



LONDON FIRE BRIGADE

APPENDIX C

Harrow Fire Station
500 Pinner Road Pinner Middlesex HA5 5RW
T 020 8555 1200 F 020 7960 3602
Minicom 020 7960 3629
www.london-fire.gov.uk

Paul Newman
Traffic Department
London Borough of Harrow
Harrow Civic Centre

London Fire Brigade is run by the London
Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

Date 4 May 2011
Your Ref WHRG 10/5

Dear Paul

West Harrow Residents Group Parking Restrictions Proposal

Following our meeting in West Harrow on Wednesday 20th April 2011 where representatives from the Residents Association, Local Authority, Police and Fire Service were in attendance. Along with the Fire Appliance and Crew from Harrow Fire Station a 'walking inspection' of the West Harrow area took place; all of the junctions contained within the Proposal were negotiated by the Appliance to assess access.

As a result of these tests it is my professional opinion that access for fire appliances would be compromised should the proposals be accepted and the existing CPZ be relaxed. On this basis I would object to the proposals put forward by the West Harrow Residents Group.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information.

Yours sincerely

John Doherty MBA. FIFireE
Station Manager

Reply to John Doherty
Direct T 07810 850705
Direct F n/a
E john.doherty@london-fire.gov.uk



**Report on West Harrow Residents Group 10/5 Proposal
Fire Appliance Test**

Wednesday 20th April 2011 1030 - 1230

The test vehicle was a normal sized fire appliance driven by an experienced London Fire Brigade appliance driver in a professional manner.

The test was carried out at walking pace, and all manoeuvres where conducted in slow time.

No emergency warning equipment was used during the test.

Prior to the test being carried out, myself and a colleague walked the proposed test route and placed cones at each location that parking would be allowed under the 10/5 solution.

The test route started from Colbeck Road from outside St Peters Church car park.

- 1) Left turn from Colbeck Road into Merivale Road.
The appliance was **unable** to turn without hitting the cones. Failed
- 2) Left turn from Bowen Road into Vaughan Road.
The appliance was **able** to turn without hitting the cones. Successful
- 3) Left turn from Vaughan Road into Drury Road
The appliance was **able** to turning without hitting the cones. Successful
- 4) Left turn from Drury Road into Heath Road

The appliance was unable to turn without hitting the cones.	Failed
5) Right turn from Heath Road into Bowen Road The appliance was unable to turn without hitting the cones.	Failed
6) Right turn from Bowen Road into Butler Road The appliance was able to turning without hitting the cones.	Successful
7) Left turn from Butler Road into Drury Road The appliance was unable to turn without hitting the cones.	Failed
8) Left turn from Drury Road into Sumner Road The appliance was able to turning without hitting the cones.	Successful
9) Left Turn from Sumner Road into Merivale Road/Bowen Road The appliance was unable to turn without hitting the cones.	Failed

These results show that there were 5 failed turns and 4 successful turns during the test.

From the West Harrow Residents Group 10/5 solution plan, this appears to remove approximately 9 parking places from their total projected gains, however I believe that the argument has always been to have a consistent scheme across the entire West Harrow area, therefore by cherry picking the successful turns and introducing the 10/5 solution but ignoring the failed turns, leaving the present double yellow lines in situ, this consistent approach argument is ignored and discarded.

There were other difficulties around the route, a large rigid UPS delivery van was unable to negotiate the right turn from Bowen Road into Butler Road due to parked vehicles and our cones, and a car (1) turning left from Butler Road into Bowen Road was unable to complete the manoeuvre due to our cones as a car (2) travelling south in Bowen Road approaching the crossroads junction, Vehicle 1 had to give way to vehicle 2 by stopping on the apex of the junction, blocking it almost completely.

There is also the issue of larger vehicles needing access to the area and being unable due to parked vehicles. Local authority refuse vehicles, larger rigid delivery vehicles and larger emergency service vehicles, a London Fire Brigade hose layer and an elevated platform were examples mentioned during the test. From the results of the test the 10/5 solution would clearly not work for these types of vehicles.

The Highway Code is very precise concerning where to and where not to stop or park. It states "**DO NOT** stop or park anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services"
It also states "**DO NOT** stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space"

Therefore in conclusion, I have to say that the test was a failure and the 10/5 solution is not viable or workable in its present form.

However that is not to say that there is not room for some relaxation of the double yellow lines to allow some more parking for the residents in the "village", such as in the lay-bys at Marshall Close, the Cul de sac section of Bouverie Road, the Cul de sac

section of Merivale Road at its junction with Lance Road and in Bowen Road between
Heath Road and Vaughan Road outside nos. 4,-6.

Neil Corfield
PC 848TD
North West Traffic Management Unit

4th May 2011