

LADYGATE LANE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Steven Austin Residents Services Directorate
Papers with report	Appendix A

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition asking for traffic calming measures on Ladygate Lane, Ruislip.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The request can be considered as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.
Financial Cost	There are no direct costs associated with the recommendations to this report.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' and Environmental Services.
Ward(s) affected	West Ruislip

2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Meets with petitioners and considers their request for traffic calming measures in Ladygate Lane, Ruislip.**
- 2. Subject to the above, asks officers to undertake a 24/7 speed and traffic volume survey at locations on Ladygate Lane to be agreed with the petitioners and to report the results back to the Cabinet Member and Local Ward Councillors.**
- 3. Subject to the above asks officers to add the petitioners' request to the Council's Road Safety Programme for further investigation into possible traffic calming measures.**

Reasons for recommendation

Cabinet Member Report – 19 February 2014

PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

The petition hearing will provide a valuable opportunity to hear directly from the petitioners of their concerns and suggestions.

Alternative options considered / risk management

None at this stage.

Policy Overview Committee comments

None at this stage

3. INFORMATION

Supporting Information

1. A petition with a total of 69 signatures, of which 39 are deemed valid in terms of the Council's Constitution, has been submitted to the Council. The signatures are mainly by residents who live in Ladygate Lane, Ruislip but the petition has also been signed by residents in surrounding roads, all of them asking for traffic calming measures to be introduced in Ladygate Lane, Ruislip.
2. In an accompanying letter submitted with the petition, residents highlight their major concerns as being the speed of vehicles using the road and the difficulties in exiting Ladygate Lane at its junction with Bury Street.
3. As residents have rightly pointed out, Ladygate Lane is a mainly residential road which serves Whiteheath Junior and Infant School and is an attractive route for vehicles travelling from the Ruislip/ Northwood/ Pinner areas to access the A40 and beyond. The road is served by the 331 bus route and is categorised as one of the Hillingdon's "link roads" which connect the Borough's main distributor routes to the secondary distributor road network. A plan of the area is attached as Appendix A to this report.
4. Ladygate Lane is a road of two halves which whilst they carry the same traffic have arguably distinct characteristics. The section from the junctions with Bury Street and with Whiteheath Avenue is quite wide, with deceptive sweeping sections past the various side road junctions in between, some of which have less than optimum visibility (such as Marlborough Avenue). The reasonably generous width of the road and the relatively low levels of on-street parking in this section are conducive to higher traffic speeds.
5. To the north of Whiteheath Avenue, Ladygate Lane remains reasonably wide for a short section but beyond the junction with Westwood Close becomes considerably narrower and continues in this vein as far as the junction with Breakspear Road. This section experiences much heavier on street parking, especially at peak school drop-off and pick-up times. Some houses in this northern end have comparatively less off street parking and consequently on-street parking levels tend to be higher at all times. Parking space is constrained by the presence of the 331 bus stops here and possibly some overflow parking from Leaholme Waye.
6. Previous improvements undertaken in Ladygate Lane include the introduction of a Zebra Crossing with special high-conspicuity 'Zebrite' Belisha Beacons near the main front entrance to the school and the inclusion of a site facing southbound traffic near the Bowls Club within the

Council's 'Vehicle Activated Sign' programme. The latter, as the Cabinet Member will be aware, involves the erection of an illuminated electronic signs with an inbuilt vehicle detector which flashes a warning to the drivers of approaching vehicles to advise them to slow down.

7. Experience has shown that these signs tend to be more effective when they are periodically moved to other sites and brought back again at intervals, in order to avoid them having less of an impact due to drivers becoming overly familiar with them. The necessary electrical post, supply and secure socket have been provided in Ladygate Lane, which constitute the principal costs of the installation work, and the sign has already been deployed in the road on a number of separate occasions.

8. Petitioners have raised two main issues in their petition through which they helpfully make some very useful suggestions to mitigate their concerns. The first issue they have raised is with vehicle speeds, which they suggest could be addressed by the introduction of traffic calming measures such as "*speed humps, width restrictions and rumble strips*". The petitioners have suggested that vehicle speed is not only an issue when the traffic is relatively light but also at school pick up and dropping off times.

9. It is therefore recommended that the Cabinet Member asks officers to commission independent 24/7 speed and traffic surveys at locations agreed with petitioners. These surveys usually take the form of "road tubes" that are placed across the carriageway to record vehicle types, speeds and volumes over an extended period of at least seven days on a 24 hour a day basis. This data captured will from the basis of any traffic calming measures the Council is able to recommend.

10. The second major concern raised by petitioners is the difficulty in exiting Ladygate Lane at its junction with Bury Street. Similarly residents have eloquently highlighted some of the issues at this junction and again they have suggested some logical solutions to the problem which includes improved sightlines, traffic signals or a mini roundabout.

11. As the Cabinet Member will be aware, this junction has been subject to previous studies and proposals to signalise this junction met with significant local opposition in the form of a petition. Transport for London (TfL), the body responsible for all traffic signals in London, also discounted signalising this junction due to the impact they would have on traffic flow in the surrounding road network and a combination of technical difficulties identified at this location.

12. The visibility distance to the right when exiting Ladygate Lane on to Bury Street is restricted by the wall, trees and hedges of the Larchmont development (all features which were retained as a legacy of the former property). This, in conjunction with the limited carriageway width and narrow footways would appear also to eliminate the possibility of a mini-roundabout at this junction but the Cabinet Member may be minded to ask officers to explore this option in greater detail and report back to him.

13. Officers have undertaken a review of the police accident database with regard to Ladygate Lane. As the Cabinet Member will be aware, this database holds records of all accidents involving some degree of personal injury which derive from the reports of police officers who attend site in the immediate aftermath of the accident in question.

14. The records show that in the most recent years for which data is available (to August 2013), there have been two lone vehicle accidents in Ladygate Lane, both involving loss of

control by the driver. In one of these, a driver (a 60 year old female) appears to have become unwell whilst at the wheel and struck a lamp column (near the school). The other accident was near the junction with Glenfield Crescent where the driver (a 79 year old male) lost control through poor visibility through a misted-up windscreen and so collided with a telegraph pole. Both incidents took place in dark conditions. It may be concluded that speeding was not a significant factor in either of these.

15. To summarise, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member discusses with petitioners their concerns and subject to the outcome of these, agree locations where 24/7 speed and volume surveys could be undertaken. It is also suggested that the Cabinet Member asks officers from the Road Safety and School Travel Team to liaise directly with the school to look at initiatives to promote more sustainable modes of transport to and from the school.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications associated with the recommendations to this report. If after further investigation any measures are subsequently approved by the Council, funding would need to be identified from a suitable source.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

What will be the effect of the recommendation?

To allow the Cabinet Member an opportunity to discuss in detail with petitioners their concerns

Consultation Carried Out or Required

None at this stage.

5. CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate finance has reviewed the above report and concurs with the financial implications stated above.

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 consultation.

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.

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

Corporate Property and Construction

There are no property implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report.

Relevant Service Groups

None at this stage

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Nil