



London Borough of Hounslow

Chief Officer Decision

[Written Statement – Regulation 13(4) Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) Regulations 2012 and the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014]

Directorate	Environment, Culture and Customer Services
Name and title of Chief Officer ¹	Mark Frost Assistant Director of Transport, Parking & Environmental Strategy
Date	30 June 2020
Title for decision	Ridgeway Road and Grove Road Junction Improvements
Key decision ²	No
Forward reference ³ Plan	n/a
Decision (To be recorded as soon as practicable and be available for inspection along with all background papers that have been used to inform the decision unless exempt from publication. If exempt include details of the exemption relied on here. Decision to be retained indefinitely in accordance with Records Management Policy)	<p><u>That the Chief Officer:</u></p> <p>a) Notes the responses and comments received to the informal public consultation and at the site meeting held on 7 February 2020 outlined within this report.</p> <p>b) Approves the progression of the scheme to statutory consultation.</p> <p>c) Approves the progression of the scheme as set out in Appendix A to implementation, in the event that no objections are received to the statutory consultation.</p> <p>d) Notes that, in the event that objections to statutory consultation are received these shall be considered by the chief officer in consultation with ward members.</p>

¹ Authorised officers are an Executive Director, Director or an officer who reports directly to a Chief Officer.

² A key decision is an executive decision which is likely to result in the council incurring expenditure or making savings that is/are significant (i.e. £250,000 or more) having regard to the budget for the service or function to which the decision relates **OR** is significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards. Key decisions apply only to executive decisions.

³ At least 28 days' notice on the Forward Plan is required where an executive decision is a key one

	e) Notes that residents be informed of these decisions.
Reasons	<p>Background</p> <p>If approved, the proposed schemes will narrow Ridgeway Road and Grove Road at their junctions with College Road, introducing raised tables at both locations. The scheme will also introduce waiting restrictions on Ridgeway Road at its junction with College Road and amend waiting restrictions and parking bays on Grove Road at its junction with College Road. These measures are designed to reduce vehicle speeds and make it easier and safer for pedestrians to cross.</p> <p>The traffic management order (TMO) setting out the waiting restrictions and amended parking bays is to be advertised in summer 2020.</p> <p>The full details of the scheme include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrowing Ridgeway Road and Grove Road at their junctions with College Road • Introducing a raised table at both locations • Amend existing and introduce new waiting restrictions to protect the junction • Extended parking bays <p>See Appendix A for full details of the proposals.</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>A consultation letter was sent out to 115 properties as shown in Appendix B inviting them to feedback on the proposal between 6 November 2019 and 8 December 2019.</p> <p>During the consultation, 20 responses were received from residents, alongside a letter from Isleworth and Syon School.</p> <p>On 7 February 2020, a site meeting with Councillors, officers and residents was held to discuss the proposals.</p> <p>Below is a summary of the consultation results, comments</p>

received and officer responses. Full details of all comments received, along with full officer responses, is contained within Appendix C.

Do you support the proposals?	Yes	Not sure	No
Total	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	6 (30%)

1. Support and Comments

A total of 11 positive comments have been received from residents about these proposals. These comments indicated a general support for the traffic calming measures proposed, particularly given concerns around vehicle speeds at these junctions.

Example of resident comments:

“Very sensible proposal. Will be safer for School children and the elderly”

“I fully support this scheme. The speed traffic shoots down Ridgeway road is alarming at times. My eldest son is 13 and walks on his own to school. Crossing our road always concerns me due to the speed of traffic. Parking and with children and getting out of the car is also hazardous. Anything to slow traffic and create a safer environment is fully supported by our household.”

“Fantastic News ! Pleased about the restricted parking on those corners which impeded views of both pedestrians and vehicles. I have narrowly avoided being hit MANY times whilst crossing the road.”

“This is long overdue and will make these two crossings much safer for the large numbers of pedestrians using this footway.

It would be good if the opportunity was take to create rain gardens in the built out sections. These would provide a positive SuDS feature on the road and would demonstrate best practice.”

Officer response:

This scheme provides the best measures that will enhance pedestrian safety and we will seek to identify opportunities to introduce SuDs where possible.

2. Objections and comments

A total of six objections were received to the proposals. These indicated a general local concern for the loss of parking, access, carriageway space and traffic island.

Additionally, there were three “Not sure” responses that required more information.

School comment:

“Whilst I can see that a raised table will slow traffic entering and leaving the junction, I remain of the view that the island will be beneficial (and probably more so) than having a table installed.”

Officer response:

In respect to the school concerns, the island is likely to be overwhelmed at school arrival and dispersal times and hence may only provide a perception of safety.

Whilst an island may protect pedestrians in the centre of the road, they provide no pedestrian priority. This can result in pedestrians being ignored as they wait in the refuge. For a pedestrian to cross safely, they must have good judgement of motor vehicle speeds and gaps in vehicle traffic.

The existing larger radii (turning circle) at these junctions accommodates high-speed turning movements by motorists, which presents a risk to pedestrians that are required to cross more than 20m of the carriageway. Implementing smaller radii at these junctions will improve pedestrian safety by requiring motorists to reduce vehicle speed when making sharper turns, which enables pedestrians to establish priority. With the smaller radii, pedestrian desire lines can be maintained, and pedestrians don't have to look further back due to the improved sight distances.

Currently, at the junction of Grove Road and College Road,

pedestrians are required to cross over 12m from the footway to the island and a further 12m from the island to the footway (24m total). By narrowing the junction (and removing the island on Grove Road), we reduce the distance pedestrians are required to cross to 7.5m (on Ridgeway Road) and 8.3m (on Grove Road).

The introduction of the raised table further slows down traffic at the point where pedestrians are crossing, increasing safety.

Narrowing the carriageway, reducing the kerb radii and introducing a raised table not only provides pedestrians with priority, but also enhances the pedestrians' safety due to the slower speeds.

Resident comment:

"worried about the proposed CPZ but at least that allowed for weekend visitors."

Officer response:

Extended parking bays for residents (and visitors on the weekend) will be provided a few metres south of the Ridgeway Road and College Road junction.

Resident comment:

"created a parking space in their front garden and recently enlarged it a little for larger cars precisely, for visitors to use"

Officer response:

Residents will continue to have access to their existing driveway.

Resident comment:


"Please can the Grove Road parking be stepped back a little from the junction to improve visibility and safety. Thanks"

Officer response:

Parking bays will start 10m north and south of the junction to improve visibility for all road users.

	<p>3. Site meeting with Councillors and residents</p> <p>During a meeting with residents and Councillors (on 7 February 2020) where the advantages and disadvantages for retaining the existing island in Grove Road at its junction with College Road were discussed. Concerns were raised about the challenges pedestrians may encounter when required to cross two lanes of traffic if the island was to be removed. After reviewing the proposal to retain the island as highlighted in Appendix D, a conclusion was made that the proposal in Appendix A means we can tighten up the junction to the maximum possible extent. This will reduce the speed of vehicles turning in and out. By retaining the island, we can't tighten the junction as much, which means turning speeds will be higher. This means the chance of a collision is higher and the severity of any injury that occurs likely to be worse. Traffic islands only really provide a perception of safety and tend only to be useful on wide and busy roads, when crossing isn't often possible in one go. That isn't the case here.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Overall, there was more support shown by respondents towards the proposals than against.</p> <p>The proposals will reduce vehicle speeds and make it easier and safer for all pedestrians to cross.</p> <p>The proposed waiting restrictions are required to allow unobstructed access and to improve highway safety at Ridgeway Road and Grove Road at their junctions with College Road.</p>
<p>Details of alternatives considered and rejected</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Factors taken into account (i.e. include here consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public sector equality duty, 	<p>The council has to give due regard to its equalities duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010, section 149.</p> <p>There is no evidence to indicate that the equality duties have been engaged by the proposal for the progression of</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • biodiversity duty and • crime and disorder implications of decision) 	<p>resident controls. The assessment concluded that none of the equalities protected characteristics are affected by this proposal because the proposal is remote or peripheral to the substance of the equality duty. Therefore, it is considered that there is no need for an Equalities Impact Assessment to be carried out on this element of the scheme and that in approving this proposal the Council will be acting in compliance with its duties under the Equality Act 2010.</p>
<p>Name and title of any Cabinet member consulted</p>	<p>Councillor Tony Louki, Councillor Unsa Chaudri & Councillor Richard Eason</p>
<p>Member conflict of interest</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Comments on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer (Key decisions, where required under Financial Regulations and/or where considered by the Chief Officer in consultation with the Assistant Director Finance to be required)</p>	<p>The total cost of these works is considered to be in the region of £85,000. This is available through s106 funding.</p>
<p>Comments on behalf of the Head of Governance (Key decisions only and/or where considered by the Chief Officer in consultation with the Head of Governance to be required)</p>	<p>When exercising functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 such as the making of Traffic Management Orders (TMOs), the Council is under a duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway. So far as practicable, the Council is required to have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises; - the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run; - the national air quality strategy; - the importance of facilitating the passage of public

	<p>service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - and any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. <p>TMOs may be made for purposes specified in section 1(1)(a) to (g) and Schedule 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. It is confirmed that the proposals set out in the report meet this statutory criteria.</p>
Signed	
Date decision to take effect ⁴	1 July 2020

End

⁴ To allow for call in of a key decision by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, a decision will not take effect until the eighth clear day after the date it is made.