

APPENDIX B – Risk assessment

Risk	Assessment			Potential Mitigation Measures
	H	M	L	
Financial				
Risk to Funding from TfL			✓	Government spending review has squeezed TfL budgets but priorities protected so at present assume funding for programme secure. £1m funding for 11/12 confirmed on portal 16 Feb 11. Harrow have still to pass through gateways 6 and 7 to release funding for implementation
Risk that costs will escalate as design develops and exposes new costs	✓			TfL have indicated available budget for implementation restricted to £1 million. Revised scheme maintaining more existing kerb lines developed. Scheme for shopping parades area only estimated as all that can be done within budget. Outline scheme for limited laybys & crossing points for rest of Mollison Way is available should actual costs permit. Based on current estimate no prospect of further works.
CCTV estimate 5 cameras (not in original plan)	✓			Security emerged as major local concern. Second option of CCTV estimated at £125k but has additional ducting costs. Basic scheme with just 2 cameras also being considered as a potential saving.
Cost of diverting/protecting buried services	✓			Revised layout largely avoids changes to buried services however small contingency allowed
Risk that scheme not be seen to be meeting objectives		✓		Improved crossing facilities and parking layout. Some other priorities and some parking problems remain. Although alternative would better meet objectives probably too expensive and seen as too radical
Statutory				
Risk of opposition to proposals at statutory stage due to proposed parking restrictions, traffic calming etc at statutory stage		✓		Engage with local community through stakeholders & working group in developing proposals establishing the justification. Carry out local consultations (May 2011, ahead of statutory stage July). Review feedback and modify proposals as appropriate.
Third Party				
Risk of divergent parking needs making consultation outcome unclear		✓		Borough-wide review of P&D prevents controls on parking spaces being introduced at this stage. Possible future controls to encourage some short term customer parking.
Risk that established trees cannot be removed	✓			Proposals largely sympathetic to tree officer advice on trees to be maintained. Scheme likely to be confined to Parades area and immediate surrounding roads with few trees involved. If scheme affordable beyond shopping area this will minimise tree removal
Risk that widening carriageway	✓			Scheme unlikely to extend much beyond shopping area. If it does, some traffic

APPENDIX B – Risk assessment

Risk	Assessment			Potential Mitigation Measures
	H	M	L	
widths will increase traffic speeds and collisions				calming features including pinch points, offsetting traffic lanes from straight and speed cushions expected to be necessary to restrain traffic speeds and ensure visibility for pedestrians at crossing points is satisfactory.
Public/Political				
Risk of opposition of businesses to any parking controls		✓		Parking needs survey indicated need for balance of short term / longer term parking. Borough-wide review likely to preclude free period and no P&D in initial scheme. What flexibility will exist on tariff levels for future P&D unclear at present.
Risk that any parking controls on Mollison Way will displace parking to surrounding streets	✓			Parking associated with the Parades already does overflow into surrounding streets which is a problem for local residents. Parking controls possibly permit parking in nearest residential streets might help but beyond the remit of scheme and limited budget. Displaced parking along Mollison Way may create more problems for buses necessitating more waiting restrictions. CCTV enforcement should address obstructive parking on main carriageway in Parades section.
Risk that reduced parking spaces will lead to obstruction of service roads for short term parking /loading	✓			Loading and very short term parking obstruction already occurs. Loading bays provided but may be too far from some businesses for convenience. Double yellow lines and no loading proposed which can theoretically be enforced by proposed CCTV
Risk of opposition to parking controls from residents		✓		Only double yellow line protection at specific point for access and visibility proposed at this stage. Reynolds Drive footway parking scheme as marked not sustainable. Can offer alternative under current regs but this itself has drawbacks.
Risk of opposition to traffic calming from buses, emergency services etc	✓			Some form of calming necessary to restrain traffic speeds. As much as practical will be by horizontal rather than vertical deflections. There will however need to be some road humps but they will be either sets of cushions or if tables with shallow ramps. Buses and emergency services habitually object to vertical deflections but should be able to show time improvements elsewhere.
Programme				
Development of design takes longer than expected due to unforeseen constraints		✓		Regular project officer meetings with clear mile stones set
Development of new design takes longer due to waiting for Harrow Engineering and utility companies		✓		Utility involvement minimised by keeping within same areas. Uncertainty on civils estimate has led to widening proposals elsewhere currently being dropped.