# TITLE: QUEENS WALK / MOUNT PLEASANT, RUISLIP – PETITION REQUESTING A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING.

 Cabinet Member
 Councillor Keith Burrows

 Cabinet Portfolio
 Cabinet Member of Planning and Transportation

 Officer Contact
 Minaxshree Rana

 Papers with report
 Appendix A

#### **HEADLINE INFORMATION**

Purpose of report	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition of 36 signatures has been received from local residents requesting the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Queens Walk, near the junction with Mount Pleasant.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The request can be considered in relation to the Council's Road Safety Programme.
Financial Cost	There are none associated with the recommendations in this report.

Relevant Policy Overview Committee Residents' and Environmental Services

Ward(s) affected

Cavendish

#### RECOMMENDATION

#### **That the Cabinet Member:**

- I. Acknowledges the petition request and meets with petitioners to discuss their concerns in greater detail.
- II. Asks Officers to investigate suitable source of funding to install the cycle / pedestrian path and pedestrian crossing which forms part of Field End school's Travel Plan.

## **INFORMATION**

Cabinet Member Petition Hearing 27 January 2010 Part I – Members. Public and Press

### Reasons for recommendation

To pursue a funding source for the provision of Cycle / Pedestrian facilities which form part of Field End school's Travel Plan.

### Alternative options considered

The petitioners have made a specific request

# **Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)**

None at this stage

## **Supporting Information**

- 1. A petition has been submitted to the Council with 36 signatures requesting for the installation of a pedestrian crossing on the junction of Queens Walk and Mount Pleasant, Ruislip. The petitioner's reasons for a pedestrian crossing are not stated in the petition, however this can be discussed with the Cabinet Member at the hearing. As the Queens Walk / Mount Pleasant junction has four arms, the petitioner organiser was informally consulted on which arm of the junction is of most concern. The location for a crossing suggested by the petition organiser is on the northern arm of Queens Walk.
- 2. Queens Walk is a residential road aligned north south extending between Whitby Road and Victoria Road. Deanesfield Primary School and Queensmead School are located at its southern end. The junction with Mount Pleasant is at its northern end, which also connects with Torcross Road. Just north of the junction is Yeading Brook, which runs east –west behind the houses in Torcross Road and Mount Pleasant. The road layout is shown on Appendix A.
- 3. The Cabinet Member will recall hearing a petition in March 2007 when pupils of Field End School requested a Cycle path leading to their School entrance. The reasons were that it would decrease the amount of congestion outside the school entrance and by reducing the number of cars taking pupils to and from the school, it would lead to cleaner air and provide a healthier lifestyle for pupils. Following the petition hearing, a feasibility study was conducted as part of the School's Travel Plan.
- 4. A scheme has been developed with the support of the school along with Councillors and other key stakeholders. The key element of the proposal is a shared cycle / pedestrian path which will link Field End Road and Bessingby Playing fields along the same alignment as Yeading Brook. This is also shown on Appendix A. As part of the scheme, a pedestrian crossing is proposed which will allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross Queens Walk in greater safety. This location is close to the Queens Road / Mount Pleasant junction and could provide a safe crossing for both users of the cycle / pedestrian path and pedestrians on Queens Walk. Cyclists would be required to dismount to use a zebra crossing.

### 5. Accident Analysis

The accident data for the junction of Queens Walk / Mount Pleasant / Torcross Road (based on a 50 metre radius and for a period 3 years ending May 2009) shows that there has been one accident which occurred at the junction of Queens Walk and Torcross Road. The accident Cabinet Member Petition Hearing 27 January 2010
Part I – Members. Public and Press

occurred in wet conditions when a vehicle that was travelling southwards on Queens Walk collided with a vehicle, which was turning right to go southwards out of Torcross Road. The accident data, which was analysed, as previously stated, only covers a period of 3 years ending May 2009. However the Cabinet Member will recall another petition he heard on 30 November 2005 in response to an unfortunate and tragic road accident on Queens Walk involving fatal injuries, which occurred on 21 October. The petitioners were calling for speed reducing measures and improved street lighting on Queens Walk particularly in the section between Torcross Road and Whitby Road. As the police would subsequently report following an investigation of the accident, the Cabinet Member requested Officers liaise with the police to formulate proposals that would be acceptable to local residents. The proposed location of the pedestrian crossing would greatly contribute to the residents' request for speed reduction and improved road safety.

## **Financial Implications**

There are none directly arising from the recommendations of the report. However if it is decided to go ahead with the proposal, as there is not currently a potential funding source, the second recommendation involves making a bid to TfL.

### **EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES**

#### What will be the effect of the recommendation?

Increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Queens Walk.

## **Consultation Carried Out or Required**

At this stage no consultations have been carried out. If an approval is given to the installation of this crossing, Public Notice will be given for members of the public to comment. The major stakeholders including the Metropolitan Police, London Fire Service and local bus companies will be consulted as part of this process.

#### CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS

**Corporate Finance** 

N/A

## **Corporate Procurement**

### Legal

Consultation must be undertaken when proposals are still at a formative stage, must give sufficient reasons to permit the consultee to make a meaningful response, must allow adequate time for consideration and response, and the results of the consultation must be conscientiously taken into account in finalising any proposals. Fairness and natural justice requires that there must be no predetermination of a decision other than a legitimate predisposition to a certain conclusion: see R (Wainwright) v Richmond upon Thames London Borough Council [2001] EWCA Civ 2062, [2001] All ER (D) 422, and Bovis Homes Ltd v New Forest District Council [2002] EWHC 483 (Admin).

Cabinet Member Petition Hearing 27 January 2010 Part I – Members. Public and Press

### **Legal Powers**

In relation to a zebra crossing the Council has powers contained in the following:

- The zebra crossing will be introduced using its powers contained in The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ("the Act");
- The crossing shall be indicated in the manner prescribed in The Zebra, Pelican and Puffin Pedestrian Crossing Regulations and General Directions 1997("the Regulations").

Section 23(2) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides that before establishing a crossing the local traffic authority shall: -

- I. Consult with the chief officer of police about their proposal to do so;
- II. Shall give public notice of that proposal to do so; and
- III. Shall inform the Secretary of State in writing.

When exercising their function conferred by or under the Act, the Council are under a duty imposed by section 122 of the Act to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. The Council must, so far as practicable, have regard to a number of matters set out in Section 122 (2), which are as follows: -

- I. The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises.
- II. The effect on the amenities of any locality affected, including the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles so as to preserve or to improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run.
- III. The National Air Quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environmental Act 1995.
- IV. The importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or wishing to use such vehicles.
- V. Any other matter appearing to the Local Authority to be relevant.

As stated above before establishing a crossing the Council must, inter alia, give public notice of the proposal. That duty encompasses a duty to consider representations received in response to such a notice.

The Council's powers to carry out these and other works are comprised in the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The crux is that exercising these powers with the object of improving highway safety is lawful, other relevant considerations such as the expeditious movement of traffic, amenity,. If specific advice is required in relation to the exercise of individual powers, Legal Services should be instructed. For example, depending on the precise option decided upon and (if appropriate) implemented, then consideration ought to be given to whether the procedures under 90GA of the Highways Act 1980 should be followed. The procedures relate to certain traffic calming works in London such as overrun areas and pinch points.

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 govern road traffic orders, traffic signs and road markings and there are no special circumstances drawn to our attention that would prevent the scheme proceeding provided that the appropriate statutory procedures are followed.

Cabinet Member Petition Hearing 27 January 2010 Part I – Members, Public and Press

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Appendix A ACCSMap – Accident Analysis System Cabinet Member report 30/11/05