

MONTAGUE ROAD, UXBRIDGE – PETITION REQUESTING FURTHER SPEED AND TRAFFIC SURVEYS.

Cabinet Member	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact	Steven Austin Planning, Environment, Education and Community Services
Papers with report	Appendix A

HEADLINE INFORMATION

Purpose of report	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents living in Montague Road Uxbridge asking for another 24/7 speed and traffic survey.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The request can be considered as part of the Council's strategy for road safety.
Financial Cost	The cost to arrange a speed and traffic classification survey in two locations in Montague Road is £370.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services
Ward(s) affected	Uxbridge North

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets and discusses with petitioners their concerns regarding rat-running and speeding on Montague Road.**
- 2. Subject to 1 above decides if officers should commission further independent 24/7 speed and traffic surveys at locations agreed with the petitioners and report back to the Cabinet Member.**

INFORMATION

Reasons for recommendation

To investigate in further detail concerns of the petitioners.

Alternative options considered

None as petitioners have made a specific request.

Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

Supporting Information

1. A petition of 20 valid signatures has been received from residents of Montague Road, Uxbridge under the following heading

“This is a new petition to the London Borough of Hillingdon regarding the rat run and speeding in Montague Road as the Council did not agree with us on the last petition”

2. Montague Road is a narrow mainly residential road close to Uxbridge Town Centre. The location is indicated on the plan attached as Appendix A to this report.

3. The Cabinet Member will remember hearing a petition in March 2009 from residents of Montague Road, Iffley Close, Grove Road and Grove Way requesting a change to the residents' parking scheme such that it would operate at all times. In a letter attached to that petition, the organiser raised concerns about traffic using Montague Road and Grove Road as a 'rat run' *“to and from The Chimes car park at great speed to beat the traffic lights”*

4. Following the meeting with petitioners the request to extend the times of operation of the permit scheme was added to the parking scheme programme. Following extensive consultation with residents, which have shown a positive level of support, the changes to the operational times will be implemented this winter. The additional request to investigate options to deal with 'rat running' and traffic speeds was considered separately under the Council's road safety programme.

5. Over a week long period between 10th and 16th June 2010 a 24 hour independent speed and traffic classification survey was undertaken at one location on Montague Road between its junctions with Grove Road and Iffley Close. The data was captured using "road tubes" which accurately measure vehicle speeds and types.

6. The data from this survey indicated that the 85th percentile was 20.1 mph eastbound and 18.8 mph westbound. This is the speed at which 85% of vehicles travel at or below which is the standards used by the police service, motoring organisations and road safety practitioners. These moderate traffic speeds were not considered sufficient grounds to consider any additional traffic calming measures in the area.

7. However, in a covering letter and attached plan submitted with the present petition the lead petitioner suggests that the residents are unhappy with the speed data captured and stated the following;

“We enclose a new petition regarding the rat run and speeding in Montague Road, as the residents are NOT convinced with your report.

The red line marked on the enclosed map of Montague Road, is where the Council put the traffic and speed check wires. This is where traffic HAS to slow down, due to a junction (Grove Road), and also a chicane, which is caused because the residents parking changes here from one side of the road to the other. When drivers pass this chicane, they then speed off again. We, the residents, would like a speed check put in where marked on the map, not where it was before”.

8. It would appear from the petition that residents are still concerned with vehicle speeds in Montague Road and have suggested two alternative locations where they believe the surveys would support their concerns. Therefore, subject to discussions with residents, the Cabinet Member may decide to instruct officers to commission a further independent speed and vehicle count survey at two locations on Montague Road. It is recommended that petitioners be invited to confirm the precise locations they wish these surveys to take place are as indicated on the attached plan as Appendix A.

Financial Implications

The cost of a speed and traffic survey for two locations in Montague Road is £370 which subject to the usual approvals could be funded from the Road Safety Programme budget. This would require the approval of release of funding from capital moratorium.

EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns with traffic speeds in Montague Road.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None at this stage.

CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Property and Construction

The Head of Corporate Property and Construction is in support of the recommendations in this report.

Legal

There are no special legal implications for the recommendations outlined above.

Should there be a decision that further measures are to be considered following the 24/7 speed and traffic surveys, then the relevant statutory provisions will have to be identified and considered.

In considering the consultation responses, decision makers must ensure there is a full consideration of all representations arising including those which do not accord with the officer recommendation. The decision maker must be satisfied that responses from the public are conscientiously taken into account.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition received – 7th June 2011