# Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel

	Advisory ranci	
Date of Meeting:	20 <sup>th</sup> September 2011	
Subject:	<b>INFORMATION REPORT</b> Petitions relating to:	
	<ol> <li>2-14 Mollison Way – Request for double yellow lines</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Stanley Road South Harrow- Request for additional parking controls</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Pinner Road Harrow- Support for changes to parking controls</li> </ol>	
	<ol> <li>Marlborough Hill Wealdstone – Objections to proposed changes to parking controls</li> </ol>	
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Brendon Hills - Corporate Director Community and Environment	
Exempt:	No	
Enclosures:	None	



#### **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**

#### Mollison Way – Request for double yellow lines

- 2.1 A petition was presented to the council by a small group of local residents from Mollison Way east of the junction of The Highlands. The petition contained 7 signatures from numbers 2-14 Mollison Way.
- 2.2 The petition was in the form of a letter and requested double yellow lines between 2-14 Mollison Way to prevent parking which residents claim occurs between their driveways creating a road safety hazard.
- 2.3 For consistency the Panel has recently agreed an assessment criterion to deal with requests for double yellow line restrictions. Each request is scored using various criteria taking into account personal injury accidents (PIA), visibility, accessibility for large vehicles and local factors including nearby schools, shops, blocked access etc.
- 2.4 This means every request is considered equally and prioritised against other sites. In doing so better use is made of the resources and funding available to us. We have scored this request in line with this criterion and unfortunately it does not meet our criteria to be selected as a priority site.
- 2.5 The council recently introduced a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Burnt Oak Broadway area and this may have inadvertently transferred some parking into the Mollison Way area. As this scheme is due for review within the next six to nine months this request will be considered again separately as part of this review process.

# Stanley Road South Harrow – Request for additional parking controls

2.6 A petition was presented at the Cabinet meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2011 containing 32 signatures from residents concerned about parking. The petition states:

"We the undersigned demand that as a matter of urgency Harrow Council address the overcrowded parking in Stanley Road, Sherwood Avenue, Eastcote Avenue and Roxeth Green Avenue. Since the construction of Barrats - The Arc situated at the end of Stanley Road was completed at the beginning of March 2009, and with new residents having moved into the large development, the volume of traffic has increased alarmingly, parking has become a nightmare and drivers are also regularly travelling at excessive speeds along Stanley Road and neighbouring residential roads.

When the application was agreed we were informed by Harrow Council that the parking controls in Stanley Road and surrounding area would be reviewed and residents fully consulted using the £30,000 Section 106 funding from this large scale development.

Therefore, we the undersigned demand that Harrow Council, using this S106 money, urgently undertake an investigation to establish a solution to the increased traffic, excessive speeding and overcrowded parking on this and neighbouring narrow residential roads with the aim of also having permit restricted parking between 18:00 and 19:00 for this area."

- 2.7 Officers are well aware of local concerns about parking and have been monitoring the area for some time. Progress has been reported to the panel within the regular progress reports to each meeting.
- 2.8 An application was made to the developers in early 2011 for the release of the £30,000 contained in the S106 agreement. This would allow full surveys and consultation to take place to mitigate the parking problems that residents have consistently reported as being due to vehicles from residents in The Arc/Biro House/Bridge Court (alternative names) development.
- 2.9 The developers responded that they did not consider that the justification for release of the money had been met and therefore no money was being made available. The S106 agreement states that if in the opinion of the Council parking problems from the development occur after a period of monitoring funding should be released to allow consultation and implementation of any parking controls necessary to mitigate this.
- 2.10 In the light of the above information the developers response is very disappointing, especially for local residents, but is an obstacle to progressing the measures residents have requested.
- 2.11 To a large extent a "chicken and egg" situation has arisen because without the funding the council is unable to fully quantify the problem through surveys. Because the reported problems are worse in the evenings/weekends officers have been restricted to undertaking observations when they have been in the area outside normal working hours.
- 2.12 The petition is helpful in adding weight to the case made by the council for the release of funds but the council's legal department have in the past stated that petitions from residents, on their own, are not sufficient to release the S106 funds.
- 2.13 The updated monitoring data from officers since January 2011 and this petition have been submitted to the developer through the council's

planning department and legal service to see if the S106 funds can be released. Every effort will be made to seek release of the funds and an update will be given at the panel meeting.

- 2.14 Once the funds have been released officers will be able to timetable, what is a substantial piece of work, into the current agreed programme and this will be reported to a future meeting of the panel.
- 2.15 The lead petitioner has been advised of the intention to report the matter to this panel and we will update them on any comments from the panel and any significant developments on the release of the S106 funding.

#### 2.16 **Pinner Road Harrow – Support of Parking provision on Pinner Road**

2.17 A petition was presented to the Cabinet on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2011 containing 262 signatures from businesses and their customers. The petition states:

"PETITION IN SUPPORT OF PARKING PROVISION ON PINNER ROAD. Ref: Review of Parking / Public Consultation. July 2011

We the undersigned busjnesses / traders and customers who use the shopping facilities on Pinner Road call on the Council to note our support to the following aspects of the above Consultation for County Roads, Pinner Road and Neptune Road:

1. Car-parking on Pinner Road: There are serious problems of car parking for the shoppers and we welcome introduction of pay and display car parking bays outside shops as shown on Plan C. We would urge to maximise this provision.

2. Loading / Unloading: We call upon the Council to make this provision to ensure that they meet the requirements of businesses/traders.

We have suffered for far too long from the lack of car parking facilities. In expressing our support we also urge the Council to expedite the process and deliver the parking provision before any further damage is done to the survival and vitality of this shopping parade which is now under most serious threat from other major retail outlets in the immediate proximity of Pinner Road."

- 2.18 A further list of 378 signatures as an addition to the petition was received on 28<sup>th</sup> July.
- 2.19 The petition refers to a recent consultation that has recently been undertaken, the results of which are reported separately to this panel meeting.
- 2.20 For completeness the background is that a parking scheme was introduced in May 2010 following public and statutory consultation to complement a local safety scheme on Pinner Road. This was set to deal with accidents and maintain traffic flow along Pinner Road which is part of London's Strategic Road Network. Ultimately Transport for London

(TfL) has the final say on any matter that affects traffic and parking along Pinner Road and immediate side roads. The implemented scheme was also intrinsically linked in reviewing parking in the adjacent County Roads and offering a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) where the majority of residents supported it.

- 2.21 It was agreed at the time of the original consultation that there would be a review of the implemented scheme and this was programmed to start at the end of 2010.
- 2.22 Following discussions with ward councilors and local business, investigations and a survey of businesses undertaken by the councils economic development unit, consultation was carried out in the three weeks leading up to 25<sup>th</sup> July 2011.
- 2.23 The full results are contained within the separate report to this panel meeting and the petition has been taken into account in reaching the officers recommendations.
- 2.24 The lead petitioner has been informed that the petition will be reported to this panel meeting and that we will respond when the outcome of the separate report on the consultation responses has been ratified by the Portfolio Holder for Community and Environment.

# Marlborough Hill Wealdstone-Objection to Advertised Parking proposals

- 2.25 A petition was received on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2011 containing 12 signatures. The petition states:
  - *"1. We are happy with the present parking times 10am-11am Mondays to Fridays.*
  - 2. We do not want the parking times to be on for Saturdays
  - 3. We do not want additional pay and display parking for station commuters as this may cause less parking spaces for residents."
- 2.26 An accompanying letter from the lead petitioner sets out some points which are summarized below:
  - Already not happy with current parking controls 10am-11am Mon-Fri
  - During above times most of parking spaces are empty
  - A far as they notice there are no visitors to Civic Center or Station parking in the road
  - Main problem arises in evening when all residents are at home
  - Pressures on parking caused by car ownership compounded by conversion of properties into flats/bedsits
  - Proposed changes to aprking wont solve evening problem
  - Restrictions on Saturdays will only impact on friends and relatives
  - Want a survey of how many cars are owned by residents and how many parking spaces are available

- 2.27 Many of the points made are in direct conflict with the petition received and reported to the panel meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2011 albeit that they originate from a separate set of residents. The original petition was instrumental in the consultation exercise that has recently occurred following the Panels agreement to add the review to the current works programme also at the June panel meeting.
- 2.28 The rational behind the advertised proposals and results of the recent consultation exercise, including this petition, form a separate report to this panel meeting.
- 2.29 The lead petitioner has been advised that the petition would be reported to the Panel and we would contact them again with any comments from the Panel and the outcome from consultation once ratified by the Portfolio Holder for Community and Environment.
- 2.30 Information has been provided at the time of writing this report that suggests not all the signatures on the petition may be genuine and officers are attempting to verify this. Any update will be given at the meeting.

### **Section 3 – Further Information**

3.1. The purpose of this report is to inform the Panel about any new petitions received since the last meeting. 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:
  - Keeping neighbourhoods clean, green and safe
  - United and involved communities: a Council that listens and leads
  - Supporting and protecting people who are most in need
  - Supporting our Town Centre, our local shopping centres and businesses

# **Section 6 - Statutory Officer Clearance**

		on behalf of the
Name: Kanta Hirani	✓	Chief Financial Officer
Date: 30/08/11		

# Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

#### Contact:

Г

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

Paul Newman, Team Leader - Parking & Sustainable Transport Tel: 020 8424 1650, Fax: 020 8424 7662, E-mail: paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

#### **Background Papers:**

Previous TARSAP reports and Public Consultation Documents