

COPPERFIELD AVENUE, UXBRIDGE- PETITION FOR TRAFFIC RESTRICTION/TRAFFIC CALMING

Cabinet Member(s)	Cllr Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Planning, Transportation & Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Sophie Bernacki Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1. Location Plan Appendix 2. Site Photographs

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To advise the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from the residents of Copperfield Avenue, Hillingdon requesting measures to be put in place to stop persistent anti social behaviour by drivers.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The petition will be considered within the context of the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Implementation Plan including the transport strategy and road safety strategy
Financial Cost	There are no financial implications of this report at this stage.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' & Environmental Services
Ward(s) affected	Brunel

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets with and listens to the petitioners concerns regarding anti-social behaviour by drivers along Copperfield Avenue and their request for traffic restriction / calming measures.**
- 2. Subject to the above, asks Officers to undertake a 24/7 traffic volume and speed survey, with the location of the survey to be agreed with the petitioners.**
- 3. Subject to the above, asks officers to consider the petitioners' suggestions, undertake further studies and report back to him.**

4. Asks Officers to liaise with the local police Safer Neighbourhood Team with regard to the allegations of antisocial behaviour by drivers.

Reasons for recommendation

To give the Cabinet Member the opportunities to discuss in detail the petitioners' concerns. To investigate in further detail the request of the petitioners.

Alternative options considered / risk management

Options will be discussed with the petitioners.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage.

3. INFORMATION

Supporting Information

1. A petition with 20 signatures has been submitted to the Council under the following heading:

'We the undersigned, call upon Hillingdon Borough Council to introduce permanent traffic calming measures in Copperfield Avenue, UB8 3NU by road narrowing and yellow lines to deter traffic flow and anti-social behaviour, prevent cars waiting and parking, and restrict traffic speed.'

2. Copperfield Avenue, Colham Green, Hillingdon is a residential 'no through road' which is 390 metres in length, with a north/ south orientation. Public highway access to Copperfield Avenue is from Pield Heath Road only. The majority of the road provides footway parking which is for permit holders only, operating Monday to Friday 9am – 5pm. The remainder has either single yellow lines or keep clear markings. At the far end of the Avenue there are double yellow lines to ensure that the space is clear for vehicles needing to turn around. It should be noted that there have been no recorded personal injury traffic accidents in the past three years up to April 2012.

3. There are sixty two residential properties on Copperfield Avenue. It should be noted that the signatures on the petition all come from households at the beginning of the street, the southern most section and none of the addresses of signatories are higher in number than 16. This may indicate that the terms of the petition are only supported by residents living at the southernmost end of the street. It is not known whether the petitioners' views are shared by residents living further along Copperfield Avenue.

4. There is an adopted access road between Copperfield Avenue and Colham Road for use by pedestrians only. There are bollards half way along to prevent vehicles using this access road. There is no parking permitted in this location. The quality of the access road is not appropriate for a highway access suitable to accommodate vehicles.

5. The letter accompanying the petition states:

'Several ideas have been suggested before; making the road one-way or blocking off entry from Pield Heath Road, allowing only access to the shops. Both of these would require the formal use of the access road to Colham Road. Another popular suggestion was to make the road 'Access for Residents' only, but it appears that this cannot be enforced. However, recently it came to our notice, after Thames Water Contractors were in the road for two weeks, that by restricting the road width (they restricted it outside numbers 1 and 3), the problems ceased. We therefore request that a permanent, road restriction be planned and installed at these points and other associated restrictive measures, such as waiting for right of way vehicles outside number 2 to combat any anti social behaviour by the corner of the shops.'

The following options discussed in turn below are those outlined within the letter accompanying the petition.

6. **One-way operation / Blocking off entry from Pield Heath Road:** as stated within the petition, either of these actions would require the use of the access road between Copperfield Avenue and Colham Road. This road whilst adopted public highway is too narrow and not suitably surfaced to carry heavy traffic levels and so cannot be recommended.

7. The Cabinet Member will also be aware that when one way working is introduced there is often an increase in traffic speed as drivers no longer expect to meet any vehicles travelling towards them.

8. Either of these measures would also increase the volume of traffic using Colham Road. Colham Road itself is physically blocked off from traffic at Pield Heath Road by a section of footway and bollards which only allow access for pedestrians and pedal cycles. This results in access to Colham Road being restricted to Royal Lane only. Blocking off entry to Copperfield Avenue from Pield Heath Road would therefore result in a considerable detour for residents along Copperfield Avenue and increased traffic pressure on Royal Lane.

9. **Access for residents only:** as acknowledged in the petition letter, making the road access only for residents is unenforceable.

10. **Road width restriction:** it has been suggested that introducing a width restriction along Copperfield Avenue would curb the anti social driving behaviour being experienced.

11. Local residents have suggested that this restriction be outside house numbers one and three. Should a width restriction be put in place, however, people driving out of Copperfield Avenue would be required to give way to those entering the road. This is in order to ensure that there are no queues forming back onto the Copperfield Avenue/Pield Heath Road junction. Initial desktop investigations indicate that there could be scope to provide a width restriction but it could potentially result in a significant loss of parking for residents and would restrict access to the driveways to some properties.

12. Width restrictions of this kind are usually five metres in length and finding a suitable location for it would be difficult. It could not be located too close to the junction with Pield Heath

Road and further north along the road most properties have dropped kerbs. It is likely that at least two properties would have access to their driveways severely restricted.

13. In 2009 there was a request by residents for road signs to be installed such as 'No turning beyond this point' or 'No delivery vehicles beyond this point'. As the Cabinet Member will be aware, all traffic signs used on the Public Highway must be compliant with National traffic sign design standards, and unfortunately the signs suggested by residents would not have been compliant. Consequently it was not possible to carry forward these suggestions.

14. Residents also requested an 'Access Only' sign for the access road between Copperfield Avenue and Colham Road in February 2008. Unfortunately, this request similarly does not comply with the regulations for signage on the public highway.

15. Officers did undertake a further assessment in 2011 following a request from a resident, but it was found that there was very low traffic flow and all vehicles which were observed with speed measuring equipment were found to be travelling under the speed limit for the road (currently 30mph).

16. The Council no longer introduces some forms of 'vertical' traffic calming such as round-topped speed humps, but does consider flat topped speed tables where the circumstances justify their use and there is also support from a majority of those residents affected. The installation of 'horizontal' traffic calming devices such as islands, width restrictions or chicanes can be considered but as noted above, these often result in significant loss of parking, which in residential roads like Copperfield Avenue may be unpopular.

17. The Cabinet Member will be aware that the Council has a road safety suggestion programme which is designed to address concerns of interest to local residents. The Cabinet Member may therefore wish, after hearing from the petitioners, to consider instructing Officers to undertake further investigations into possible options and to report their findings back to him.

18. The Cabinet Member will be further aware that the Council sometimes commissions special 24/7 traffic surveys to establish the volume and speed of traffic in a particular location. These surveys can provide evidence to support the case for any traffic calming measures. The Cabinet Member may therefore wish to consider instructing Officers to commission such a survey in Copperfield Avenue with the location of the survey to be agreed with the petitioners, reporting the survey results back to him and Ward Members.

19. Due to the petitioners' explicit reference to anti-social behaviour by drivers, the Cabinet Member may also wish to instruct Officers to liaise with the local police 'Safer Neighbourhood Team' (SNT) with regard to these allegations of antisocial behaviour. Further investigation by the SNT could potentially lead to some enforcement action and if appropriate support the case for further measures.

Financial Implications

None at this stage.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

It will allow for consideration of petitioners' concerns over the anti social behaviour and detailed design and consultation on proposed measures.

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None at this stage.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications.

Legal

There are no special legal implications for the proposal, which amounts to an informal consultation. A meeting with the petitioners is perfectly legitimate as part of a listening exercise, especially where consideration of the policy, factual and engineering issues are still at a formative stage. Fairness and natural justice requires that there must be no predetermination of a decision in advance of any wider non-statutory consultation.

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

In considering any informal 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.

Corporate Property and Construction

None at this stage.

Relevant Service Groups

None at this stage

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition Report received, date 9th July 2012.