# REPORT FOR: Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

**Date of Meeting:** 24<sup>th</sup> November 2010

Subject: INFORMATION REPORT

Petitions relating to:

Antoneys Close - request for safe crossing

2. Whistler Gardens - objection to road humps as part of Stag Lane 20 mph zone scheme

Marsh Lane, Stanmore - late request for extension to CPZ

**Responsible Officer:** Brendon Hills - Corporate Director

Community and Environment

Exempt: No

**Enclosures:** Appendix A – Whistler Gardens

Decision record

**Appendix B -** Marsh Lane-Location Plan and existing parking controls

## **Section 1 – Summary**

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**

#### **Antoneys Close – request for pedestrian crossing facilities**

2.1 A petition was presented to the Council by the residents of Antoneys Close, Pinner. The petition contained 56 signatures from 48 addresses in Antoneys Close.

The petition requested a safe crossing on Uxbridge Road between Antoneys Close and Montesole Playing Fields. It was stated in the following terms:-

"We, the residents of Antoneys Close, Pinner ask the council to provide a safe crossing over Uxbridge Road between Antoneys Close and Montesole playing field."

- 2.2 The council receives many requests each year for new pedestrian crossing facilities. In order to use our funds and resources to best effect each request is investigated and the results assessed, taking account of national criteria and guidance, to identify the most suitable locations. The main factors measured are the number of people crossing, traffic speeds and the volume of traffic.
- 2.3 In addition to this we do also consider other factors such as the number of injuries on the road near to the proposed site, the layout of the road and the location of local amenities in the area such as hospitals, schools, parks, shops and any community severance. The request is placed on our list for further investigation and if it meets the criteria it is prioritised to see if it will be taken to TfL for funding.
- 2.4 If a site does not meet the criteria for a formal controlled crossing further investigations are undertaken to determine the suitability of alternative measures such as pedestrian refuges. This would be subject to funding being available from the council's Traffic Management budget.
- 2.5 In recognition of the concerns raised in the petition the request for a crossing has been included in the list of sites for investigation and traffic surveys have been commissioned.
- 2.6 A study of the latest accident data (approximately 100m either side of its junction with Antoneys Close) has already confirmed that there have been no incidents involving pedestrians in the most recent 36 month period for which data is held. In addition preliminary site investigations indicate that there is already an existing pedestrian refuge island some 150 metres to the east of the junction with Antoneys Close.

# Whistler Gardens - objection to road humps as part of Stag Lane 20 mph zone scheme

2.7 A 69 signature petition was presented to Council on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010 by residents in Whistler Gardens requesting that the proposed road humps in their road be omitted from the scheme. This was in response to the statutory consultation notices advising residents of the intention

to introduce a 20 mph zone in the streets surrounding Stag Lane First and Middle School.

The petition states;

"We the majority of residents of Whistler Gardens oppose the speed humps on our road and have had an agreement from the residents on our road consenting to the opposition of the humps by the way of signature on the attached petition. Firstly, our street is so narrow that it is virtually impossible for a vehicle to speed; also the surrounding roads all have speed humps, which we feel is sufficient for all the road safety of the children and school. We also feel that the public funds should be spent on more pressing and important issues such as the public footpath on our road which is in a very bad state causing many elderly members of the street to have falls and young children to be hurt."

The Portfolio Holder was asked to consider the contents of the petition and for the reasons given in the decision record (shown at **Appendix A**) it was recommended that the objection be overruled by the delegated officer and the scheme proceed to the implementation stage.

#### Marsh Lane, Stanmore - request for controlled parking in street

- 2.8 A petition has been received from 17 properties which front a service road on the western side of Marsh Road opposite the junction with Du Cros Drive. This petition represents 85% of the properties affected. The Service road lies immediately to the south of the boundary of the Stanmore Zone B CPZ. This has control hours of Mon-Fri 3pm to 4pm.
- 2.9 The petition states "This petition is in relation to the parking areas on Marsh Lane, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7, between house numbers 96-136. It has become more apparent that commuters and other drivers are using the spaces outside our homes between the hours of 8am and 7pm and this tends to cause a lot of problems for the residents as currently we are faced with a street full of cars parked by non-residents. This petition has been constructed in the hope that council can introduce controlled parking, something which has already been introduced to other streets/areas in Stanmore. As we understand, no additional cost will be incurred by the residents. If you agree with the above or have any suggestions to improve the current situation please sign up to this petition".
- 2.10 A consultation took place in 2008/09 when residents were asked if they wanted parking controls. From the results it can be seen that of the 17 signatures from properties fronting the Marsh Lane service road:
  - 8 did not respond to the consultation in 2008/9
  - 4 responded that did not support any parking controls
  - 4 responded that supported parking controls
  - 1 responded but expressed no preference

- 2.11 Because there was clearly no majority support from residents no parking proposals were taken forward and the residents were subsequently informed of this decision.
- 2.12 The background to this situation is that immediately after the extension to Stanmore Zone B and H became operational in April/May 2009, together with double yellow lines installed at both ends of the service road, a request was received from one resident to include the service road in the CPZ. It was explained at that time that the consultation results, detailed above, did not show the necessary majority support for this to be implemented. It was explained that there would be a review around 12 months later and perhaps the resident would like to see if other residents supported such a change and raise the matter at the review.
- 2.13 This section of Marsh Lane was not included in the previous list of sites to be included in the Stanmore review, reported to the Panel, as no further contact until recently had been made. Neither did the site feature in any locations discussed with ward councillors and others during the review process.
- 2.14 As the Panel is aware the results of consultation on possible changes to the Stanmore CPZ zones B and H were reported to the last Panel meeting in September 2010 and progress is well advanced. However in the current financial climate officers are aware of the need to make the best use of resources. Panel members will be aware that elsewhere in the reports to the meeting there is also an item on consultation for parking controls at Canons Corner Stanmore.
- 2.15 Given the large support offered in the petition officers have therefore issued consultation documents to the properties in the service road and will report the results at the Panel meeting. It should be noted that the petition states that "As we understand, no additional cost will be incurred by the residents". Clearly the purchase of residents and visitors permits would be involved in any CPZ extension and this was pointed out to the petitioners when the petition was acknowledged. No subsequent correspondence on the subject has been received.
- 2.16 Any progress on extension of the CPZ into the Marsh Lane Service Road should not be at the expense of delaying the main CPZ changes. It should be noted that it would not be possible to include any further requests for a CPZ extension without delaying other aspects of the programme.

#### **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	<b>~</b>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 2 <sup>nd</sup> November 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, E-mail: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

#### **APPENDIX A**

#### **Community & Environment Directorate**

#### **DECISION RECORD**

**Reference No.** DR-000001 **Date:** 9th September 2010

**Title:** Whistler Gardens – petition – objection to road humps

Project name: Stag Lane School – 20 mph zone

#### 1. Decision required and recommendation

Some residents in Whistler Gardens are objecting to the introduction of road humps which are proposed as a part of the Stag Lane 20mph zone. They have presented a petition to the Council which was received during the consultation period stated on the public notice.

After considering the nature of the objections it is recommended that they are overruled and the scheme proceed to implementation.

#### 2. Background

The introduction of 20mph zones will play an important role in achieving the Government's road safety strategy and casualty reduction targets set out by the Department for Transport (DfT) for 2020.

Transport for London (TfL) has approved a programme of 20mph schemes in Harrow on the basis of the Council's 2010/2011 Borough Spending Plan (BSP) submission, which sets out the borough's programme of schemes for the year. The submission to TfL had previously been approved by the Council's Portfolio Holder for Environment and Community Safety. TfL ensure that the submission accords with the Borough's Local Implementation Plan and the Mayor for London's Transport Strategy and has approved a total budget of £200,000 for two 20 mph zones this financial year. Zones are proposed for the streets surrounding Stag Lane First and Middle School and Earlsmead School in 2010/11. The attached plan (Stag1) shows details of the proposed 20 mph zone in the streets surrounding Stag Lane School including Whistler Gardens to which the petition relates.

Before a scheme can be implemented statutory consultation must be undertaken on the proposal and any comments, objections or representations invited. These must be considered before proceeding with the scheme. In respect of the road humps in the proposed scheme public notices under the highways Act were erected on street and adverts put in the local press giving notice of the proposal. The consultation period ended on the 1<sup>st</sup> September after a period of three weeks.

A 69 signature petition was presented to council on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2010 by residents in Whistler Gardens requesting that the proposed road humps in their

road be omitted from the scheme. This was in response to the statutory consultation notices.

#### The petitions states;

"We the majority of residents of Whistler Gardens oppose to the speed humps on our road and have had an agreement from the residents on our road consenting to the opposition of the humps by the way of signature on the attached petition. Firstly, our street is so narrow that it is virtually impossible for a vehicle to speed; also the surrounding roads all have speed humps, which we feel is sufficient for all the road safety of the children and school. We also feel that the public funds should be spent on more pressing and important issues such as the public footpath on our road which is in a very bad state causing many elderly members of the street to have falls and young children to be hurt."

#### 3. Detail

Before statutory consultation was undertaken the council consulted local residents regarding the proposed 20 mph zone in the streets surrounding Stag Lane School. The results indicated a clear majority of residents in favour of a 20 mph zone including Whistler Gardens where 17 out of 19 residents were in favour of the scheme.

The results of the area wide consulation are shown in the table below:

	20 MPH ZONE – STAG LANE SCHOOL					
STREETS			Don't	No		
	Yes	No	know/ No	comme	Total	
			Opinion	nt given		
Conatable Gardens	17	1	0	0	18	
Cotman Gardens	6	2	0	0	8	
Collier Drive	9	0	1	0	10	
Chelsea Close	1	1	0	0	2	
Camrose Avenue	1	0	0	0	1	
Dale Avenue	19	2	0	0	21	
Gainsborough Gardens	11	2	0	0	13	
Haverford Way	4	0	0	0	4	
Hogarth Road	5	1	0	0	6	
Leighton Close	7	1	0	0	8	
Landseer Close	4	1	0	1	6	
Millais Gardens	11	1	1	0	13	
Nolton Place	6	0	0	0	6	
Prescelly Place	3	3	0	0	6	
Raeburn Road	3	0	0	0	3	
Roch Avenue	8	0	0	0	8	
Tenby Road	9	1	0	0	10	
Westleigh Gardens	13	3	0	0	16	
Whistler Gardens	17	2	0	0	19	
NO ADDRESS	1	0	0	0	1	
GRAND TOTAL	155	21	2	1	179	

The purpose of a 20 mph zone is to create a safer environment for all road users by limiting vehicle speeds through the use of self-enforcing measures. Therefore

20 mph zones contain traffic calming features such as road humps or speed cushions spaced at set intervals in order to meet these requirements. These are required in all streets within the zone to regulate speeds consistently throughout the zone. The resident's suggestion that road humps are omitted in one of the roads would be contrary to these requirements. In addition it is likely that this could lead to more traffic using Whistler Gardens in order to avoid road humps in the surrounding streets.

In light of the concerns raised in the petition and following a meeting with the PH on 2<sup>nd</sup> September it was agreed to amend the design of the proposed road humps in Whistler Gardens from 3.7m long round top humps to a speed cushion design which is shorter (2.5m in length). It was not possible to reduce the number of speed cushions in Whistler Gardens because the design standards require a minimum spacing distance between humps.

#### 4. Details of consultation with Portfolio Holder

A meeting was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> September between officers of the Traffic team and the PH for Environment and Community Safety. The detail above was discussed and it was agreed by officers, in consultation with the PH, that the objections from the residents in Whistler Gardens are overruled.

Officers also agreed to investigate whether it would be possible to consider using speed cushions as an alternative because they are slightly smaller than the proposed road humps. This was reviewed after the meeting and subsequently agreed.

#### Officer requesting decision

Name: Barry Philips Position: Team Leader

Signature: Date: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2010

#### Delegated officer making decision

Name: David Eaglesham Position: Service Manager

Signature: Date: 10<sup>th</sup> September 2010

Provide details and/or reference of delegated power being exercised:

P&I delegations reference no. 142

#### \* I agree to the recommendation proposed

\* I do not agree to the recommendation proposed. The reason is specified below:

(\*cross out the one that does not apply)