

ELM AVENUE & PARK WAY, RUISLIP - REQUEST FOR TRAFFIC CALMING AND SAFETY MEASURES

Cabinet Member	Councillor Jonathan Bianco
Cabinet Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport
Officer Contact	Sophie Wilmot, Place Directorate
Papers with report	Appendix A – Location Plan

HEADLINES

Summary	To inform the Cabinet Member that a petition has been received from residents of both Elm Avenue and Park Way, Ruislip requesting traffic calming and safety measures.
Putting our Residents First Delivering on the Council Strategy 2022-2026	This report supports our ambition for residents/ the Council of: Live active and healthy lives. This report supports our commitments to residents of: A Green and Sustainable Borough.
Financial Cost	The estimated cost associated with the recommendations to this report is £360 and will be managed within existing revenue budgets for the Transportation service.
Relevant Select Committee	Property, Highways and Transport Select Committee.
Relevant Ward	Ruislip, Ruislip Manor and Eastcote

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Cabinet Member for Property, Highways and Transport:

1. meets with petitioners and listens to their request for traffic calming and safety measures in Elm Avenue and Park Way, Ruislip;
2. notes petitioners' concerns over vehicle speeds and level of HGVs on Elm Avenue and Park Way and instructs officers to consider the undertaking of 24/7 speed and vehicle classification surveys (the Cabinet Member may be minded to ask petitioners their views on locations for these);
3. notes the specific feedback provided by ward councillors at an early stage upon receipt of the original petition;

4. asks officers to investigate the feasibility of the petitioners' request for pedestrian crossing in the area, given the constraints, most notably the width of the road; and;
5. based on the results of the traffic surveys and pedestrian refuge feasibility investigations, instructs officers to explore further investigations for improving road safety on Elm Avenue and Park Way, within the scope of petitioners' testimony and report back.

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.

Select Committee comments

None at this stage.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 1) The Council has received a petition, with 60 signatures, from residents of Elm Avenue and Park Way, Ruislip under the following heading:

We the undersigned petition Hillingdon Council to address the following three issues on Elm Avenue and Park Way, Ruislip HA4. a) Speed Limit - b) Weight Limit - c) Pedestrian Refuge Island.

We would like to draw Hillingdon Council's attention towards the following three issues on Elm Avenue and Park Way, Ruislip HA4.

a) Speed Limit - the current speed limit is 30mph, but despite electronic signage warning for this, this is routinely exceeded by vehicles on the road. Therefore, we would like to request Hillingdon Council to review traffic calming measures on this road, with a speed limit of 20mph, in the interest of safety.

b) Weight Limit - HGV over 7.5mt routinely operate on this road, despite 5mt Weight limits/signage applicable between 0830-1830 hrs. These large trucks cause noise, vibrations, and safety issues for the residents on the street. Large trucks use Elm Avenue to access Oak Grove, which has a narrow & weak bridge (despite a new signage), and this can lead to structural problems with the bridge. Therefore, we would like to request Hillingdon Council to review HGV weight and restrictions on this road and install physical restrictions like bollards/height restriction barriers in the interest of safety and environment.

c) Pedestrian Refuge Island - There are no pedestrian refuge islands on the road, despite the road being on a school route. School children crossing two lanes of traffic and a busy intersection (Elm Avenue-Lime Grove-Oak Grove) needs to be reviewed on a priority basis.

Therefore, we are requesting Hillingdon Council to review the use of pedestrian refuge islands on the road in the interest of safety.

- 2) Park Way which becomes Elm Avenue is a long stretch of mainly residential properties running between Windmill Hill and Field End Road. There are a few commercial developments on Park Way, close to the junction with Windmill Hill. Both roads currently have a speed limit of 30moph as denoted by the presence of street lighting. There is a combination of 'no parking' restrictions and single yellow lines restrictions along both roads. A plan of the area is attached as Appendix A.
- 3) The petition has raised concerns over vehicle speeds along mainly residential roads. The Cabinet Member may wish to remind the petitioners that the first port of call for anyone with concerns about traffic speeds will always be the Metropolitan Police, which is presently the only statutory organisation with the necessary powers of enforcement against speeding drivers; speeding is an enforceable offence, which can result in prosecution and, in many cases, points on the driver's licence. Contrary to common belief the Council neither has any speed enforcement powers nor does it own, operate or maintain the safety cameras that are seen on the road network.
- 4) Fortunately, neither Elm Avenue nor Park Road has evidence of a significantly poor road traffic collision record. Officers have interrogated the Police Road Traffic Collision data for the location and have established that there have only been a handful of slight personal injury accidents, as recorded by the Police, within the most recent five years for which data is available. It is appreciated that incidents involving the Police may not tell the whole story, but at the same time this road traffic collision data, collated and recorded by the Police is a very important tool to help the Council prioritise interventions across the Borough.
- 5) The Local Ward Members of the area have provided some feedback to be considered alongside the requests set out in this report, they highlight the following:

'When considering this please note that on our last street survey in Ruislip Manor, we had residents protesting about the increase in the number of 20MPH schemes and 'tables' being installed in the wider Ruislip area. They wanted reassurance that as an Authority we would not be doing what many Inner London Councils had done to make motorists life more awkward. They are of the opinion that any councillor supporting more traffic measures was not putting Hillingdon Residents First.'
- 6) The above comments highlight that although there may be some support for traffic calming measures, this needs to be considered alongside the views of those who do not wish to see physical measures excessively implemented which many believe cause nuisances such as more noise, vibrations and, to some residents, are what they may feel is a blight on the amenity of an area. Should further studies be sanctioned that could lead ultimately to proposals for further traffic calming, residents should note that the Council would be obliged to undertake appropriate formal consultation on the proposals.
- 7) The petition also raises concerns about the level of HGVs using Elm Avenue and the Oak Grove Bridge which some may believe has a weight limit imposed, implying that the bridge itself is weak. The Cabinet Member will wish to note that the 7.5T weight limit does not apply to the bridge itself, but the warning signage in Elm Avenue, which has been in place for a number of years, alludes to the fact that there is a signed 7.5T weight limit in Chelston Road (by its junction with Dulverton Road); thus the purpose of the signage in Elm Avenue

is as a deterrent to large vehicles, headed from Eastcote towards Ruislip Manor and South Ruislip, which might be tempted to cut through from Elm Avenue to try to get to Victoria Road without following the correct route via the main traffic signal junction at Windmill Hill.

- 8) Due to recent concerns raised Council officers have investigated use of the bridge and a request for widening, initially with Transport for London who are responsible for the bridge, who responded:

The Head of London Underground Infrastructure (part of Transport for London), who is responsible for the Oak Grove Bridge, has advised that they have no concerns about its structural integrity or ability to carry heavy traffic. It was first constructed in 1904 and originally served as a farm access, which possibly explains its narrowness. They have no plans to alter or replace it, and the constraints of the site make widening almost impossible even if the funds were available.

- 9) When considering the implementation of formal pedestrian facilities such as a pedestrian refuge island, the Council is required to do so in line with national design guidance issued by the Department for Transport. Key criteria which need to be considered for a pedestrian refuge island include, but are not limited to:

- a suitable area on both sides of the crossing to accommodate pedestrians;
- forward visibility must be adequate (clear visibility for 60 metres is required in both directions);
- the island is required to be no less than 1.2m wide, ideally 1.8m wide to accommodate wheelchair uses and pushchairs;
- the carriageway on each side of the island should be no less than 4m wide.

- 10) A high-level analysis of Elm Avenue and Park Way for the purposes of this report indicates potential challenges which may inhibit the provision of pedestrian refuge islands, the average width of the roads is around 7.7m, but in order to provide a safe refuge ideally the carriageway needs to be between 9 – 11m wide.

- 11) In order to support investigations, to better understand the concerns being raised by the petitioners, and to help with any future design considerations, the Cabinet Member may be minded to instruct officers to undertake speed and vehicle classification surveys via an independent survey company. These surveys involve transverse pneumatic strips which are kept in place for a minimum of one week and which record all traffic movements, including size, type and speed of vehicle on a 24/7 basis. The Police regard this type of equipment as the most reliable and accurate available for such purposes. The Cabinet Member may be minded in this context to invite petitioners to indicate the locations where they feel such surveys would be most appropriate; survey equipment generally needs to be securely attached to tall street furniture such as lampposts or trees and preferably not where equipment could be parked on.

- 12) In conclusion, therefore, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member listens to the testimony of the petitioners and their Ward Councillors and considers the possible actions set out for his consideration at the head of this report.

Financial Implications

The estimated cost associated with the recommendations to this report is £360 and will be managed within existing revenue budgets for the Transportation service. Should further investigation support the installation of a zebra crossing, an appropriate funding source would need to be identified and released via the Council's Capital Release process.

RESIDENT BENEFIT & CONSULTATION

The benefit or impact upon Hillingdon residents, service users and communities

To allow the Cabinet Member to consider the petitioners' request.

Consultation carried out or required

None at this stage.

CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS

Corporate Finance

Corporate Finance has reviewed the recommendations to this report and concurs with the financial implications as set out above.

Legal

Legal Services confirm that there are no specific legal implications arising from this report.

Infrastructure/ Asset Management

None at this stage.

Comments from other relevant service areas

None at this stage.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Petition received.

Appendix A - Location Plan

Elm Avenue and Park Way



Map Notes

© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100019283