

# TITLE: EDWARDS AVENUE, RUISLIP – PETITION REQUESTING ACTION TO STOP SPEEDING

**Cabinet Portfolio**

Planning and Transportation

**Report Author**

Steve Austin

**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 the South Ruislip area asking for action to stop “dangerous speeding that occurs on Edwards Avenue”.

**Contribution to our plans and strategies**

The petitioner’s request can be considered as part of the Council’s annual programme of road safety initiatives.

**Financial Cost**

There are none associated with the recommendations to this report.

**Relevant Policy Overview Committee**

Residents and Environmental Services

**Ward(s) affected**

South Ruislip

## RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet Member

1. Discusses with petitioners their concern with speeding traffic in detail and the possible options to address issues that would be acceptable to residents.
2. Subject to 1, asks Officers to include the request and possible options in the Road Safety programme.

## INFORMATION

### Reasons for recommendation

The success of traffic measures which address speeding are largely successful if they are acceptable to local residents. These can be identified with petitioners for further detailed investigation by Officers within the Road Safety programme.

### Alternative options considered

These will be discussed with petitioners.

## Comments of Policy Overview Committee(s)

None at this stage

### Supporting Information

1. A petition with 64 signatures has been received from residents in the area of South Ruislip, south and east of Station Approach and West End Road respectively. The signatures consist of half from residents in Edwards Avenue and the remainder from roads within the area.
2. The petition heading is as follows:  
  
*“We, the undersigned, request the council take immediate action to stop the dangerous speeding that occurs along Edwards Avenue and surrounding streets, when motorists try to jump the queue along Station Approach, Ruislip. This speeding occurs at all times of the day, not just at rush hour times. Residents are particularly concerned as children walk along this route to attend Bourne Junior School and feel it is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs”.*
3. The road layout in this part of South Ruislip is indicated on Appendix A and shows Edwards Avenue is parallel with Station Approach. At the junction of West End Road and Station Approach, there are traffic signals and Edwards Avenue from the plan would appear to be an attractive route for motorists to avoid this junction. As a consequence of this, a diagonal road closure was installed at the junction of Edwards Avenue and Mahlon Avenue some years ago and this prevents traffic from Station Approach by-passing the signal installation for access to West End Road. Both Station Approach and West End Road are busy, as the latter is an important link to the A40 Western Avenue. For most of the day, queuing occurs in Station Approach on the approach to West End Road. There is a ‘turn left’ filter from Station Approach into West End Road.
4. It would now seem that due to the extensive queuing on Station Approach towards West End Road, motorists are endeavouring to by-pass the queue and from Appendix A, it would appear a number of side roads along Station Approach link with Edwards Avenue and could be perceived by drivers as an attractive route to “jump” the queue. The petitioners point out this has become a frequent occurrence and that these motorists travel at inappropriate speeds.
5. There are a number of options to address speeding traffic and one could be the introduction of a further diagonal closure. This however would require the support of most residents living within the area whose vehicle journeys could be made more torturous. This would be a more cost effective solution than the introduction of Traffic Calming measures, assuming appropriate ones could be identified in Edwards Avenue. Whatever measures can be developed would require the support of local residents most affected.
6. It is suggested the Cabinet Member discusses in detail with petitioners their concerns with speeding traffic and endeavour to determine options that Officers could investigate in detail as part of the Road Safety programme.

## **Financial Implications**

Any measures that are subsequently approved by the Council would require funding from the Road Safety programme, and would be subject to budget availability and capital release and approval rules. At this stage, the estimated cost for these measures is unknown and will only be determined following investigation and consultation with residents.

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

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

To allow the Cabinet Member to discuss directly with petitioners their concerns and possible measures to address the issues.

### **Consultation Carried Out or Required**

Consultation with local residents would be carried out if suitable traffic measures could be identified to address the petitioners concerns.

## **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Corporate Finance**

### **Legal**

There are no special legal implications for this matter.

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 due course.

In considering any consultation responses arising, 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 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009