

# EDINBURGH DRIVE, ICKENHAM - PETITIONS REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES AND A ONE-WAY SYSTEM

<b>Cabinet Member &amp; Portfolio</b>	Councillor Steve Tuckwell Cabinet Member for Planning, Housing & Growth
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Karrie Whelan – Corporate Director Place
<b>Report Author &amp; Directorate</b>	Steven Austin – Place Directorate
<b>Papers with report</b>	Appendix A – Location Plan

## HEADLINES

<b>Summary</b>	To inform the Cabinet Member that two petitions have been received requesting both traffic calming measures and a one-way system.
<b>Putting our Residents First</b>  <b>Delivering on the Council Strategy 2022-2026</b>	<p>This report supports our ambition for residents/ the Council of: Live in good quality, affordable homes in connected communities</p> <p>This report supports our commitments to residents of: Safe and Strong Communities</p> <p>The request can be considered as part of the Council's annual programme for road safety measures.</p>
<b>Financial Cost</b>	Should speed and traffic surveys be commissioned, costs will be c.£85 per location, managed within existing Transportation Services revenue budgets.
<b>Select Committee</b>	Corporate Resources & Infrastructure Select Committee
<b>Ward</b>	Ickenham and South Harefield

## RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1) Meets with petitioners and listens to their request for traffic calming measures and a one-way system for Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham;
- 2) Notes the results of the previous speed and traffic surveys undertaken in January/ February 2024; and
- 3) Subject to the outcome of the above, decides if officers should commission independent 24/7 speed and traffic surveys on Edinburgh Drive, at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors.

## Reasons for recommendations

The Petition Hearing will provide a valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners regarding their concerns and suggestions.

## Alternative options considered/ risk management

None at this stage.

## Select Committee comments

None at this stage.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. Two valid petitions, signed mainly by residents of Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham have been submitted to the Council. As both petitions are broadly focussed on the same location and similar concerns, it seems appropriate to consider both requests at the same time. The Cabinet Member may be interested to hear that a third petition from Edinburgh Drive has also been submitted but unfortunately did not meet the Councils' threshold to be considered as valid.
2. The first of the valid petitions has been signed under the following heading

*"Request for a one-way system and traffic calming measures, Edinburgh Drive*

*We the undersigned petition the Hillingdon Council to install a one-way system and traffic calming measures in Edinburgh Drive"*

*The lead petitioner also helpfully provided the following information:*

*We, the residents of Edinburgh Drive, urge the Council to take immediate action to address the dangerous traffic conditions on our road.*

*Edinburgh Drive is frequently used as a cut-through to Glebe Avenue or as an access point to the main road. Drivers, particularly those coming from Long Lane and the high school side, often speed through is residential area. The bend in the road creates a blind spot, leading to hazardous situations where the vehicles are forced onto the pavement to pass. This has resulted in aggressive behaviour from some drivers and poses a serious risk to pedestrians and residents.*

*It is deeply concerning that a neighbour tragically lost their life on the slip road off Glebe Avenue before any action was taken by the Council. We do not want to see another preventable tragedy occur.*

*We respectfully request that the Council prioritised this issue and implements necessary changes without delay".*

3. The second petition has been signed under the following heading:
4. *"Speed bumps"*

5. For completeness the third petition, was signed by one resident under the following heading:  
*“We the undersigned petition Hillingdon Council to place speed bumps along Edinburgh Drive to slow down drivers that use the road to cut-through traffic on Long Lane during rush hour.”*
6. In addition, the following information was submitted:  
*“Although the council’s traffic report came back with insufficient evidence to support the argument for speed bumps due to the average speed of traffic being below the threshold, we believe that the “average speed” has no correlation with the risk of life that is caused when non-residents decide to use our road as cut through during the busiest time of the evening. Cars are exceeding the residential limit just to beat 2-3 minutes of traffic and causing a huge risk to residents of the area.*  
  
*The road is often busy as this time, with Douay Martyrs children walking to Ickenham Station, the local bus stop, or to parents’ cars parked along the road. We have elderly residents who walk to and from Ickenham shops and young children who enjoy using the front of their houses to play. These residents no longer feel safe outside the front of their homes, as a direct result of this fast-moving traffic.”*
7. Officers have interrogated the most recently available official police recorded collision data for the last five years and there have been no recorded incidents on Edinburgh Drive. However, this data may not include any recent collisions or crashes that the emergency services do not attend and so do not form part of the Police database records.
8. Both petitions mention so-called ‘speed bumps and traffic calming measures’; if by these, as seems likely, petitioners are thinking of the older type of round-topped narrow transverse road humps – often known colloquially in the past as ‘sleeping policemen’ - then the Cabinet Member will be aware that the vast majority of councils, Hillingdon included, have not introduced these particular types of measure for many years.
9. Having said that, various forms of traffic calming features could be considered, where appropriate, if there is a case for them. However, petitioners may wish to consider that such features can sometimes have the unintended effect of increasing noise from passing traffic, notably skip lorries and similar commercial vehicles which may carry loose loads.
10. Horizontal traffic calming measures, such as chicanes and similar measures, are seldom suitable for the average residential road; they can cause loss of parking, are visually intrusive and are less effective at actually reducing the speeds, of cars and vans in particular. The Cabinet Member may wish to advise the petitioners to consider these factors in their own deliberations and it should be noted that any form of physical measures can prove to be ‘popular’ and ‘unpopular’ in equal measures.
11. The Cabinet Member may be aware that independent speed and traffic surveys were undertaken in January/ February 2024 and a table of the results are attached below:

	Total Vehicles	0 - 20 mph	20 - 25 mph	25 - 30 mph	30 - 35 mph	35 - 40 mph	40 - 100 mph	85th% mph
<b>North of The Paddock</b>								
Northbound	2,842	1,180	1,201	326	30	5	0	25
Southbound	1,216	792	345	72	7	0	0	23
<b>South of The Paddock</b>								
Northbound	2,922	1,184	977	558	166	29	8	27
Southbound	1,109	600	352	107	41	8	1	25

12. This chart shows that the 85% of speeds in Edinburgh Drive were found to be between 23 and 27 mph. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is the speed at which or below 85% of vehicles are travelling within the road segment. As one of the petitions made reference to 'average speeds', it is perhaps worth noting that the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is as a rule somewhat higher than a simple 'average' and is also used internationally as a reliable statistical tool to help assess speed patterns.
13. However, it is appreciated that traffic patterns may evolve over time, and so subject to the above the Cabinet Member may be minded to commission further independent 24/7 speed and traffic surveys on Edinburgh Drive at locations agreed with petitioners and Ward Councillors. This would then result in two sets of data representing traffic patterns in Edinburgh Drive.
14. As the Cabinet Member will be aware, independent traffic surveys are a reliable and well-established means to understand the real situation on the ground. These surveys generally use specialist equipment, including pneumatic tubes which are mounted temporarily on the road surface, fitted transversely across the whole width of the carriageway. These devices are installed for a period of at least a week or ten days and monitor traffic movements on a '24/7' basis. The discreet equipment is sufficiently sophisticated such that not only can it record traffic speeds at any given time, but also records the size and type of vehicles, from motorcycles to large multi-axel lorries.
15. Petitioners have suggested implementing a one-way system and whilst the introduction of one-way working is feasible and can prove to be a useful traffic management tool in certain circumstances, there are nevertheless two important factors which also need to be borne in mind.
16. Firstly, whilst the introduction of a one-way working would undoubtedly remove the attractiveness of the route through Edinburgh Drive for some drivers, this could also impact directly on residents in adjacent roads such as The Paddock and Edinburgh Close and possibly over a wider area.
17. It is appreciated that some residents who signed the petition do not live on Edinburgh Drive and whilst it is helpful that the lead petitioner has sought the views of nearby roads, it would be important to establish, through consultation on detailed proposals, that there is widespread support for such a change from the wider community, which will, in turn, determine the success of any scheme.

18. The second factor which should be borne in mind is that a possible unintended side effect of the introduction of a one-way working is usually the increase in average traffic speeds. With one-way working, drivers will often inevitably travel more quickly in the certain knowledge that they will not meet oncoming traffic.
19. In order to counteract this, some form of traffic calming measures, such as the ones suggested in both petitions, often prove necessary to try to counteract such increases in traffic speeds. There is of course a further risk that even if traffic calming is added, a one-way working could increase 'rat-running' at certain times, in the knowledge that drivers will not meet any opposing traffic flow. Finally, on this point, as the Cabinet Member will be aware, traffic calming can have unwelcome nuisance impacts if, for example, large commercial vehicles (in particular skip lorries) use the road.
20. The above points are set out in order to ensure that some possible consequences of the introduction of a one-way working are understood from the outset of any investigations and deliberations with petitioners.
21. It is also recommended that if they have not already done so, residents raise their concerns directly with the Metropolitan Police because they alone have the necessary powers to tackle speeding and inconsiderate driving in general (if this is the case in Edinburgh Drive) through enforcement. Physical traffic calming and traffic management can be effective tools, but as mentioned previously, it can also have unwelcome side effects including an increase in noise caused by traffic passing through.

### **Financial Implications**

Subject to the outcome of discussion with petitioners, the Cabinet Member may request the commissioning of speed and traffic surveys. The current cost of these is c.£85 per location, with spend managed through the existing Transportation revenue budgets.

## **RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION**

### **The benefit or impact upon Hillingdon residents, service users and communities**

To allow the Cabinet Member to consider the petitioners' request.

### **Consultation & engagement carried out (or required)**

None at this stage.

## **CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

Corporate Finance has reviewed the recommendations to this report and concurs with the financial implications as set out above.

## **Legal**

Legal Services confirm that there are no specific legal implications to following the recommendations within this report in relation to the petitions received for traffic-calming measures and a one-way system on Edinburgh Drive, Ickenham.

A meeting with the petitioners is in line with the Council's constitution and is a perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise, especially where consideration of the policy, factual and engineering issues are still at a formative stage. Public law principles provide that there must be no predetermination of a decision in advance of any wider consultation. Therefore, decision makers must ensure there is a full consideration of all representations arising, including those which do not accord with their own.

Should there be a decision that the road measures are to be considered further, then the relevant statutory provisions for these measures will have to be identified and considered.

### **Comments from other relevant service areas**

None at this stage.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Petitions

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A – Location plan