



**City of Westminster**

# Cabinet Member Report

**Meeting or Decision Maker:** Cabinet Member City Management and Customer Services and Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking

**Date:** 18 May 2016

**Classification:** For general release

**Title:** Shirland Road / Elgin Avenue Junction Improvements

**Wards Affected:** Harrow Road/Maida Vale

**Better City, Better Lives Summary:** This scheme contributes to the City for all Initiative by improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists who use the junction.

**Key Decision:** Yes

**Financial Summary:** The estimated cost for the implementation of the proposals identified in this report is £276,951 which includes £71,158 for risk and contingency.

The £276,951 cost is being funded by Transport for London ("TfL") through their 2015/16 Local Safety Scheme (LSS) Programme.

**Report of:** Stuart Love - Executive Director City Management and Communities

**Report Author:** Roger Pye - Project and Programme Manager

## **1. Executive Summary**

- This report seeks approval to:
- Implement the highway and safety improvements to the Shirland Road / Elgin Avenue junction;
- Modify and make Traffic Regulation Orders as appropriate;
- Commit the capital expenditure required to complete the implementation of this scheme;
- Delegate authority to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications to the scheme in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking and the Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That approval be given for the implementation of the proposals, described in section 5 and shown in drawing number 70010092-03-GA-01 included in Appendix B, in accordance with the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 (“The 1980 Act”).
- 2.2 That approval be given to modify and make Traffic Regulation Orders in accordance with the provisions of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“The 1984 Act”) necessary to accommodate the highway improvements and as shown on drawing number 70010092-02-TMO-01C in Appendix C.
- 2.3 That approval be given to capital expenditure of £276,951 to be used to cover the total project cost for the implementation of this scheme.
- 2.4 That delegated authority be given to the Executive Director of City Management and Communities to approve minor modifications to the approved scheme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services and the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking.

## **3. Reasons for Decision**

- 3.1 The proposed junction safety improvements identified in this report will help improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists at a busy traffic signalised junction, which is by retail and residential premises. It is a junction well used by pedestrians, including children from local schools.

3.2 The traffic signals will be upgraded to include a dedicated all-red to vehicle pedestrian stage (including pedestrian countdown facilities). This means that whenever a pedestrian push button is activated, all the traffic signals for vehicles will subsequently turn to red and a green man will be shown on all crossings, allowing pedestrians to cross each road without any vehicles passing through the junction at the same time. The physical pedestrian crossing facilities will be improved at the junction by repaving the footways and widening the crossing points. Advanced cycle stop lines will also be provided on both Elgin Avenue approaches to supplement those already existing on the two Shirland Road approaches. The road will also be resurfaced at the junction.

3.3 The Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services and the Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking are therefore recommended to approve the safety improvements outlined in the body of this report and approve the capital expenditure necessary to implement the proposed improvement works.

#### **4. Background, including Policy Context**

4.1 The junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue is a signalised crossroads on two local roads. There are a number of retail units around the junction and at other locations along their routes. In addition to Councillors and local residents writing to the City Council to advise of the safety risk to pedestrians who cross at this junction there has been a Petition raised by Councillor Dimoldenberg which gained 122 signatures.

4.2 The existing junction has no green man signal aspect for pedestrians. Throughout the day there is a steady stream of pedestrians crossing at this location including parents and school children during school opening and closing times. Two schools, namely, ARK Atwood Academy and St. Peter's Primary School have identified this junction as a particular issue in their school travel plan.

4.3 Shirland Road is a busy local road that includes a bus route. In February 2015 the City Council commissioned an accident remedial study at the junction as part of the local safety scheme programme. The study report concluded that safety improvements to the junction should be carried out, including upgrading the signals to include for a pedestrian crossing facility, improving the physical pedestrian crossing provision, and amending the existing Traffic Orders to prevent parking around the junction. A copy of the accident remedial study report is contained in Appendix D.

4.4 A separate assessment of the street lighting at the junction was undertaken in May 2015. This assessment identified that the existing lighting did not conform to current lighting standards and should be upgraded.

4.5 TfL has also informed the City Council that the traffic signal equipment at this junction is due to be modernised. This work was due to have been undertaken in 2015 but was postponed to allow it to be included in this project in order to reduce on-street disruption. The traffic signal modernisation works will be funded by TfL signals directly with no additional costs to the City Council.

## **5. Scheme Design Proposals**

5.1 The aim of the proposals is to help improve the safety for all road users of the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue.

5.2 The proposals are shown on the general arrangement drawing number 70010092-03-GA-01 included in Appendix B include but are not limited to the following:

- Upgrade of the traffic signals to include a dedicated all-red to vehicle pedestrian stage (where all traffic is held at a red signal whilst pedestrians cross the road);
- The traffic signals will be upgraded to include for pedestrian count-down indicators;
- Improving the existing crossings;
- Adding advanced stop lines for cyclists on Elgin Avenue;
- Introduction of no waiting and no loading restrictions around the junction;
- Resurfacing of the carriageway;
- Upgrading the existing highway lighting;
- Improving surface water drainage.

## **6. Traffic and Parking Implications**

6.1 At present there are only single yellow line controls around the junction. There is a need therefore to increase the restrictions at the junction in order to maintain sightlines between vehicle users and pedestrians at all times and to take into account the advance stop lines for cyclists.

6.2 In the light of discussions with local residents and businesses revised proposals have been drawn-up that seek to address the issues raised through slightly relaxing the extent of the no loading at any time controls. The revised proposals are shown on drawing number 70010092-02-TMO-01C in Appendix E. These revised kerbside controls proposals do not affect the junction layout proposed in the scheme.

6.3 Other than the loss of parking resulting from the removal of single yellow lines within the junction area itself, there is to be no change in parking provision in the area.

## **7. Programme**

7.1 The construction of the scheme commenced on 14<sup>th</sup> March under a Delegated Authority Approval to allow the enabling works to be carried out. The completion of the implementation of the scheme is programmed for May 2016.

## **8. Financial Implications**

8.1 The estimated cost of the proposed safety improvements identified in this report is £276,951, which includes risk and contingencies of £71,158.

8.2 The £276,951 cost is being funded by TfL through their 2015/16 Local Safety Scheme (LSS) Programme. The traffic signal element of the scheme will be directly funded by TfL through their traffic signal modernisation programme.

## **9. Legal Implications**

9.1 The Legal implications are broadly set out in the body of this report.

9.2 Section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 places an obligation on the City Council in its capacity as "Traffic Authority" to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular traffic on its road network (including cyclists and pedestrians) as it considers appropriate for planning and carrying out the action to be taken in performing this duty.

9.3 Section 75 of the 1980 Act authorises the City Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority to carry out works to repair, maintain or replace highways maintainable at public expense, which under highways law includes the footway or pavement.

9.4 Section 6 of the 1984 Act provides the City Council with powers to regulate or restrict traffic on roads within the Borough, in the interest of safety, including the making of Traffic Regulation Orders.

9.5 The Director of Law has considered this report and is satisfied that the proposed works and orders fall within the Council's statutory powers as detailed in 9.3 and 9.4 above.

## **10. Consultation**

10.1 Public Consultation regarding the Traffic Order amendments was completed in October 2015. In addition to the publication / posting of press and street notices the letter consultation on the proposals included Ward Councillors, three local residents' associations, 31 statutory bodies and 226 frontagers. The consultation resulted in 17 responses being received. These responses are more particularly detailed in Appendix C to this report.

10.2 On 6<sup>th</sup> October 2015 the City Transport Advisor considered and approved a report under his delegated powers allowing consultation on proposals to introduce double yellow lines “at any time” waiting and loading restrictions at the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue to help improve road safety.

10.3 Some of the responses to the consultation were in support of the proposals but the majority of respondents were against the proposal on either loss of parking or loss of loading provision. Other than the loss of parking resulting from the removal of single yellow lines within the junction area itself, there is no change in parking provision in the area.

10.4 In the light of discussions with local residents and businesses revised proposals have been drawn-up that address the issues raised through slightly relaxing the extent of the no loading at any time controls.

10.5 Ward Councillors have been consulted on the proposals but no written responses have been received. Councillor Prendergast has been involved in two meetings with residents and shop keepers.

**If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the  
Background Papers please contact:**

**Roger Pye on 020 7641 2654, email [rpye@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:rpye@westminster.gov.uk)**

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services**

**Declaration of Interest**

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: **Councillor Melvyn Caplan, Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services**

State nature of interest if any .....

.....  
*(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)*

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled **Shirland Road/Elgin Avenue Junction Improvements** and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed .....

**Cabinet Member for City Management and Customer Services**

Date .....

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment: .....

.....  
If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Director of Law, City Treasurer and, if there are staffing implications, the Director of Human Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking**

**Declaration of Interest**

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME: **Councillor Heather Acton, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking**

State nature of interest if any .....

.....  
(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled

**Shirland Road/Elgin Avenue Junction Improvements**  
and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed .....

**Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking**

Date .....

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment: .....

.....  
If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Director of Law, City Treasurer and, if there are staffing implications, the Director of Human Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.



## Other Implications

### 1. Resources Implications

No Implications

### 2. Business Plan Implications

No implications.

### 3. Risk Management Implications

No implications.

### 4. Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment including Health and Safety Implications

The scheme will have a beneficial impact on health and well-being by improving accessibility and safety.

Disruption during works will be carefully managed to minimise negative impacts such as dust and noise.

### 5. Crime and Disorder Implications

Improvements to the public lighting should help reduce anti-social incidents

### 6. Impact on the Environment

Existing materials that are taken up will be recycled wherever possible.

### 7. Equalities Implications

The scheme will not negatively impact those with mobility difficulties.

### 8. Staffing Implications

No implications.

### 9. Human Rights Implications

The City Council will have regard to its rights and responsibilities under the Human Rights Act 1998 when considering the junction improvement works to ensure that residents are not adversely affected.

### 10. Energy Measure Implications

No implications.

### 11. Communications Implication

Residents and business will be notified of the works through a letter drop in advance of the works. Contact details will be displayed on site notice boards.



70010092-03-GA-01 General Arrangement Drawing for Shirland  
Road / Elgin Avenue proposals



TMO Consultation – Response Summary

**DELEGATED AUTHORITY OBJECTIONS REPORT – REF: 7150**

**TRAFFIC ORDERS – ELGIN AVENUE AND SHIRLAND ROAD**

**INTRODUCTION OF “AT ANY TIME” WAITING AND LOADING RESTRICTIONS  
(Drawing No. 70010092-02-TMO-01 Rev A)  
(Harrow Road and Maida Vale Wards)**

---

**BACKGROUND**

On 6<sup>th</sup> October 2015 the City Transport Advisor considered and approved a report under his delegated powers allowing consultation on proposals to introduce double yellow lines “at any time” waiting and loading restrictions at the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue to improve road safety. The “at any time” waiting and loading restrictions will improve sightlines for vehicle users and pedestrians, and improve traffic flow by preventing obstructive parking.

Following the publication / posting of press and street notices during October 2015 and consultation with frontagers and other key parties on the proposed measures 17 responses were received, as detailed in the appendix to this report. The extent of the letter consultation included eight ward councillors, three local residents' associations, 31 statutory bodies and 226 frontagers.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Traffic Orders are made as proposed to facilitate the implementation of the scheme shown on Drawing No. 70010092-02-TMO-01 Rev A.

I agree / disagree with the recommendation.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
City Transport Advisor  
(Growth, Planning and Housing)

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
<p>Mark Elwell</p> <p>Emails dated: 9<sup>th</sup> &amp; 20<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	1.	<p>Mr Elwell fully supports the proposals to introduce double yellow line “at any time” waiting and loading restrictions on Elgin Avenue and Shirland Road. He states there have been a number of traffic accidents at this difficult and busy junction in the two years he has lived in Elgin Avenue and introducing such parking restrictions should help alleviate the situation.</p> <p>Buses have to travel through the junction and this is often made difficult with cars parking outside of the restricted hours of the single yellow lines.</p> <p>Access to Mr Elwell’s drive has on at least 20 occasions in the past year been restricted by people parking on the single yellow line within controlled hours making it impossible to either move his car or park. He has always believed double yellow lines would prevent this.</p> <p>Mr Elwell was recently threatened by a motorist, who had parked on the single yellow line and blocked him in, when he asked them to move.</p>
<p>Flavia Sala</p> <p>Email dated: 10<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	2.	<p>Ms Sala is completely against the proposals on Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue. As a resident, she finds it very difficult to find parking spaces in Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue, having to use the single yellow lines to park at night. If the proposal goes ahead, she states it will be extremely difficult for residents to find parking spaces nearby.</p>
<p>Paola Bassi &amp; Metteo Patrone</p> <p>Email dated: 12<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	3.	<p>Ms Bassi and Mr Patrone point out that their property in Elgin Avenue has a gated parking space facing on to the street, where they can park a small car or motorbike. In front of the gate is a dropped kerb to allow proper entry and exit from the gated area to the road. There is currently a single yellow line in front of the gate.</p> <p>They understand it is proposed to introduce double yellow lines with loading restrictions in front of their house and are concerned that the possibility they currently have to load / unload their car, entering and exiting the parking area with their car or motorbike and parking the car in front of the gate, outside of controlled hours, will be affected.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
<p>Judith Abrahams</p> <p>Email dated: 13<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	4.	<p>Ms Abrahams finds the proposed double yellow lines totally unnecessary. There are bus stops on both sides of the road, near the traffic lights, used by three routes. Therefore, every two or three minutes there is a bus parked at the bus stop/s and this is what obstructs sightlines, not the vehicles loading / unloading.</p> <p>She states the accidents that have occurred at this junction have been caused by cars jumping the lights or cyclists pulling out suddenly.</p> <p>Not being able to park near the junction would make life very difficult for people dropping off or collecting large items, like curtains, from the dry cleaners at 123 Shirland Road.</p>
<p>Antonio Pereira</p> <p>Letter dated: 14<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	5.	<p>La Petite Venice is a small sandwich and coffee shop situated on the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue. They understand that the City Council is proposing to introduce double yellow lines at the junction and that there will not be any parking allowed at any time of the day or night.</p> <p>Mr Pereira asks the Council to reconsider as they and other small retail businesses around the junction rely on passing trade, including customers who just pop in to pick up a coffee or sandwich, leaving their car on the single yellow line for two or three minutes. There is no other parking available as it is all residents' parking or metre bays, all of which there are never any places. They would possibly not be able to remain in business with this loss of turnover, they are a small family run business providing a service to the local residents and passing trade.</p>
<p>Elizabeth Virgo Chair Paddington Waterways &amp; Maida Vale Society</p> <p>Email dated: 15<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	6.	<p>Paddington Waterways and Maida Vale Society's planning committee has no objection to the proposals.</p>



NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
<p>Alison Ramsey</p> <p>Email dated: 16<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	7.	<p>Ms Ramsey is very much in favour of the proposals.</p> <p>She states the junction is frankly dangerous left as it is because there are far too many buses coming down Shirland Road full stop. It's a fact that the junction simply cannot cope. Further, the noise and blockages these buses are causing are wholly unacceptable.</p> <p>She thinks the number of buses allowed to carrier down Shirland Road and up onto Elgin Avenue towards Harrow Road is reckless. They are a real and present problem separate from the additional problem of over-parking on the Shirland Road / Elgin Avenue junction. The congestion, buses coming down Shirland Road should be reduced and without delay. The route is simply overused and is wholly unfair on the residents of both Elgin Avenue and Shirland Road. The highways' authority should note that they have no choice but to keep the windows closed during spring and summer because the noise is intolerable.</p> <p>There are frequent blockages on this junction. This is due to buses being unable to turn from Elgin Avenue into Shirland Road (towards Harrow Road). This is because cars parked on the side of Shirland Road mean the buses don't have enough room in which to turn. In turn this causes the whole junction to come to an absolute standstill, frenzied blasting of horns, angry drivers. It is just unacceptable.</p> <p>There are simply too many vehicles double parking or taking up residents' parking spaces to deliver / collect from 123 Dry Cleaners.</p> <p>Notably, Ms Ramsey has seen the aftermath of frequent vehicular accidents on this junction. This speaks for itself. As she has said the junction is deficient and dangerous.</p>
<p>Samantha de Lotz Bus Operations Transport for London</p> <p>Email dated: 19<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	8.	<p>Ms de Lotz confirms, on behalf of London Buses, that TfL are in favour of the proposals as they believe they will assist bus operations.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
<p>Amal Al-tak</p> <p>Email dated: 24<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	9.	<p>Ms Al-tak states the residents of 120 Elgin Avenue are not happy with the proposals. They have three residents parking and there isn't enough room for them to park in the residents' parking spaces so they have to park on the single yellow line at the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue, they then have to get up early on weekdays to move their cars. The Council comes up with these ideas when they don't live on the roads and don't know what a nightmare parking is.</p>
<p>K Behbahani</p> <p>Email dated: 25<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	10.	<p>Ms Behbahani believes the proposal will have a detrimental negative impact on her right to be able to use and enjoy her property as her place of residence. She has been living at 99F Elgin Avenue since 1988. Over the years, she has observed the Council spending money to reconstruct the corners of this junction to try and stop large heavy vehicles using Elgin Avenue. Now it seems they are proposing the reverse because they seem to want to give priority to ease of access for such vehicles, including all the empty buses which the Council are now, most annoyingly, encouraging to use these residential streets to get to and from their depots.</p> <p>There is absolutely no rational reason whatsoever which would merit changing the single yellow line directly outside Ms Behbahani's property(99F &amp; 99E Elgin Avenue). The single yellow line has been working absolutely fine and she has never seen any vehicle find it difficult to turn into Elgin Avenue from Shirland Road because of this patch of single yellow line being used for parking purposes outside of controlled hours or even during the controlled hours when vehicles are parked for short term loading/unloading etc.</p> <p>She looks after her elderly parents and her father now suffers from severe mobility problems. It is absolutely crucial for her to be able to park outside her property to enable him to get into and out of the car, to unload their shopping and to park in the evenings outside controlled hours.</p>
		<p>Ms Behbahani notes from the wording of the letter that the Council only seems to want to receive views from the local businesses (final paragraph of the letter). This clearly shows that they have failed to appreciate the fact that this area is in fact largely residential and not commercial. Therefore, her views as a resident should also be taken into account. They need these single yellow lines and the ability which comes with them to be able to park on them outside controlled hours.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
		<p>As mentioned above, she has lived at this junction since 1988 and quite simply does not see any necessity for the changes to be implemented - unless of course the Council are intent on making life difficult for the local residents. Instead of these proposals, she suggests funds are allocated to enforce the traffic rules on Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue to stop all the empty buses using these roads to detour and/or take shortcuts to and from their depots. The empty double-decker buses or the long small ones, with their poorly trained drivers, are the only vehicles which sometimes get stuck at this junction. This should not be surprised given that these roads are not designed for such vehicles.</p>
<p>Julia Moye</p> <p>Email dated: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	<p>11.</p>	<p>Ms Moye objects to the proposals for Elgin Avenue and Shirland Road. She is concerned that the introduction of double yellow lines outside her property would make it more difficult for deliveries to be made at her house. Also, her father is disabled and when he comes to visit, he needs to park as close to her property as possible. He is currently able to use his disabled badge to park on the single yellow line at weekends, but this would no longer be possible.</p> <p>She states it does not seem that there are existing problems with this junction and she has not been able to find out why these new restrictions are proposed.</p> <p>Last July she received notice that there would be work on the traffic lights starting on 20<sup>th</sup> July lasting for a few weeks. This did not appear to take place. She asks if this is going to happen in the future.</p> <p>The one thing Ms Moye does like about the proposals is the bike boxes.</p>
<p>Jake Lyle</p> <p>Email and letter dated: 29<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	<p>12.</p>	<p>123 Cleaners oppose the current proposals at the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue. The proposals would have a detrimental impact on their business in the following ways.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT
	<p><b>Customers dropping off and collecting</b>  They estimate that 30-40% of their walk in customers briefly stop by car to unload/load their cleaning (20-30 times a day). Many items dropped off/collected are heavy – dry cleaned curtains, bags of washing, linen etc. They believe they would lose many of these customers if they can no longer load/unload outside the premises. Many studies have shown the detrimental impact of restricted parking, loading/unloading on the high streets. Some of their launderette customers travel some way by car and park outside to load/unload their laundry. And some of these are elderly. These proposals will make it very difficult for them.</p> <p><b>Vans loading/unloading throughout the day</b>  Their vans load and unload on the single yellow line throughout the day (10-15 daily). Their delivery constitutes almost half of their business. These proposals would have a devastating impact on this side of the business. Without the ability to load and unload they would most likely have to relocate the entire premises. This would break 45 years association with their family business in Maida Vale. The launderette would also close as it would not be viable without the delivery work it receives and this would be very unpopular with many residents many of whom are elderly.</p>
	<p><b>Delivery of stock</b>  Much of the stock arrives by van and lorry and is heavy e.g. hangers, plastic, soap, bags, water softener salt, solvent, paper etc. (1-2 times daily). This is currently unloaded outside the shop. The proposals would make this very difficult, especially if deliveries are then made out of hours and resultantly have to be left in the street.</p> <p>Whilst broadly agreeing to the aims behind the proposals Mr Lyle cannot see, in their current form, their effectiveness. He believes that to open up the junction (with the proposed parking restrictions) would only result, in those inclined to speed, going even faster. He has also seen many accidents over the years but recollect most have been caused by drivers jumping the lights, going too fast, and often involving two vehicles crashing together of which one was turning right.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
		<p>Mr Lyle makes the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the delay between each set of lights changing from red to green. An extra second or two would ensure that vehicles turning right are less at risk of being hit by oncoming vehicles speeding to 'make the lights'.</li> <li>• A warning speed check sign that flashed an oncoming vehicle speed, changing colour if they are speeding. He believes this would especially help on the southbound carriageway of Elgin Avenue. Or similar speed controlling measures.</li> </ul>
		<p>He states if the current proposals do go ahead, there are compromises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That any new double yellow and loading restrictions are as minimal in length as possible e.g. just opposite the traffic light islands.</li> <li>• The exceedingly long bus stop in front of No. 121 Shirland Road is shortened to allow a double loading/unloading bay or single yellow line without restrictions. It is very rare buses arrive together and if they do a loading area in front of the bus stop would most likely be available for them to pull in. Even if they couldn't the road is more than wide enough to allow traffic to keep moving.</li> </ul>
<p>Michaela Best</p> <p>Email dated: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	<p>13.</p>	<p>Whilst fully supporting any change that might improve safety at the junction of Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue, Ms Best completely disagrees with the methodology.</p> <p>For a long time the issue with this junction has been one of safe crossing, mainly for pedestrians but also drivers and motorcyclists/cyclists. For those living and working near this junction, the cause of most accidents is vehicle speed and jumping of traffic lights. Increased sightlines might, indeed, increase driver speed. It is cheap to implement, certainly, with the cost of a bit of paint and a couple of hours labour. However, the proposed method will only serve to restrict residents, business owners and visitors, by removing single yellow lines for parking/unloading, without necessarily improving safety.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
		<p>Whilst a busy junction at certain times of day, traffic flow is not generally an issue (i.e. no queues of cars etc.). The only beneficiaries that Ms Best can see would be some bus drivers. Shirland Road is a regular route for the 6, 187 and 414, and of course the route needs to be clear &amp; safe, as it appears generally to be. But in recent years, Elgin Avenue (west of Shirland Road junction) has increasingly, and rather surreptitiously, been used for bus diversions and bus trainee drivers wanting to do the tight turn left onto Shirland Road.</p> <p>Ms Best believes there are alternative road management alterations to consider if the reality is that the proposals are as much about the buses as pedestrian/vehicle safety. As residents and business owners, they have some valuable suggestions to make, Ms Best requests two things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that the consultation period be extended (some of her neighbours directly affected by these changes have not received a letter and she only received it on 21/10/15 despite the letter date 08/10/15);</li> <li>• that a meeting is held at one of the business premises to discuss working alternatives together.</li> </ul>
<p>Christian Nerdrum</p> <p>Email dated: 29<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	14.	<p>Mr Nerdrum does not write with any expectation of it having any effect on the decision already made to introduce double yellow lines at the junction of Elgin Avenue and Shirland Road. He feels confident in this assumption for the simple reason that, as a resident of the area; he knows that there is no good reason for introducing the double yellow lines.</p>
		<p>He crosses the road at the junction on foot many times a day, and has never felt that cars stopped/parked on the single yellow lines were obstructing his sightlines. He also drives across the junction many times a day and, again, has never felt that cars stopped on the single yellow lines were obstructing his sightlines. Equally, he has never felt that cars stopped on the yellow lines have in any way impeded or obstructed the flow of traffic.</p> <p>The spurious reasons given for introducing the double yellow lines expose this proposal for what it is, an exercise in raising revenue. Despite being contrary to both statute and case law, he is certain this proposal will nevertheless be implemented. Ever the optimist, he hopes to be proved wrong.</p>

NAME and ADDRESS	OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS / SUPPORT	
<p>Adam Devaney</p> <p>Email dated: 30<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	15.	<p>Mr Devaney states the obstructive parking in the area is on the bus route on Shirland Road so restrictions on Shirland Road make sense. There are occasional bus diversions on Elgin Avenue leading towards Harrow Road so restrictions there also make sense.</p> <p>However, he requests that the restrictions do not include Elgin Avenue, outside 123 Cleaners and the opposite side of the road outside Nos. 99 and 101. There is already very limited parking in the area and he requests that the parking on the north-west side of Elgin Avenue is actually extended to the driveway/dropped kerb of 99E Elgin Avenue.</p>
		<p>He states there is also a small area of yellow line outside 105 to 107 which he requests to be removed as it restricts parking for no apparently reason and there is not a similar restriction on the opposite side of the street.</p>
<p>Mary Gomez</p> <p>Letter dated: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	16.	<p>Ms Gomez recently started renting the space at No. 121 Shirland Road for her clothing alteration business. She objects to the proposals for the introduction of double yellow line "at any time" waiting and loading restrictions. Many of her customers bring their garments by car and park on the single yellow line for a short duration, particularly those more elderly customers. The proposals would not help my her business at all and she strongly objects, she is now very worried.</p>
<p>Shaiq Hakeem</p> <p>Letter dated:</p>	17.	<p>Elgin Food &amp; Wine is a small family run business and relies on passing trade as well as the local community. They strongly object to the proposals as it will prevent any passing trade from stopping for a few minutes for urgent items, this would affect around 35% of their business/customers. The proposals would make it impossible for their deliveries of the mini supermarket supplies during the day including such items as fresh bread.</p> <p>They offer a service to the community in many ways and strongly object to the proposals to remove the single yellow lines as there is no other available parking because the residents' bays are always full as are the paid-for bays.</p>

## **Appendix D**

Shirland Road and Elgin Avenue Accident Remedial Study – June 2015.



## Appendix E

Revised Kerbside Controls Proposals – Drawing no. 70010092-02-TMO-01C

