

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

Date of Meeting: 21 June 2012

Subject: **INFORMATION REPORT**

Petitions relating to:

1. Roxeth School and Safety Matters in Brickfield, Harrow on the Hill
2. Butler Road West Harrow - Objection to removal of CPZ
3. Anselm Road Hatch End - Request for parking restrictions
4. Grimsdyke Car Park Hatch End - Objection to introduction of parking charges
5. Pinner Road – Petition to support introduction of pay and display bays
6. 40 Eastcote Road, Pinner - request for parking restrictions
7. Objections to the proposed bus service along Wood Lane

Responsible Officer: John Edwards - Divisional Director
Environmental Services

Exempt: No

Enclosures: Appendix A – Location of Nursery
Grimsdyke Car Park
Appendix B – Wood Lane Bus Route
Letter

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

Roxeth School and Safety Matters in Brickfield, Harrow on the Hill

- 2.1 A petition was presented to the council by a Governor of Roxeth School. The petition contained 40 signatures and states:

“We the undersigned protest to Harrow Council our concerns for the safety of children in this narrow cul-de-sac which is the only route into the rear entrance to Roxeth School. The real problem is the speed of traffic, combined with motorist’s lack of awareness of pedestrians and indiscriminate parking. This has previously been drawn to the attention of the traffic department.

We do not believe that the Localised Safety Parking Programme which has recently been out to consultation fully addresses these concerns. We do believe that the proposals to put some double yellow lines around corners – while welcome- are insufficient to cope with the problems. More enforcement is required.

We formally request that the council takes urgent action to enforce the restrictions which are already in place there: and also that it should liaise with the Police to ensure their presence at the road at least on some afternoons so that they can take action to alleviate the perceived dangers to children.

We are also unhappy that during the recent bad weather the council was apparently unable to clear the snow/ice from the pavements here. This means the children must walk in the road to get to school. This is not very good in terms of road safety training. We ask that the council should make every effort to clear the pavements in similar bad weather in future as a necessary protection for the children.

- 2.2 This is a commonly received complaint that we receive for most schools in the borough and is not easily resolved. Parents driving their children to school can cause severe congestion in the peak hours and this is likely to get worse as car ownership increases. It is necessary for attitudes to change and recognise that there is a need to use more sustainable forms of transport, such as rail, the bus, cycling and walking where this is possible.

- 2.3 In this context, it is important to encourage these alternatives by providing the right infrastructure so that alternative choices can be made. Officers from our road safety team regularly attend schools to talk about the problems that the “school run” can cause and suggest alternatives.
- 2.4 There is more emphasis being given to buses, cyclists and those who walk and to the council works in partnership with the schools, parents and children in developing infrastructure schemes that will encourage walking and/or cycling. At the moment this programme is targeted at primary and middle schools where we hope we can change attitudes about the use of the car at an early stage of development.
- 2.5 We have made the Parking enforcement team aware of the contents of the petition for their attention.
- 2.6 With regard to winter gritting during periods of snowfall the Council does endeavour to clear snow from certain areas that generate heavy footfall, unfortunately it is not feasible to clear all such areas. Whilst the petitioners' concerns are noted no assurance can be given that these footways will be cleared in future.

Butler Road West Harrow - Objection to removal of CPZ

- 2.7 A petition has been received from residents of the western end of Butler currently within the Controlled Parking Zone which was implemented in April 2010.
- 2.8 The petition was signed by 22 residents from 19 households and states:

“We, the undersigned, object to proposed removal of permit parking on Butler Road, West Harrow, for the following reasons;

- 1) *Our road will be the only one in the area where commuters can park.*
- 2) *This will be dangerous and there will be road rage incidents*
- 3) *Our cars will be damaged as commutes squeeze into the tiniest of spaces”*

- 2.9 The background is that public consultation was carried out in June/July 2011 as part of a review of the implemented scheme. The results were;

Butler Road results	Number
Number consulted	20
Number responses	7
Do you wish to remain in CPZ - Yes	3
Do you wish to remain in CPZ – No	4

- 2.10 Based upon these results and the consistent approach taken when dealing with the area it was recommended by the Panel that the removal of the area from the CPZ should be progressed to Statutory Consultation.

- 2.11 The Statutory Consultation was carried out in February/March 2012 and the results are the subject of a separate report on the agenda for this Panel meeting. This petition is considered as part of this report. Based upon this petition 19 of the 20 households in the section of road within the CPZ now do not wish the CPZ to be removed
- 2.12 The lead petitioner has been advised that the petition will be reported to this meeting of the Panel and we will advise them of Panel recommendation and Portfolio Holder decision in due course.

Anselm Road Hatch End - Request for parking controls in the road

- 2.13 A petition has been received from residents in Anselm Road off Uxbridge Road Hatch End. The petition has been signed by 29 residents representing 21 of the 35 households in the road.
- 2.14 The petition states;

“In view of the Hatch End Broadway Parking Review, residents in Anselm Road are concerned that many vehicles using the present free facilities for long term parking will attempt to use adjacent roads like Anselm Road instead. This will lead to increased problems in the road and worsen the incidence of vehicles blocking or partially blocking resident’s drives. We would ask that measures be taken to obviate this such as having a middle of the day parking ban and/or painting yellow lines across drives. Any other proposals to help would be welcome.”

- 2.15 This petition was received during the public consultation held in March 2012 on proposals to introduce pay & display parking in the service roads off Uxbridge Road and Grimsdyke Car Park. The results of this public consultation are reported elsewhere in the agenda for this meeting of the Panel.
- 2.16 The lead petitioner was advised that the petition would be reported to this panel meeting. In addition clarification was sought if residents were indicating their wish for parking controls only if it was decided to pursue the pay and display parking in Hatch End in whole or in part. The response from the lead petitioner was that all the people who signed the petition wanted the requested parking controls regardless of the introduction of parking charges in hatch End or not.
- 2.17 Consideration of this petition is included in the consultation results reported elsewhere in the agenda for this panel meeting.

Grimsdyke Road Car Park, Hatch End - Objection to introduction of charges

- 2.18 During the consultation on introducing pay and display parking in Hatch End, which is described above in 2.15, a petition was received from The Jigsaw Nursery which uses the Scout Hut off Grimsdyke Car Park. The

petition was signed by 94 people, presumably customers of the Nursery, which states;

“We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge Harrow Council to act now to reconsider the proposed charging for the use of the Grimsdyke Road Car Park”

- 2.19 The nursery lies off the Car park as shown on the plan at **Appendix A**. The only vehicular access to the Nursery is off the car park. There are existing arrangements to allow loading and unloading to the site but at present as the car park is free there are no restrictions on people parking in a marked bay for unlimited periods.
- 2.20 There is no intention to remove the existing arrangement if the decision is to introduce parking charges in whole or in part at Hatch End. The results of public consultation are reported separately on the agenda for this Panel meeting.
- 2.21 If the panel recommends pursuing the introduction of parking charges in the car park then users who need to stay longer than the momentary picking up or dropping off of passengers would be required to pay and display. The advertised parking charges for the car park are 20p per hour or part hour. As the borough wide review of parking strategy and charges, whose aim is to make charges more consistent, transparent and understandable, is ongoing these are indicative.
- 2.22 The petition is considered in the report on the public consultation results at Hatch End and the lead petitioner has been informed that the petition would be reported to this meeting of the Panel.

Pinner Road - Support of Parking provision on Pinner Road

- 2.23 We have received a petition containing 30 signatures from Businesses/Traders and customers of premises on Pinner Road located between Oxford Road and Bedford Road. The petition states;
- “We, he undersigned Business/traders and customers who use the shopping facility on Pinner Road call on the Council to note our support to the following aspects on the (Statutory) Consultation for Pinner 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”*
- 2.24 The background is that we carried out public consultation as part of a review of the parking scheme that was implemented on Pinner Road outside the shopping parade in May 2010. A scheme was established from first principles prior to contact with Transport for London (TfL), however, there is a requirement to consult with TfL because Pinner Road is part of London’s Strategic Road network. Following public consultation TfL subsequently objected to the introduction of pay and display parking on Pinner Road suggesting that inset parking should be provided outside the shops.

- 2.25 The provision of inset parking bays has been considered since the original parking review stakeholders meeting took place in 2007. However following several approaches to businesses there was no agreement to providing the private forecourt land to enable such facilities to be pursued and this option was abandoned.
- 2.26 In an effort to try to overcome the TfL objection further surveys and background work was carried out and an option of transposing the location of a bus stop with proposed pay and display bays between Rutland Road and Bedford Road was proposed. After much deliberation TfL finally agreed to the revised proposals and these were subject to statutory consultation in March 2012.
- 2.27 The results of statutory consultation are reported separately to this panel meeting and consideration to this petition is included in the report.
- 2.28 The lead petitioner has been informed that the petition would be reported to this Panel meeting and the Panel's recommendations and Portfolio Holder decision in due course.

Eastcote Road Pinner - Request for parking restrictions

- 2.29 A petition has been received from residents of 40 Eastcote Road, Pinner. The petition has been signed by 49 residents representing 32 of the 37 households in the apartments at that address.
- 2.30 The petition states:
- “Signatures attaching to the petition to make the area immediately to the right of the entrance of 40 Eastcote Road (when exiting) a definite no parking zone by any vehicle at any time.”*
- 2.31 There is an existing zebra crossing to the east of the entrance/exit to the off street parking attached to these apartments. The controlled area (zig-zag markings) for this crossing go across the entrance/exit but the area to the west is uncontrolled. This area frequently has parked vehicles close to the entrance which restricts the visibility for drivers leaving the entrance causing drivers to have difficulty in seeing approaching vehicles from the west.
- 2.32 This particular section of road is straight so the visibility issue is not significantly different to that experienced by drivers leaving private off-street parking onto a traffic sensitive bus route with on street parking.
- 2.33 The lead petitioner contacted the council to discuss the parking issue and explained that a petition was being circulated. He was advised that an assessment for the Local Safety Parking Schemes (LSPS) programme recently completed did not prioritise this location for consultation.
- 2.34 The introduction of yellow line waiting restrictions does involve an extensive legal consultative process which is resource intensive. The council, faced with many such requests for restrictions, therefore applies

a set of agreed objective assessment criteria to establish the very worst locations as a priority for the limited resources available to this programme.

- 2.35 In this particular instance there is an alternative to waiting restrictions due to the position of the zebra crossing and favourable consideration is being given to a modest extension of the crossing zig-zags which does not require consultation in the same way as waiting restrictions.

Objections to the proposed new bus service along Wood Lane

- 2.36 We have received a petition containing 1 signature which refers to an enclosed letter with 5 signatures (See **Appendix B**). The petition states:

“We the undersigned confirm that we have read the attached letter to Councillor Phillip O’Dell and that we support the views expressed in this letter”

- 2.37 The background is that Section 106 (S106) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows the local planning authority to enter into a legally binding planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission. As part of this act, Harrow Council in conjunction with Transport for London secured funding from the developers of the new housing on the former BAE site at the northern end of The Grove to introduce a bus service in the vicinity of the development.

- 2.38 Providing a bus service along Wood Lane will serve the new housing development and other properties along this corridor including the Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital (rear entrance), the Aspire Centre, the Shia Hussein Islamic Association community centre & mosque, the Swaminarayan Satsang temple and the Harrow Rugby Football Club. The service will provide a direct connection to Stanmore Station, reducing the demand for private transport and facilitating independent travel, particularly to the RNOH which is a specialist hospital attracting patients and visitors from a wide catchment area.

- 2.39 A Hertfordshire County Council bus service route 615 currently runs between Old Church Lane and Hatfield via Stanmore Station and Brockley Hill. This is a low frequency service, which runs Mondays to Fridays between approximately 6:30am and 8.30pm. Hertfordshire County Council and the bus operator Uno Bus have agreed to route this service via Wood Lane in order to increase service frequency and introduce a Saturday service if Harrow covers the additional costs associated with the changes.

- 2.40 Following liaison between Harrow Council, TfL, Hertfordshire County Council and Uno Bus, it was agreed to consider diverting the 615 service along Wood Lane using the S106 funding secured from development.

- 2.41 In July 2011, Harrow Council informed all stakeholders including residents and businesses along Wood Lane and Warren Lane (approx.

240 properties) about the proposed bus route. The letter sent out was approved by TfL and Ward Members..

- 2.42 The letter was not a formal consultation asking for support or objection. Rather it was an information letter intended to inform stakeholders of the proposal and generate response if there were any strong objections. A total of 11 responses were received citing objections to the bus route together with 21 responses in favour. A summary of the responses and issues was presented in a Portfolio Holder report which recommend that the route go ahead together with localised works to widen the junction of Stanmore Hill with Wood Lane. The Portfolio Holder decision was to approve the recommendation.
- 2.43 The issues raised in the petition are largely covered in the original Portfolio Holder Report but for ease of reference the issues are summarised below with responses.
- 2.44 Risk of accidents to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians due to the new buses – There isn't evidence to suggest that buses increase the risk of accidents. The frequency of buses is 2 per hour so the impact of buses on the road will be marginal. The bus stops are sited with good visibility.
- 2.45 Traffic jams – two buses an hour are unlikely to have any significant adverse impact on traffic congestion.
- 2.46 Noise levels and pollution – vehicle noise including that from buses is unavoidable. However, bus stops are not sited outside directly outside any residential accommodation and the low number of buses is unlikely to mean that noise will be a significant problem.
- 2.47 The primary purpose of the proposals is to provide an alternative mode of transport to key destinations on Wood Lane and facilitate independent travel by specific groups of people such as the young and elderly or those without access to private vehicles. The change in traffic as a result of the new service being introduced is not the primary purpose of the proposals. It is intended to monitor the take up of the service in order to decide whether or not funding should be sought to continue the service after 3 years once the S106 contribution is fully utilised. This will include assessing the usage by those visiting the key destination on Wood Lane.
- 2.48 Uno Bus have advised that they plan to use shorter buses compared to their current vehicles on the route 615. The location of stops will be agreed with Transport for London and the Police and only installed where it is deemed safe to do so. The minor road widening of about 70cm at the junction of Stanmore Hill with Wood Lane was not significant to warrant a consultation. Access was maintained throughout the works to minimise disruption.
- 2.49 A fundamental benefit of the 615 route is that it will feature in mainstream public transport maps which allow visitors to plan their journeys better. Any private shuttle bus will not be publicised adequately. At the time of writing, Hertfordshire County Council advised that the new

service is due to start operating from 23rd July 2012. The Council will review the service annually.

- 2.50 Transport for London are not prepared at this stage to divert any TfL bus routes as this will impact on their service and require long term funding which they are unable to commit. However, they will be monitoring the proposed service and could be looking at changes in the future. The Brockley Hill stops do not serve the RNOH satisfactorily as the distance from the stops to the outpatient's entrance is considerable. The proposed new stops will be much closer to the entrance.
- 2.51 The Council will continue to lobby TfL for improvement to bus services such as the 142 but this is not a replacement of the 615 service which will go closer to some of the key destinations on Wood Lane.
- 2.52 The lead petitioner has been advised that the petition will be reported to this meeting of the Panel and we will advise them of the Panels views in due course.

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

Name: Kanta Hirani



on behalf of the
Chief Financial Officer

Date: 01/06/12

Section 7 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact:

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 and Sustainable Transport
Tel: 020 8424 1065, Fax: 020 8424 7622,
E -mail:paul.newman@harrow.gov.uk

Hanif Islam – Senior Professional - Transport Planning
Tel: 020 8424 1548, Fax: 020 8424 7662,
E-mail: hanif.islam@harrow.gov.uk

Background Papers:

Previous TARSAP reports