Widening of the footway can be carried out under Section 75 of the Highways Act 1980.
- f) Footway parking can be authorised by resolution under Section 15(4) of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974.
- g) 'School' warning signs, when laid as road markings, require special authorisation from the Department for Transport. This was granted in a letter dated 10 February 2004.

Signature..... date.....

10. **Conclusion**

- 10.1 A comprehensive traffic calming scheme has been developed together with stopping and waiting restrictions and footway parking exemptions. The measures put forward will deal with the issue of congestion around the schools and will reduce the danger faced when crossing the road in these areas. Permitting footway parking will allow free access for emergency and other services.
- 10.2 Objections raised against the scheme following publication of the relevant statutory orders and notices have been carefully assessed against design and consultation guidelines, Highway Code guidance and independent research information and are shown to have little foundation. The negative aspects of the proposals are very minor in comparison with the safety and environmental benefits that will accrue and it is recommended that the objections are set aside.
- 10.3 Some comments put forward and past correspondence received by Harrow Council have highlighted an issue over parking in Stafford Road that warrants further investigation on its own merits and it is also recommended that options through which parking could be improved, together with their cost, should be explored and an assessment made on whether such a proposal is justified.

11. **Background Papers**

- 11.1 a) The Highway Code – Rule 217.
b) Traffic Advisory Leaflet 3/94 – Fire and Ambulance Services traffic calming: a code of practice
c) Traffic Advisory Leaflet 10/00 – Road humps: discomfort, noise and ground borne vibration
d) Traffic Advisory Leaflet 6/96 – Traffic Calming: Traffic and Vehicle Noise
e) Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2002 – Policy No. D9
- 11.2 Anyone wishing to inspect the background papers listed should telephone Jean-christophe Chassard on 020 8863 5611.

12. **Author**

- 12.1 Bill Heale, Principal Engineer, Traffic Management (Central)
Telephone 020 8424 1065 ext 2065
Email: william.heale@harrow.gov.uk

*I do agree to the decision proposed

*I do not agree to the decision proposed

*Please delete as appropriate

Additional comments made by and/or options considered by the Portfolio Holder

Signature:

Portfolio Holder

Name:

(please print)

Date:

Signature:

Position: *Insert relevant Head of Service*

Date: