

PARK AVENUE, RUISLIP - PETITION REQUESTING TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES

Cabinet Member(s)	Councillor Keith Burrows
Cabinet Portfolio(s)	Planning, Transportation and Recycling
Officer Contact(s)	Catherine Flew Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendices A & B & C

1. HEADLINE INFORMATION

Summary	To inform the Cabinet Member that the Council has received a petition requesting traffic calming measures on Park Avenue, Ruislip.
Contribution to our plans and strategies	The request can be considered as part of the Council's Road Safety Programme.
Financial Cost	Subject to the outcome of the petition hearing, recommendation 3 will incur costs which can be funded from an allocation from existing revenue budgets for the transportation service.
Relevant Policy Overview Committee	Residents' & Environmental Services.
Ward(s) affected	Eastcote and East Ruislip Ward.

2. RECOMMENDATION

Meeting with the Petitioners, the Cabinet Member:

- 1. Considers their concerns regarding vehicle speeds in Park Avenue;**
- 2. Notes the previous work associated with an earlier traffic calming scheme installed in Park Avenue during 2011, relevant details of which are set out in the body of this report;**
- 3. Subject to the above, decides if officers should undertake further classified traffic volume and speed survey(s) at location(s) to be agreed with the petitioners and the relevant Ward Members ;**
- 4. Subject to the above asks officers to add the petitioners' request to the Council's Road Safety Programme for further investigation.**

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Reasons for recommendations

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 39 signatures has been submitted to the Council, requesting traffic calming measures on Park Avenue, Ruislip. The petitioners are residents of Park Avenue.
2. In a covering letter, the lead petitioner has stated the following:-
"In short, all the people we spoke with are extremely concerned at the excessive speed cars and motorbikes drive down Park Avenue, they are also having trouble backing into and out of their own driveways, it makes parking in your own driveway very tricky indeed. Some complained of damage to their motor vehicles and most are increasingly worried for the safety of small children and the elderly residents. Everyone agreed there is a huge speed issue in the road.

As you can see from the petition, the residents are keen for either speed bumps to be installed or a gate at the top of the road to prevent traffic altogether".

3. The Cabinet Member will recall the installation of a traffic calming scheme in Park Avenue and Kings College Road in 2011, following an earlier petition request. The scheme consisted of two new raised tables and new slow markings with antiskid surfacing on the section of Park Avenue between its junctions with Bury Street and Kings College Road.
4. The Council commissioned independent 24 hour / 7 day vehicle speeds and volume surveys at two locations in Park Avenue, and one site in Kings College Road, following the installation of the traffic calming measures to review vehicle speeds in these roads. A summary of the speed survey results are attached as Appendix B to this report.
5. The Cabinet Member will be aware that the 85th percentile speed is the speed at or below which 85% of the traffic is travelling, and is the standard statistical tool used by traffic engineers when assessing speeding issues. The 85th percentile speed is usually higher than the average speed and so is a more reliable measure of assessing prevailing traffic speeds. The speed survey results indicated that the 85th percentile speeds for all three sites had reduced following implementation of the traffic calming schemes. The latest traffic survey results also indicated that the majority of vehicles were travelling below or close to the 30mph speed. The Council has also reviewed vehicle speeds on Park Avenue between its junctions with Bury Street and St

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

Martin's Approach. A summary of these speed survey results are attached as Appendix C to this report. The latest survey undertaken in January 2012 indicated an 85th percentile speed of 32.7 mph eastbound and 32.9 mph westbound.

6. Analysis of the latest available Police recorded personal injury data for the three year period ending April 2016 has indicated that there have been two incidents on Park Avenue between the junctions with Bury Street and Kings College Road. One of these collisions involved a motorist travelling westbound on Park Avenue who lost vision due to the sun and collided with a bollard. The second collision took place at the junction of Park Avenue and Kings College when a motorist lost control and collided into the rear of a second vehicle.

7. The Council has invested in a number of Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS), which flash a warning sign to motorists exceeding the speed limit. These signs have been found to be most effective if they are installed at key sites, left in place for three months and then moved to another site. Subject to the outcome of further investigations, it is suggested that the Cabinet Member considers asking officers to add Park Avenue to a future phase of the Council's VAS programme.

8. To assist with investigations concerning the speed of vehicles using Park Avenue, it is suggested that the Cabinet Member may be minded to consider asking officers to commission further independent 24 hour / 7 day vehicle speed and classification surveys at locations agreed by the petitioners and Ward Councillors.

9. Although the Council does not install traditional round-topped road humps as would appear to have been suggested by the petitioners, the Council can consider the installation of further flat-topped raised tables like the existing ones in Park Avenue and Kings College Road where these are supported by traffic survey results and further investigations including the positioning of existing vehicle accesses.

10. The Cabinet Member will note that the lead petitioner has made reference to an idea put forward by some petitioners of a gate at the end of Park Avenue, presumably at its junction with Bury Street. The site already has a dual width restriction which governs the size of vehicles which can pass through at this point and this width restriction undoubtedly has a governing effect on vehicle speeds. This imposition of a gate at this point would require extensive consultation and would impose inconvenient detours for many residents, not only of Park Avenue but also Keswick Gardens, St Edmunds Avenue, Broadwood Avenue, Sherwood Avenue and St Martin's Approach. For these reasons, the Cabinet Member may feel that such an idea is not viable.

11. In response to the petition, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member meets the petitioners and listens to their concerns, and decides if this request should be added to the Council's Road Safety Programme for further detailed investigations and the possible development of options, subject to the outcome of the speed and traffic surveys.

Financial Implications

Subject to the outcome of the petition hearing, recommendation 3 will incur costs which can be funded from an allocation from existing revenue budgets for the transportation service.

4. EFFECT ON RESIDENTS, SERVICE USERS & COMMUNITIES

PART I - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

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 this report and confirms that there are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations set out above.

Legal

There are no special legal implications for the proposal to discuss with petitioners their request for traffic calming measures in Park Avenue, Ruislip, 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.

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.

Corporate Property and Construction

None at this stage.

Relevant Service Groups

None at this stage.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.