



Highways and Infrastructure
Projects Development
Delegated Approval Report

Report for Head of Highways and
Infrastructure

Wards Affected: Fryent

Title: Proposed Waiting Restrictions on the Springfield Estate and Wakemans Hill Avenue / Summit Close / Meadow Way Junction

Approved by:

Title	Name	Date
Author	Sumola Salami	30/07/2019
Principal Engineer	Adam Smith	05/08/2019
Projects Development Manager	Sandor Fazekas	05/08/2019
Head of Highways and Infrastructure	Tony Kennedy	05/08/2019

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1** This report summarises the outcome of the public consultation for the introduction of a waiting restrictions at various locations on the Springfield Estate and Wakemans Hill Avenue/Summit Close/Meadow Way Junction. The scheme has been developed following concerns received from local residents regarding safety and accessibility in the area.
- 1.2** The Head of Highways and Infrastructure is recommended to proceed with the implementation of the scheme and the making of the Traffic Management Orders necessary to implement the waiting restrictions in the area.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1** The Council has received complaints about safety and access around the Springfield Estates roundabouts and on Wakemans Hill Avenue / Summit Close / Meadow Way Junction. Concerns have also been raised regarding parking and accessibility issues on Kingbury Road / Mardale Drive and on Crummock Gardens. Vehicles are often parked inconsiderately on the highway and thereby narrowing the width of the road and obstructing access for emergency and service vehicles. This often resulting in vehicles, particularly larger vehicles, having to mount the pavement to gain access along the road. The impact of this is damage to the pavement, kerbs and creating safety hazards for pedestrians.
- 2.2** Residents are also concerned in regards to the traffic speeds in this area. The Council installed yellow lines several years ago, to one roundabout, but these were removed following a petition objecting to a loss of parking. The situation is

worsening and there is a need to have an area wide approach in preventing obstructive parking on and around these roundabouts.

2.3 An assessment has been carried out and officers have identified a waiting restrictions proposal to address this issues. The waiting restrictions should help to protect pedestrian crossing points, but this will minimise any loss of parking.

3.0 CONSULTATION RESULTS

3.1 Consultation Procedure

3.1.1 An informal consultation was carried out for four (4) weeks from 12th April and closes 10th May 2019 on the proposals to introduce waiting restrictions in the area shown below.



Plan showing area consulted.

- The objectives of the proposals were to prevent obstructive parking at this section of the road, improve visibility and accessibility for all vehicles including emergency services and improve road safety for all other road users particularly the vulnerable road.

3.1.2 A consultation document, questionnaire and a drawing of the proposed scheme were distributed to a total of 665 addresses in the local area in April 2019. A copy of the documents is included in Appendix A and B.

3.1.3 The consultation documents were also posted to the local Ward Councillors, interested groups and statutory authorities including the emergency services.

3.2 Consultation Results

3.2.1 Table 1 shows the number and percentage of questionnaire responses received from the consultation and Table 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 shows the numbers and percentage of those who are supportive or objected to the proposed measures at various locations.

	Number	Percentage
Questionnaires Sent Out	665	100
Questionnaires Returned	226	34

Table 1 – Questionnaire Response Rate

Question 1	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you agree with the proposed waiting restrictions around the Springfield Estate?	119	79	16
Percentage	53%	35%	7%

Table 2 – Question 1 in the questionnaire

Question 2	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you agree with the proposed waiting restrictions on Wakemans Hill Avenue/Summit Close/Meadow Way Junction?	130	51	38
Percentage	57%	22%	17%

Table 3 – Question 2 in the questionnaire

Question 3	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you agree with the proposed waiting restrictions on Crummock Gardens?	143	47	25
Percentage	63%	21%	11%

Table 4 – Question 3 in the questionnaire

Question 4	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you agree with the proposed waiting restrictions on Springfield Garden / Springfield Mount?	134	60	22
Percentage	59%	26%	10%

Table 5 – Question 4 in the questionnaire

Question 5	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you agree with the proposed waiting restrictions on Kingsbury Road / Mardale Drive?	153	44	19
Percentage	68%	19%	8%

Table 6 – Question 5 in the questionnaire

- 3.2.1 Table 1 shows that a total of 226 questionnaires were returned which represented a response rate of 34%. This is marginally higher than the normal range experienced by the Highways and Infrastructure Service when undertaking public consultations for similar schemes.
- 3.2.2 Table 2 shows that out of the questionnaires returned, 119 (53%) were supportive of the proposed waiting restrictions on the Springfield Estate Roundabouts, 79 (35%) objected and 16 (7%) did not express an opinion. This shows that majority of residents from within the scheme area were supportive of these restrictions.
- 3.2.3 Table 3 shows that out of the questionnaires returned, 130 (57%) were supportive of the proposed waiting restrictions on the Wakemans Hill Avenue/Summit Close/Meadow Way Junction, 51 (22%) objected and 38 (17%) did not express an opinion. This shows that majority of residents from within the scheme area were supportive of these restrictions.
- 3.2.4 Table 4 shows that out of the questionnaires returned, 143 (63%) were supportive of the proposed waiting restrictions on Crummock Gardens, 47 (21%) objected and 25 (11%) did not express an opinion. This shows that majority of residents from within the scheme area were supportive of these restrictions.
- 3.2.5 Table 5 shows that out of the questionnaires returned, 134 (59%) were supportive of the proposed waiting restrictions on Springfield Garden / Springfield Mount, 60 (26%) objected and 22 (10%) did not express an opinion. This shows that majority of residents from within the scheme area were supportive of these restrictions.
- 3.2.6 Table 6 shows that out of the questionnaires returned, 153 (68%) were supportive of the proposed waiting restrictions on Kingsbury Road / Mardale Drive, 44 (19%) objected and 19 (8%) did not express an opinion. Again, this shows that majority of residents from within the scheme area were supportive of these restrictions.
- 3.2.7 Section 3.3 considers the positive and negative responses received to the consultation in more detail and provides corresponding Officers responses.

3.3 Responses from Statutory Consultees

- 3.3.1 A copy of the consultation documents was sent to Fryent Ward Councillors. They all supported the proposals.
- 3.3.2 No comments were received from other statutory consultees.

3.4 Comments from consultees

- 3.4.1 A number of comments were also received from local residents and businesses regarding the proposal. Below is a summary of their comments:

Road Name	Comments
Coniston Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Feel this consultation is a waste of tax payers' money as measures should be automatically implemented</i> • <i>Would like resident to restrict yellow line for safety and emergency</i>

	<p><i>of vehicles to have clear roads</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Double Yellow Lines (DYL) on the four roundabouts reduce car parking spaces and encourage faster driving</i> • <i>No point putting yellow lines if you don't police them</i> • <i>I like waiting restrictions on end of Mandle Drive/Coniston Gardens please</i> • <i>Poor visibility for vehicles turning right at junction of Coniston Gardens & Kingsbury Road</i> • <i>Try filling in cracks and holes on roads and pavements</i>
Crummock Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I object to double yellow lines on roundabout, never seen any problems</i> • <i>Parking is bad at the moment. This will only make it worse</i> • <i>Agree with proposed double yellow lines at both roundabouts leading to Crummock Gardens</i> • <i>No yellow lines</i> • <i>The road on Springfield estate are quite narrow</i> • <i>I agree with yellow lines at play area</i> • <i>Not 5M but 4M on roundabout please</i> • <i>No yellow lines please</i> • <i>Springfield estate roundabouts especially need the double yellow lines</i> • <i>Long overdue and will help the traffic flow around the roundabouts</i> • <i>No yellow lines on the roundabout</i> • <i>The reasons why I propose we have double lines is I had to have an ambulance and it struggled</i> • <i>If implemented I think it will cause parking problems for residents</i> • <i>Strongly agree as it has become a dangerous blind spot coming in and out of my drive way</i> • <i>2nd time of trying to put down double yellow lines, we made it clear they are not needed</i> • <i>For the roundabouts - parking will be much more difficult so I am against it</i> • <i>Streets will become less safe through widened roundabouts</i> • <i>If housing tackled the multiple occupation in the area, then there wouldn't be a parking issue</i> • <i>No yellow lines on roundabout please</i> • <i>Already difficult finding a parking space</i> • <i>These are unnecessary changes</i> • <i>Double yellow lines on the roundabout will take out approx. 48 much need spaces</i> • <i>Our street will become less safe as speeding drives will whizz through widened roundabout</i>
Ennerdale Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Completely agree as there are too many cars being parked at awkward locations</i> • <i>I would also propose extending the double yellow lines at end of Derwent Ave/Springfield Mount</i> • <i>We value the neighbourhood. At times it is difficult to see vehicles through the blind spot</i> • <i>This will chase even more traffic & congestion to all the areas, and major parking issues</i> • <i>Double yellow lines @ junction of Rydal Gardens & Springfield Mount also needs to be extended</i> • <i>Think how the current restrictions are fine & there's no need for the double yellow lines</i> • <i>No yellow lines please</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposed lines is opposed and does not help with traffic flow, it was rejected once in the past</i> • <i>Aware it may cause inconvenience for some neighbours but will help services vehicles have access</i>
Forest Gate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Restrictions will allow a better view for moving vehicles to see when approaching the roundabouts</i>
Highcroft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposals are overdue and very welcomed, well done</i> • <i>Totally agree, find it hard to believe the question even arises about yellow lines on roundabouts</i> • <i>Extend yellow lines as shown only</i> • <i>Thinks for this consultation, please look at the facts & do what's right, be strong and don't be weak</i>
Kingsbury Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Please with the proposal as I find it difficult to exit driveway when there is an event at the temple</i>
Ladore Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would make a massive change to the way traffic is controlled within the area</i> • <i>The application of all of these proposals is as good as its enforcement</i> • <i>Works on Kingsbury High Rd is shambolic - unrelated but re Brent</i> • <i>Roundabout zone has plenty of turning space so yellow lines does not add to the safety of the area</i> • <i>Introducing double yellow lines will have a severe impact on parking, strongly oppose</i> • <i>As there will be double yellow lines there should not be any complaints re lack of parking as some have garages</i> • <i>Believe this will improve safety on the road for the public especially the elderly and children</i> • <i>Parking on the roundabout creates danger to vehicles, drivers and pedestrians</i> • <i>Support the double yellow lines, the people who park on there are a menace</i> • <i>Truly against the plan for double yellow lines on the roundabout, the idea is frankly ridiculous</i> • <i>Yellow lines on roundabout will cause added pressure to already limited parking spaces</i> • <i>Would help if you put white lines where people can park</i> • <i>The issue is large vans & commercial vehicles</i> • <i>Totally uncalled for this estate. We are doing fine as we are, thank you</i> • <i>We are happy with the restrictions already in place, don't need any further restrictions</i> • <i>Make the lines double red, I have lived here for nearly 30 years and it's ridiculous</i>
Mardale Drive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>With regard to question 4 & 5 I strongly support your proposal</i> • <i>I'm in favour of these proposed changes, these are critical to have safe travel & access for road users</i> • <i>Very important as difficult to see as too many cars are parked on the road</i> • <i>Too many parking restrictions everywhere, people need space to park</i>
Meadow Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The double yellow lines could be extended along south eastern side of Wakesmans Hill Avenue</i> • <i>Why waste time and money on something that is no use</i> • <i>Speed bump needed on Wakemans Hill to slow down traffic going up hill</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If these waiting restrictions are on Wakemans Hill the parking on Meadow Way will get worse</i>
Rydal Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Trees to be lopped in the children playground at the bottom of Crummock Gardens</i> • <i>The restrictions will cause congestion in Rydal Gardens where I live</i> • <i>Being a resident of Rydal Gardens we urgently require controlled parking on this street</i> • <i>Resident parking urgently required on Rydal Gardens and surrounding roads</i> • <i>I agree with all the proposals</i> • <i>Estate is plagued by commercial vans & trucks being left sometimes for weeks on end</i>
Summit Close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal for VAS is a good idea for Hill View Gardens & Wakemans Hill but speed hump would be better</i> • <i>Think speed bump where existing slow signage is would be crucial to allow safe manoeuvrability</i> • <i>Would like to suggest double yellow lines be extended on both sides of Wakemans Hill Ave</i> • <i>Agree with the extension of lines but recommend traffic enforcement officers visit the area</i> • <i>Always find it difficult to come out from Summit close</i> • <i>Speaking to some residents they would like to see new lines joined up with existing ones and humps</i> • <i>This is not far enough as a lot of high sided vehicles park there and it's a blind spot</i> • <i>Exiting from Summit Cl is very dangerous due to parked trucks and vans on Wakemans Hill Ave</i> • <i>Finally, you have agreed to the double yellow lines at junction of Wakemans Hill Ave & Summit Close</i> • <i>The proposed double yellow of 5m on Wakemans Hill should be extended to the end of garden of No1 Summit Close</i>
Springfield Gardens Springfield Gardens (continue)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can you tell me when the pavements will be done on Springfield Gardens?</i> • <i>Agree with proposals and think you should apply restrictions at the end of Springfield gardens</i> • <i>Springfield Estate is not ideal to have waiting restrictions and can cause parking disruptions</i> • <i>I agree to any changes that stop illegal and selfish parking</i> • <i>Who will monitor the double yellow lines - no traffic wards to be seen</i> • <i>Yellow lines on the roundabout will cause congestion</i> • <i>Currently dangerous the way that cars park on the actual roundabout, totally obscuring the view</i> • <i>Live here for 48 years and see no reason for putting yellow lines on the roundabouts</i> • <i>Opposed to the proposed around Springfield estate roundabouts as it will have a negative impact</i>
Springfield Mount	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Good Job</i> • <i>Would like double lines extended to the opposite side of proposed lines in Springfield Mount to opposite 83</i> • <i>Whilst I agree with most of the proposals there will be complaints re the loss of parking</i> • <i>Reassuring to see such prominent changes being made to make the estate a safer place to live in</i> • <i>No restrictions on areas ticked as there's limited parking</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cars park up to the lights - very dangerous • Agree with this proposal • You must keep an eye on no.64 for the amount of vans and trailers • Residents of this area already have a hard time finding parking with these new restrictions • Double yellow lines on 4 roundabouts will take out 48 much needed spaces and set neighbours against each other • Why are people allowed to park on roundabouts? Is it not traffic law not to allow parking? • Totally agree with the 5m double yellow lines at around the said roundabout
Wakemans Hill Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's a significant increase in commercial vehicles parking next to dropped pavements • In my opinion there is enough free space for any services to go in and out of the road • Problems with us here its too many vans parking on our road for very long time • Why are there so many trees missing from Wakemans Hill Ave

Table 7 – summary of comments

3.4.2 Table 7 above shows that there were a number of positive and negative comments to the consultation. These negative comments have been summarized into broad themes below along with an Officers response.

The proposed parking restrictions on the Springfield Estate roundabouts will remove much needed car parking spaces

3.4.3 Officers Response: The Highway code rule 243 states that you do not park on the roundabout, on a bend at any time where the kerb has been lowered to help wheelchair users and powered mobility vehicles as it obstructs and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in pushchairs, wheelchairs or with visual impairments and you must not leave your vehicle in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road. It also states that you do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. Residents have reported obstructive parking and raised concerns about emergency vehicle access.

Is this an agenda to introduce a 'controlled parking zone' around the Springfield Estates?

3.4.4 Officers Response: The Council have no plans to introduce resident permit and in fact our policies mean that there would have to be a resident petition requesting a permit scheme before the Council could even consult on one. We will prioritise areas where we receive numerous requests for changes, there is evidence of on-street parking pressures and a high level of public support. No request yet from any resident.

A reduction in the diameter of the Springfield Estates roundabouts will help resolve this problem

3.4.5 Officers Response: A reduction in the roundabouts without restrictions would not address visibility issues where pedestrians wish to cross the road and this may result in further parking on the roundabouts unless restrictions are included,

which will compound the situation. There is also a cost associated with this proposal as this will incur a significant additional cost to the Council.

This proposal is only aim at making money from local residents on behalf of the Council

3.4.6 Officers Response: The aim of the scheme is to address local concerns, no financial forecast on fines has been considered and we envisage that there will be a high level of compliance and low level of enforcement required. We have introduce waiting restrictions to address obstructive parking at junctions and improve safety in numerous locations in the borough, and this proposal has been developed to address safety and accessibility concerns raised by local residents.

Clearing-out of vehicles on the roundabouts will increase speeding on the roundabouts when vehicles are cleared and will often lead to accidents as the estate is already a dangerous rat-run

3.4.7 Officers Response: There are traffic calming measures in the area and a 20mph speed limit, and we have no reason to believe that this would encourage speeding. Improving visibility at junctions will improve road safety, particularly for more vulnerable pedestrians. Speed surveys will be arranged before and after restrictions are introduced and we can also address any locations on the estate where speeding is found to be an issue. These measures can include additional signage and road makings, and enforcement.

4.0 EQUALITIES ANALYSIS

4.1 The 226 questionnaires returned shows that approximately 34% of respondents had completed the equality monitoring questionnaire. The total number for each question may not be the same as the total responded because some respondents have not answered every question.

4.2 A breakdown of the equality data is shown below along with a commentary on any significant variations to the average demographic profiles for Fryent Ward.

Asian or Asian British					Black or Black British				Any other ethnic background	White			Mixed Race / Dual Heritage			Prefer not to say
Indian	Pakistani	Chinese	British	Asian Other	Caribbean	African	Somali	Black British		British/ English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish	Irish	White other	White/Black African	White/Asian	Other	
20	2	3	8	15	2	4	-	1	2	29	13	210	1	-	-	4

Table 6 – Responses to “What is your ethnic group?”

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?			Gender			Sexual Orientation			
Yes	No	Prefer not to say	Male	Female	Preferred not to say	Heterosexual	Gay	Bisexual	Other or prefer not to say or
11	98	5	68	43	3	76	1	6	20

Table 7 – Responses to “Do you consider yourself to have a disability?”, “What is your gender?” and “What is your sexual orientation?”

Religion									
Agnostic	Buddhist	Christian	Hindu	Humanist	Jewish	Muslim	No Religion	Other	Prefer not to say
3	5	53	25	1	-	16	3	1	10

Table 8 – Responses to “What is your religion?”

Age group							
16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Prefer not to Say
2	4	18	22	26	24	21	4

Table 9 – Responses to which age group do you belong?”

4.2 Project Equalities Analysis

Protected Characteristic	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Comments	Mitigation if required
Age		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Disability		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Gender reassignment		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Pregnancy and maternity		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Race		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Religion or belief		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Sex		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A
Sexual orientation		X		No reason to believe this group will be disproportionately affected	N/A

4.3 The equality analysis above does not affect adversely on any of the protected groups.

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The scheme will be funded under the Local Transport Funding for the year of 2019 / 2020. A total allocation of £100,000 is available for the scheme. The initial estimate for the works is £10,000 and the funding allocation is therefore adequate for implementing the waiting restriction.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 The Head of Highways and Infrastructure is therefore recommended to approve the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions at various locations on the Springfield Estate and Wakemans Hill Avenue/Summit Close/Meadow Way Junction as shown in the plan subject to the making of the Traffic Management Orders (TMO) necessary to implement the proposals.

7.0 APPENDICIES

Appendix A – Consultation Drawing

Appendix B – Consultation Document and Questionnaire

Appendix C – Final Construction Detailed Drawing

Local Government Act 1972 – Access to Information

The following items were used in the preparation of the report:

- Consultation responses and analysis

The above documents may be inspected / copied by contacting:

Contact Officer: Sumola Salami.

Highways and Infrastructure

Telephone: 0208 937 5600

Email: transportation@brent.gov.uk

AGREED / REJECTED

Signed: 

Date: ...29/08/2019.....

Tony Kennedy
HEAD OF HIGHWAYS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

