

**REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety
Advisory Panel**

Date of Meeting: 16th September 2010

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**

Petitions relating to:

1. Taunton Way, Stanmore -
Request for traffic measures
2. Eastcote Road / Kingsley Road
Roxeth Park entrance, Harrow -
dangerous accident zone
3. Canons Corner, Edgware-
Request for parking for shops
4. Pinner Road, Harrow - Request to
remove parking controls
5. Kynaston Wood, Harrow Weald –
Footway parking issues

Responsible Officer: Brendon Hills - Corporate Director
Community and Environment

Exempt: No

Enclosures:

Appendix A

Eastcote Road / Kingsley Road,
Roxeth Park entrance proposed
changes to the junction layout.

Appendix B

Canons Corner - details of proposals
in 2007

Appendix C

Pinner Road Parking - Notes of site
meeting held on 19th July 2010

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

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

FOR INFORMATION

Section 2 – Report

Taunton Way – request for traffic measures

- 2.1 A 67 signature petition was presented to Council on 8th July 2010 by residents in Taunton Way requesting road safety improvements.
- 2.2 Council referred the petition to this Panel for consideration. The petition requests that:-
 - The council implement a 20 mph speed camera as the only plausible and practical solution to act as a deterrent of future accidents;
 - Address concerns relating to the un-doctored kerbs on Taunton Way;
 - Address concerns relating to the tree in front of no 49-51 Taunton Way as it blocks the 30mph warning board.
- 2.3 The Panel will be aware that existing speed camera locations have to meet strict Department for Transport (DfT) guidelines and are only located at sites where there have been three or more fatal or serious speed related personal injury collisions within the last three years.
- 2.4 An analysis of collisions leading to personal injuries in Taunton Way showed that there were 6 slight collisions within the last 3 years of accident data available. Only one of these accidents was speed related and therefore this is considered to be a comparatively good safety record for this location and compares well with similar roads in the borough. Based on the existing criteria for a speed camera Taunton Way would not meet the DfT guidelines.
- 2.5 With regard to 20 mph cameras generally, Transport for London (TfL) has scheduled trials with the SPECS average speed camera system which utilises automatic number plate reading digital technology (ANPR) via a state of the art video system. The trials are scheduled for later this year in four London boroughs, subject to funding and a review of existing programmes. The trial will allow authorities to consider whether it is

feasible to enforce 20 mph speed limits with time over distance cameras. At the moment this type of technology does not have Home Office approval for use on the public highway in residential areas and therefore we are unable to locate a 20 mph camera in Taunton Way.

- 2.6 The council is keen however to pursue this option at viable locations should Home Office approval be granted and we will develop criteria to assist in prioritising requests in the future if this is the case. The Department for Transport is also conducting trials with regard to speed limiters in vehicles and as far as we are aware research is still ongoing.
- 2.7 A local safety scheme (LSS) was introduced in Camrose Avenue and Taunton Way in 2008. As part of this scheme speed activated bend warning signs with a "slow down" message were introduced at either end of the bend where Camrose Avenue meets Taunton Way. The council also introduced two "watch your speed" 30 mph speed activated signs in Camrose Avenue as part of the LSS. Officers will investigate whether it is feasible to introduce similar signs in Taunton Way.
- 2.8 Officers have discussed the concerns of the petitioners with the Police who have confirmed that they carry out regular speed checks in Taunton Way as part of a borough wide speed enforcement initiative. This enforcement programme is ongoing.
- 2.9 With reference to the concerns raised regarding the un-doctored kerbs on Taunton Way this was referred to the Highway Maintenance team for investigation who have subsequently confirmed that one side of Taunton Way Footway was reconstructed some years ago as part of the previous administration's drive to repair streets. Given the current limitations on finance there are no plans at this time to reconstruct the remaining parts of Taunton Way footways. However, regular safety checks are made by highway inspectors to identify any hazards or unsafe areas and these are programmed for repairs as necessary.
- 2.10 Officers have investigated the positioning of the bend warning speed activated sign and have concluded that this is in the most suitable location given the constraints of the existing environment having taken account of the location of existing dropped kerbs, street furniture and trees. Any foliage on the tree in front of no 49-51 which is obstructing sightlines will be removed to ensure that clear visibility to the sign is maintained.

Eastcote Road / Kingsley Road - Roxeth Park entrance - request for safety measures

- 2.11 A petition was presented at the last TARSAP meeting in July by a local councillor containing 47 signatures. The petitioners are residents of Kingsley Road (1-99) and Eastcote Road (2-64).
- 2.12 The petition requests that safety measures are introduced at the Eastcote Road / Kingsley Road near to the entrance to Roxeth Park. The petition states:-

“We the undersigned Petitioners and Residents of Kingsley Road Nos. (1-99) and Eastcote Road Nos. (2-64) are being the victims of reckless driving by the other Road users who enter and leave the Roxeth Park. This park is used by many outsiders, who are not the residents of this area. Often, there are many pedestrians i.e. young children, parents and elderly crossing the junction at Kingsley Road and Eastcote Road in order to enter the park or to go to the Weldon Park primary and Middle Schools. There were near misses involving children and elderly at this accident prone junction”.

- 2.13 The funds available to the council for accident remedial schemes are limited and therefore we have a set assessment method for considering traffic calming requests. This objective method of assessing requests has allowed Harrow to prioritise roads so that the worst accident and traffic problems can be dealt with first. In terms of road safety this has helped us to become one of the safest boroughs in London.
- 2.14 Following the concerns raised an assessment of personal injury accident data for Kingsley Road / Eastcote Road has revealed that one personal injury accident has occurred at the junction within the most recent three years of data available. The accident data does not record or include non injury accidents or the recent incident as described by the local residents in their petition. The accident record is considered to be acceptable and compares well with other similar roads in the borough. This road would therefore not be considered a priority for any substantial traffic calming scheme.
- 2.15 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.
- 2.16 However, in light of the concerns raised by the petitioners officers have reviewed the site and are proposing to introduce new road markings to highlight the junction. The proposed changes can be seen in **Appendix A**.

Canons Corner - request for parking for shops

- 2.17 At the Panel meeting on 15th July 2010 a petition was presented on behalf of the businesses at Canons Corner London Road Stanmore.
- 2.18 The petition contained 552 signatures from businesses and customers which states:
- “We, the undersigned, call on the appropriate authorities to provide parking for the shops of Canons Corner, London Road. We believe that these shops would close as a result of the current parking restrictions which are making the use of these stores very difficult.”*
- 2.19 There is currently a lay-by outside the shops, which is uncontrolled and can accommodate around 8 vehicles. Following a previous request from businesses a consultation was held in February 2007 on installing pay

and display parking controls in the lay-by together with some shared parking provision in Court Drive for businesses and residents.

- 2.20 The outcome of that consultation after assessing the questionnaires returned was that 4 businesses were in favour and 2 were against the proposals. In terms of the residents who have properties above the shops, 1 was in favour and 9 were against the scheme. Subsequently two petitions were received in March 2007. The first contained 9 signatures representing 7 businesses stating:

"We the undersigned feel that pay & display parking restriction will have a detrimental impact on our business and wish Harrow Council not to implement parking restriction"

The second petition contained 58 signatures from customers who were against the proposals

- 2.21 Taking into account the consultation results and petitions the Portfolio Holder's decision was not to proceed with the scheme.
- 2.22 Clearly without any parking controls there is nothing to stop drivers from parking in the lay by for unlimited periods. Without any turnover of parking this could disadvantage the local businesses by restricting access for customers or deliveries.
- 2.23 Following the suggestion made at the Panel meeting a parking survey was commissioned to quantify the current parking trends and the analysis is still awaited at the time of writing this report.
- 2.24 It is the intention to review the results and the details of the previous scheme shown in **Appendix B** to see if the scheme still meets the needs of local businesses and residents. Following comments made by the petitioner at the last Panel meeting it would appear that parking controls are required on all days rather than the Monday to Friday period proposed in 2007.
- 2.25 It is intended to carry out local consultation on revised proposals once the parking survey results are received. The consultation results and officers recommendations will be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel.

Pinner Road - request to remove parking controls

- 2.26 At the last panel meeting a petition containing 1802 signatures was presented. The petition states:
- "We, The Pinner Road Small Business Group are asking Harrow Council to remove the recently imposed, draconian road restrictions (The Double Yellow lines) on the Pinner Road, specifically in front of all the small businesses, as it only serves to drive trade away, which in turn put a lot of the local small businesses out of business"*
- 2.27 The parking controls referred to became operational on 1st May 2010. This followed a period of informal and statutory consultation, the Panel's

endorsement of the scheme on 17th June 2009 and the subsequent approval of the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety.

- 2.28 It is of significance that Pinner Road forms part of the strategic road network and the Council and Transport for London (TfL) are required to ensure that the road is kept free flowing to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic as a part of their collective Network Management Duty.
- 2.29 The scheme that was implemented attempted to strike a balance for all road users and took into account comments made by TfL and their operating arm London Buses. It included alternative loading and parking provision for customers in the adjoining side roads albeit that these are not available at all times.
- 2.30 The panel, in making their recommendation to proceed with the scheme, instructed officers to review the scheme 6-12 months after implementation. This scheme review was incorporated into the annual review of Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes that was considered by the panel in February 2010 and is a part of the 2010/11 programme of work
- 2.31 It is intended to review the Pinner Road Scheme at the end of 2010. There is no scope to bring forward the commencement of the review because the current workload of consultations reported elsewhere to this panel meeting including the review of the West Harrow CPZ zones U and V are programmed to commence in October 2010.
- 2.32 A meeting was held on 19th July at the instigation of Navin Shah, Greater London Authority (GLA) Member. The meeting was attended by Navin Shah, two ward councillors, a representative of the Pinner Road Small Business Group and officers from TfL and Harrow.
- 2.33 The meeting sought to clarify the responsibilities of TfL and Harrow Council on Pinner Road and the background for the proposals that were implemented. A copy of the meeting notes is attached in **Appendix C**.
- 2.34 At the meeting Harrow officers agreed to obtain electronic iBus data, which had only recently become available to the Council, to try to ascertain whether there were measurable changes to the delays in bus journey times along Pinner Road before and after the parking scheme was implemented.
- 2.35 Once the data is obtained we will review this to measure and compare the effects on bus journey times before and after the parking scheme was implemented.
- 2.36 There have also been calls from the Pinner Road Small Business group to suspend the changes to parking that were made on 1st May 2010. Such a change cannot be made without modifications to the legal traffic regulation orders that were published to implement the scheme. Any change would require consultation and approval by the Portfolio Holder and would effectively be the same procedure that is involved in the review that is programmed to commence at the end of 2010.

- 2.37 A verbal update will be provided at the Panel meeting with any relevant information.

Kynaston Wood, Harrow Weald – footway parking issues

- 2.38 At the meeting of Council held on 8 July 2010, a petition was presented by Councillor Ferrari, containing 46 signatures from residents of Kynaston Wood. The petition stated:

“We the undersigned would like to comment on the recently issued parking tickets in Kynaston Wood. We ask the Council to consider the appropriateness of issuing parking tickets in a road where parking on the pavement is a long established custom and practice. We also ask the council to consider allowing parking on the pavements here. The road is too narrow to allow access for wide vehicles and parking at the same time.”

The petition was referred to this Panel for consideration.

- 2.39 Parking on footways in London became prohibited under the General Powers Act 1974 which was introduced by the former Greater London Council. Those powers are still in force and apply to all public highway footways except where there are formal exemptions in place. These exemptions are clearly marked out and indicated by traffic signs and road markings. There are no formal footway parking exemptions in Kynaston Wood.
- 2.40 This petition was submitted by local residents as a consequence of parking enforcement action undertaken in April this year by the Council using a mobile CCTV vehicle. Penalty charge notices (PCNs) were issued to offending vehicles that had parked on the footways in Kynaston Wood and approximately 15 different vehicles received PCNs.
- 2.41 The reaction by local residents was probably as a result of the suddenness of the enforcement action taking place in this road after many years of having not received any active enforcement. In terms of the road network hierarchy this unclassified residential cul-de-sac is a very low priority for parking enforcement and any action taken would generally be where a specific problem was reported by the public that needed attention such as obstruction of the pavement for pedestrians or road safety. The majority of parking enforcement activity is usually targeted at the main road network and controlled parking areas where there is the greatest need for action.
- 2.42 The purpose of parking enforcement is to change behaviour and encourage responsible parking. The parking enforcement team's standard operating practice for these more isolated locations, or where non-compliant practice has developed over a long time is to provide some advance warning of enforcement action before proceeding. This was not done in this case and representations against the PCNs issued were treated sympathetically and many were revoked, and warning notices were issued instead.

2.43 The petitioners have also asked that consideration be given to allowing parking on the footways and this has been reviewed by officers in the Traffic & Network Team. The Panel should note that in order to formalise footway parking in a road a number of considerations need to be taken into account as follows:

- It is not appropriate to exempt a whole road in its entirety. Footway parking bays need to be specifically marked out with traffic signs and road markings indicating the extents of parking allowed. This is in the same way that parking bays are marked out in controlled parking zones. Bays are positioned in such a way that sufficient footway width is allowed for pedestrians to pass and also so that parking does not obstruct passing traffic or compromise road safety.
- Where areas of footway will have parking bays marked the footways would need to be strengthened to a carriageway specification in order to prevent any damage and excessive maintenance costs. A conventional footway construction is not designed to withstand the weight of any vehicles parked on it over a prolonged period of time. In addition to this statutory undertakers would need to be consulted about the impact on equipment they may have in the footways and their ability to gain access to equipment.
- A traffic regulation order would need to be made to permit this type of parking. This would involve statutory consultation in the same way as a controlled parking zone and be potentially subject to representations.

2.44 It is expensive to introduce this type of scheme because of the need to reconstruct areas of footway, erect signs, lay road markings and undertake statutory consultation. The cost of introducing a footway parking exemption scheme in this one road could be as much as £50,000. It should be noted that there are also many other roads across the borough which have similar problems where this type of solution could be desired and undertaking a scheme here would almost certainly be followed by requests for similar schemes in other roads. The potential cost of undertaking this type of work in all the roads affected across the borough is not affordable. Members therefore need to be aware of the financial consequences of undertaking this type of scheme.

2.45 The only potential funding sources are through the Capital Programme of works. Footway parking is not a high priority area of work in terms of our Local Implementation Plan (LIP) objectives and therefore TfL LIP funds would not be used for this purpose. Harrow's Capital Programme for traffic and parking schemes is the only budget that could potentially be used. However, it is not suggested that funds be directed from controlled parking zone (CPZ) schemes to footway parking schemes as this is considered a much lower priority than the CPZ programme.

2.46 The Panel are advised that a footway parking exemption scheme in Kynaston Wood will not be taken forward for the reasons explained above.

Section 3 – Further Information

- 3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel of new petitions received. No updates will be reported at future meetings as officers will liaise with the Chair of TARSAP and the Portfolio Holder directly regarding any updates.

Section 4 – Financial Implications

- 4.1. There are no direct financial implications. Any suggested measures in the report require further investigation and would be taken forward using existing resources and funding.

Section 5 – Corporate Priorities

- 5.1. Any suggested measures in the report accord with our corporate priorities to deliver cleaner and safer streets, build stronger communities and improve support for vulnerable people.

Section 6 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Kanta Hirani	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 16 th August 2010		

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

Paul Newman , Parking and Sustainable Transport Team Leader,
Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622, email:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Barry Philips, Traffic Team Leader, Traffic and Road Safety Team Leader, Tel:
020 8424 1437, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: barry.philips@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

TfL - London Road Safety Unit

Headstone South/Pinner Road- Report to TARSAP 26th November 2008

Headstone South/Pinner Road- Report to TARSAP 17th June 2009

Controlled Parking Zones and Parking Schemes-Annual Review-Report to TARSAP 10th February 2010