

**Croydon Council**  
For General Release

<b>REPORT TO:</b>	<b>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b> <b>11 October 2017</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>OBJECTIONS TO THE INTRODUCTION OF “NO ENTRY” TRAFFIC RESTRICTIONS WITH SHORT ONE WAY WORKING AND PEDAL CYCLE BYPASS IN ADDISCOMBE COURT ROAD AND CANNING ROAD</b>
<b>LEAD OFFICER:</b>	<b>Shifa Mustafa</b> <b>Executive Director Place</b>
<b>CABINET MEMBER:</b>	<b>Councillor Stuart King</b> <b>Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment</b>
<b>WARDS:</b>	<b>Addiscombe, Fairfield</b>

**CORPORATE PRIORITY/POLICY CONTEXT:**

This project addresses the corporate policies adopted in the Corporate Plan 2015-2018 to enable Growth, Independence and Liveability. This report helps address the Growth and Liveability strategy of the Plan with particular emphasis on the Transport vision to:

- Implement the 20-year Transport Vision to improve safety and access for all road users, particularly pedestrians, cyclists and people travelling by public transport.
- Creating a place where businesses and people want to be.
- To create a place that communities are proud of and want to look after as their neighbourhood.
- To build a place that is easy and safe for all to get to and move around in

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

The cost of implementing this proposal is estimated to be £35,000 to be met from the Accident Prevention and Congestion Relief allocation secured through the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for 2017/2018.

**KEY DECISION REFERENCE NO.:** Not a key decision

**1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Traffic Management Advisory Committee recommend to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment that they agree to:

- 1.1 Consider the objections received in response to the public notice for the introduction of No entry with short one way working and pedal cycle bypass in Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road as shown on appended drawings.
- 1.2 The officers to inform the objectors of the Cabinet Member’s decision.

## **2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 2.1 This report details the responses received following the advertisement of the public notice on the proposed 'No entry' with short one-way working and pedal cycle bypass in Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road.
- 2.2 The scheme itself aims to mitigate traffic congestion and road safety concerns in Addiscombe Road, Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road. It also aims to encourage motorists to use the arterial routes and not use side roads as through routes.
- 2.3 The Council has made a commitment to increase the number of journeys made by cyclists, in line with the Mayor of London's Transport Plan. This includes the provision and maintenance of a safe network of quieter routes for cyclists to use.
- 2.4 This commitment can be assisted through the introduction of one-way working/no entry restriction with a cycle bypass and contraflow, which allows pedal cycles to travel safely against the flow of one-way traffic or to bypass a no entry restriction safely. The cycle contraflow is indicated clearly with traffic signs and road markings as per the Department for Transport design guidance. Details can be seen on the drawings located in the appendix within this report.

## **3. DETAIL**

- 3.1 A petition was received from the residents of Addiscombe Court Road and Tunstall Road, signed by 85 residents. The residents signing this petition requested that the Council take action to reduce additional road traffic using their roads as a consequence of an adjacent road, Lebanon Road, being made one way. The petition was presented at the Council's 30 January 2017 meeting.
- 3.2 Meetings were already taking place with officers, ward councillors and residents and a proposal came out of these meetings. The proposal was to make Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road no entry to motor vehicles for traffic travelling north. Officers undertook to write to residents in the wider area, inviting them to express their views on this proposal, and to indicate whether they were prepared to support the measures or not.
- 3.3 The findings of this informal consultation were reported back to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee (TMAC) on 5th July 2017. The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment at that meeting agreed to advertise the public notice for this scheme in the local Croydon Guardian and London Gazette on 12th July 2017.
- 3.4 Statutory (formal) consultation on these proposals was then undertaken. This process was publicised via Public Notice (attached to lamp columns within the consultation area) and via notices in local and London newspapers. Representations from residents both within the locality and outside of it were received, many of these were objections but there were also a significant number of representations in support.

- 3.5 Funding for the design, consultation process and implementation is available within the “LIP” (Local Implementation Plan) funding for 2017-2018 provided by Transport for London (TfL).
- 3.6 A road safety audit has been completed and the scheme meets safety requirements for all road users.

#### **4. CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 Following the public notice issued on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017, 84 objectors sent in representations. Unusually for a public notice, which invites people to object, 35 further emails in support of the proposals were received, which is around 30% of all responses.
- 4.2 A summary of objections received are given in the table below. Similar objections have been grouped together to aid and simplify the process of reporting and responding. The tables below show numbers of objections raised and their locations within or outside of the streets listed below.
- 4.3 The following Residents Associations made representations:

H.O.M.E. Residents Association - representing Elgin, Outram, Havelock Roads and Mulberry Lane.

H.O.M.E. Residents Association objected, expressed concern around traffic displacement into the roads to the east of Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road. It was their view that Elgin Road in particular would bear the brunt of displaced traffic resulting from the proposed restrictions.

TACRA (Tunstall and Addiscombe Court Road) Residents Association

This residents association responded to the public notice, stating clearly strong support for the proposal.

Canning and Clyde Road Residents Association

This residents association presented a paper previously (reported to TMAC July 2017) which indicated there was a majority who did not support their street (Canning Road) being made no entry. Whilst no formal objection was received to the public notice, their views are noted here.

Whitgift Estate (East Croydon) Residents Association

An objection was received which relates to increased congestion on the main road network arising from the proposal, with traffic levels currently travelling along this being already congested at peak times. A concern was also raised about the volume of through traffic currently using residential roads in the Whitgift estate.

#### 4.4 Tables showing numbers of objections received and respondent's location.

Objection	Elgin Road	Havelock Road	Mulberry Lane	Outram Road	Ashburton Road	Rushmead Close	No address supplied or remote from the locality
1. Increase traffic/congestion/Journey times	13	4		2	1	1	8
2. Scheme will increase Noise/Air Pollution	9	2		2			4
3. Scheme will not encourage walking/Cycling							
4. Scheme will not reduce Vehicle Speeds							
5. Scheme will not improve Safety/Reduce Accidents	7	4		1			2
6. Traffic will be displaced to other neighbouring roads	13	4	1	3	2	1	8
7. Scheme will not make area a pleasant place to live						1	
8. Council didn't conduct any proper analysis on traffic data	1	1				1	4
9. Full Traffic Analysis/ Whole area approach for the whole area needs to be done	5	4	1	2	1		3
10. Informal Consultation process flawed			1	2	1		2
11. Canning Road should remain 2 way only Addiscombe Court Road should be No Entry		1					1
12. Canning Road residents did not support the proposal during informal consultation		1					2
13. Scheme will causes problems for emergency vehicles							1

Objection	Cedar Road	Lebanon Road	Addiscombe Court Road	Tunstall Road	Addiscombe Road	Canning Road	Clyde Road
1. Increase traffic/congestion/Journey times		1	1	2		1	1
2. Scheme will increase Noise/Air Pollution		2		2		1	1
3. Scheme will not encourage walking/Cycling				1			
4. Scheme will not reduce Vehicle Speeds				1			
5. Scheme will not improve Safety/Reduce Accidents		3		2		1	
6. Traffic will be displaced to other neighbouring roads	1	2		2	2	1	
7. Scheme will not make area a pleasant place to live							
8. Council didn't conduct any proper analysis on traffic data		2					
9. Full Traffic Analysis/ Whole area approach for the whole area needs to be done		1					
10. Informal Consultation process flawed							
11. Canning Road should remain 2 way only Addiscombe Court Road should be No Entry						1	
12. Canning Road residents did not support the proposal during informal							

consultation							
13. Scheme will cause problems for emergency vehicles		1					

#### 4.5 **Objection Group 1**

*The Scheme will lead to an increase in traffic and result in more congestion on other neighbouring roads, and especially in Elgin Road. There will be an increase in journey times and congestion on the main road network and in some of the residential roads.*

Response:

One aim of this proposal is to encourage traffic to stay on the main road network and discourage drivers from using residential roads as through routes. It is appreciated that some traffic may use other nearby residential roads if Addiscombe Court Rd and Canning Road are made no entry, and that Elgin Road does provide an alternative route, should Canning Road become no entry for northbound traffic.

During these busiest times, Elgin Road is only one of several choices for those going north using Addiscombe Road. It is also likely that some traffic will remain on the main road network or disperse via other alternative routes. Depending on where motorist journeys originate from, some drivers may completely change their route and drive through another area altogether.

In addition to Elgin Road, nearby alternative routes available are via Havelock Road, Outram Road and Ashburton Road. It is likely that all these roads could experience some additional traffic if the proposals are agreed. It is not possible however to predict which of the alternative routes motorists might choose and some may vary their routes on different days depending on prevailing traffic conditions.

Should the proposals be agreed, then post-implementation monitoring of traffic flows will take place once the new traffic regime becomes settled in. This would be around 2 months after completion. Other measures can be considered if new traffic problems materialise.

Journey times are likely to increase, in particular for residents of Addiscombe Court Road and Canning Road as one end of their street will no longer be accessible to them.

However, road safety and quality of life for these residents is also a priority and is the reason why residents of Addiscombe Court Road/Tunstall Road presented the Council with a petition requesting measures.

Discussions are taking place between Council officers and Transport for London (TfL) regarding improving the capacity of the main road network to assist with keeping traffic on the arterial routes. This could result in an improvement for the area in the longer term.

#### 4.6 **Objection Group 2**

*Scheme will result in increased noise and pollution*

Response:

It is acknowledged that there will be changes to the local traffic regime and local pollution and noise levels may vary, however a net increase is not anticipated unless a significant volume of extra traffic chooses to travel through the area.

By encouraging traffic to use the main roads (which are wider), impact on residents is reduced, as pollution and noise from vehicles decreases the further away from the traffic lane one is.

**4.7 Objection Group 3**

*The scheme will not achieve its aims to encourage walking and cycling, encourage using other public transport, become quieter place to live and reduce vehicle speeds*

Response: The reduction in motor vehicle traffic on residential roads resulting from introducing the no-entry, one-way (part or in whole) will provide a better environment for vulnerable road users and in particular for cyclists, allowing them to travel part of their journey on quieter back streets, and provides links to and between other roads which are more suitable for cycling. Residents of Addiscombe Court Road, Tunstall Road and Canning Road should also benefit from their streets become quieter and more pleasant places to live.

**4.8 Objection Group 4 & 5**

*The scheme will not reduce vehicle speeds. The scheme will not improve road safety for residents.*

Response:

The recently completed traffic surveys included speed data and no speeding issues were identified. The standard way of presenting speed data is known as 85 percentile speed, which is the speed at which 85% of vehicles recorded in a survey travel below.

Data for Addiscombe Court Road gives 85 percentile speed at around 15mph. For Canning Road, Elgin Road, Havelock Road and Outram Road it is below 20mph for all roads. The speed of vehicles as shown by the survey findings does not present any road safety issue.

A road safety audit has been carried out on the proposal and no safety issues arising from the proposals were found. The road safety issue of vehicles overtaking trams at Lebanon Road tram stop will be removed, should the measures be approved.

**4.9 Objection Group 6**

*Traffic will be displaced to other neighbouring roads*

Response:

This matter has been discussed in the first group of objections and impact of traffic displacement onto residential streets will be subject to monitoring if proposals are approved.

**4.10 Objection Group 7**

*The scheme will not make the area a pleasant place to live*

Response:

By alleviating the problems of those living on Addiscombe Court Road and Tunstall Road and removing the potential for Canning Road to become a “rat-run” it will help to restore the quality of life for those living in these roads to when traffic volumes were lower. Addiscombe Court Road in particular has house frontages only 3m - 4m from the carriageway and the residents here do experience traffic noise, more so than some of the other streets where house frontages are much further away from passing traffic.

#### 4.11 **Objection Group 8 & 9**

*Council did not conduct any proper analysis on traffic data*

*A Full Traffic Analysis/ Whole area approach for the whole area needs to be done*

Response: The issues on Addiscombe Court Road have been recognised to be a problem and there is a need to resolve this as quickly as possible. In particular the matter of vehicles illegally overtaking trams stopped at Lebanon Road tram stop to then turn left into Addiscombe Court Road is a road safety issue which has to be resolved. Traffic surveys were carried out in early 2016 to establish traffic displacement, following on from Lebanon Road being made no entry/one way. A further pre-implementation traffic survey has been carried out on the affected roads to assess the traffic impact on the wider road network.

Data now available shows current numbers of vehicles who travel through the residential roads in the area. Further detailed studies would involve origin and destination studies over a much wider area and these are very expensive, requiring a large amount of resource to complete surveys and tabulate the data. The benefit of such a study is unlikely to add much extra value to the traffic surveys already carried out, which has provided the number of motorists using the residential roads to get to/from the A232 Addiscombe Road from/to Lower Addiscombe Road and that they will do so via the most convenient route available. Given the limitations of affordable and realistic options available to provide a solution, the data collection and analysis is adequate and appropriate.

#### 4.12 **Objection Group 10**

*Consultation process was inadequate or flawed*

Response:

The Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 sets out how Local Authorities undertake statutory consultation. For this proposal, the notice was published in the Croydon Guardian on 17th July 2017 and also in the London Gazette on the same date. Although not required, street notices were also put up on lamp columns. The legally required process has been complied with.

Prior to undertaking the statutory (legally required) consultation, all residents within a wide surrounding area have been written to, to get their views and thoughts on the proposals. The engagement took place with every household in a wide area and was not inadequate nor flawed.

#### 4.13 **Objection Group 11 & 12**

*Canning Road should remain 2 way only Addiscombe Court Road should be no Entry*

*Canning Road residents did not support the proposal during informal consultation*

Response:

At the TMAC meeting of 5 July 2017 it was acknowledged that there was a majority of Canning Road residents who wanted their road to remain as it currently is ie. no restrictions nor one way sections. The matter was discussed by the committee in consultation with the Addiscombe ward councillors. After careful consideration the committee concluded that were Canning Road to remain two way it would simply be a matter of time before Canning Road residents were complaining about traffic displacement and requesting the Council to deal with the consequences.

If Addiscombe Court Road alone were made no entry then all north bound traffic coming from Park Hill Road/Park Hill Rise and some adjacent residential roads in the restricted area would use Canning Road during the morning and evening traffic restrictions on Addiscombe Road. Canning Road would be the only available northbound exit from the area from 7 – 10am and from 4 – 7pm.

#### **4.14 Objection Group 13**

*Scheme will causes problems for emergency vehicles*

Response:

If an emergency vehicle needs to access either Canning Road or Addiscombe Court Road they are permitted to drive through the no entry and against the short one way section, so long as they are sounding their emergency sirens and/or have warning lights flashing. There should be no impact on access in a genuine emergency. Emergency services are contacted directly as part of the statutory consultation process and no objections to the proposals have been received.

#### **4.15 Comments Received in response to the Public Notice**

##### *4.15.1 Introducing alternatives to the one way would be good, traffic calming would be a better approach*

Response: Addiscombe Court Road, Canning Road, Elgin Road Havelock Road and Outram Road all have physical traffic calming already in place. The effect of this traffic calming is reflected in the traffic surveys completed recently in terms of vehicle speeds as already discussed above. Alternatives considered are at the end of this report.

##### *4.15.2 Parking Spaces will be affected by the scheme*

Response: No on street parking bays will be lost should the proposals be taken forward, nor will any free parking space be reduced. Altering parking arrangements is not part of these proposals.

##### *4.15.3 The East India Conservation Area will be affected by the proposals*

Response: The roads in question have already been discussed within the “objections” section of the report. Conservation area status is covered by planning legislation or local area planning rules whereas highway matters are separate.



Whilst they are legally distinct matters, any physical measures introduced within a conservation area will be sympathetic to the locality in terms of their appearance and siting. For example, consideration will be given to the location of any new road signs or street furniture to ensure it has the minimum visual impact on the local street scene.

*4.15.4 An Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out.*

Response: Environmental or Traffic/Transport Impact Assessments are usually carried out as part of the legally required planning process, where new developments are proposed which might introduce a large amount of new traffic onto the highway, impacting on the environment or on travel. This allows planning authorities to mitigate the impact by requiring a developer to fund improvements to deal with the effects or impact of new traffic.

In the case of the small scale measures proposed in this report, whilst the traffic regime may be altered, it is not proposed to increase the traffic in the area and there is no requirement to carry out such an assessment.

*4.15.5 The informal consultation did not include enough roads/the informal consultation was inadequate.*

Response: The informal consultation area covered a large number of streets in the area, a plan showing streets included is in the appendices to this report. The informal consultation served its purpose which was to find out residents views on proposals. There was a good response rate and the outcomes/findings were discussed at the TMAC meeting in July 2017.

*4.15.6 Refuse vehicles will find it difficult to complete their waste/recycling collections should no-entry restrictions be introduced.*

Response: The Council's refuse vehicles routinely collect waste/recycling from one way streets, no entries and cul de sacs across the borough. Whilst there may need to be some re-planning of routes to optimise the time taken on the collection rounds it is not envisaged that this would become an insurmountable problem for the waste collection service.

*4.15.7 Some roads could be made left or right turn only.*

Response: Whilst this might reduce a number of vehicle journeys in Addiscombe Court Road, it would not resolve the safety issues with vehicles overtaking the trams at the tram stop by this road. In addition, these banned turns are rather difficult to enforce and predictably there would be a large amount of non-compliance without regular enforcement, as is seen quite often in the borough.

**5. FINANCIAL AND RISK ASSESSMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

**5.1 Revenue and Capital consequences of report recommendations**

Current year

Medium Term Financial Strategy – 3 year forecast
--

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/2020	2020/2011
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Revenue Budget available</b>				
Expenditure				
Income				
<b>Effect of decision from report</b>				
Expenditure				
Income				
<b>Remaining budget</b>				
<b>Capital Budget available</b>	125			
Expenditure				
<b>Effect of decision from report</b>	35			
Expenditure				
<b>Remaining budget</b>	90			

## 5.2 The effect of the decision

This scheme is funded by Transport for London (TfL) from the Council's 2017/2018 Local Implementation Plan allocation (Casualty Prevention and Congestion Relief). A decision to proceed will result in that allocation being spent partially.

## 5.3 Risks

There is a risk that if the proposed scheme is not approved, the allocated £35,000 may not be fully spent. Any unspent monies will need to be reallocated to other highways projects or returned to TfL.

## 5.4 Options

Should this recommendation not be agreed then the alternative would be to either do nothing, or look to other options to solve the traffic problems.

## 5.5 Future savings/efficiencies

Although there will be no direct savings and efficiencies as a result of this scheme there may be indirect savings within the Council and with partner organisations if casualty rates are reduced as a result of implementation.

Approved by: Luke Chiverton, Interim Head of Finance, Place and Resources.

## 6. **COMMENTS OF THE COUNCIL SOLICITOR AND MONITORING OFFICER**

- 6.1 The Council Solicitor comments that Section 6, 124 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) provides powers to introduce, vary and implement Traffic Management Orders. In exercising this power, section 122 of the Act Imposes a duty on the Council to have regard (so far as practicable) 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. The Council must also have regard to such matters as the effect on the amenities of any locality affected.

- 6.2 The Council have complied with the necessary requirements of the Local Authorities Traffic Order Procedure (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 by giving the appropriate notices and receiving representations. Such representations must be considered before a final decision is made.

Approved by: Jacqueline Harris-Baker, Director of Law, Council Solicitor and Acting Monitoring Officer.

## **7. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPACT**

- 7.1 There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

Approved by: Sue Moorman, Director of Human Resources.

## **8. EQUALITIES IMPACT**

- 8.1 The proposals in this report could improve road safety through a reduction in likelihood of injury collisions, encourage walking and cycling. This will make a positive contribution to improving health and tackling obesity, improving air quality, improving accessibility, improving the local environment, improving the quality of life for all groups (including those that share a protected characteristic) and strengthening community cohesion.
- 8.2 The proposal is likely to improve conditions for all the protected groups in the streets with new no entries and has the potential to ease community severance by aiding the development of healthy and sustainable places and communities. In reducing the perception of road danger the scheme could enable the protected groups to make more and better use of their local streets.
- 8.3 The proposal is likely to benefit in particular, certain groups that share a “protected characteristic” such as people with a disability, older people and children in providing additional road safety (as pedestrians), whilst in comparison the more able pedestrians would benefit to a lesser degree.
- 8.4 An initial equalities impact assessment has been carried out on this proposal and it is considered that a full assessment is not necessary at this stage, as the changes are likely to benefit a number of groups that share a “protected characteristic” as detailed in the initial assessment. However the scheme if implemented should be monitored as it progresses and if any negative impact on the protected groups do emerge, a full assessment will be carried out to identify any mitigating actions that may be required.

## **9. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**

- 9.1 The reduction in through traffic will benefit residents of Addiscombe Court Road,

Tunstall Road and Canning Road, by improving the local environment and making these streets a more pleasant place to live. There will be a reduction in traffic and associated noise, improvement in local air quality and it will be easier for people to move around within the area.

- 9.2 By restricting traffic movements at access/egress points local residents may need to alter their motor vehicle journeys to and from their homes. This may involve additional distance and increased journey time driving along the main road network which would also become more congested as a result of these measures.
- 9.3 The main road network is likely to become more congested, vehicle journey times may increase and it is likely that traffic will displace onto the nearest available north-south through route or find other routes to complete their journeys.
- 9.4 It is possible that the scheme will encourage people to choose more physically active lifestyles by opting to make healthier active travel choices such as walking and cycling which in turn will help to reduce emissions and improve air quality by reducing congestion.

## **10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPACT**

- 10.1 There are no crime and disorder reduction impacts in this report.

## **11. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS/PROPOSED DECISION**

- 11.1 The proposed scheme should assist the Council in encouraging more sustainable transport use such as walking and cycling, by reducing vehicle speeds and improving safety, and the perception that the streets are safer and more user friendly. Any modal shift to more sustainable transport achieved as a result of the scheme will also assist in improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions contributing to the Council's objectives. The roads made "no entry" will become quieter and more pleasant places to live as a result of the scheme.

## **12. OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 12.1 Other options considered and not taken up at this time are summarised here.
  - 1. Reversing the direction of the one way system in Lebanon Road, which was implemented in January 2015. This would result in the traffic transferring back onto this road, thus reintroducing the same problems as are currently being experienced in Addiscombe Court Road.
  - 2. Removal of most or all one way or no-entry restrictions in the roads running north-south between Lower Addiscombe Road and Addiscombe Road between Cherry Orchard Road and Ashburton Road. This would not resolve the issues of high traffic flows travelling through the area. Indeed, this could lead to a further increase in such traffic if the movements are perceived to be easier.
  - 3. Making each of the north-south roads in paragraph 12.1 (2) above one way in

alternate directions. Making these roads alternate one-way would also lead to an acceptance of the high traffic volume using the residential roads as through routes and could lead to these roads becoming the default route for all north and south bound traffic to the east of the town centre.

4. Carry out alterations to the junction of Cherry Orchard Road with Lower Addiscombe Road to take north-south through traffic. This junction has been studied recently with a view to improving road safety for pedestrians and two wheeled vehicles and it was found that this junction at peak traffic times is already at full capacity carrying east-west traffic. A scheme to provide a north-south through route would need a major investment of the order of millions of pounds and purchase of land/buildings would also be necessary. Accessing Cherry Orchard Road would need to be via the junction with Addiscombe Road at East Croydon and this is already very congested at peak times.
5. Improve the junction at Chepstow Road. This is under discussion with TfL and is being looked at as part of the wider area. TfL have been approached and the problems residents in the Addiscombe area face with through traffic was highlighted. The matter regarding improvements to the existing main road network in order to reduce peak time congestion was discussed. TfL confirm that they are willing to work with the borough to look at the TfL/borough main road network, with a view to seeing what improvements could be made to the junction of Addiscombe Road/Chepstow Road to reduce queuing at peak times. TfL have also suggested a review of the wider main road network in conjunction with borough officers, to see what measures are possible to facilitate improved traffic flows on arterial routes in the area in general, including the town centre.

---

**CONTACT OFFICER:** Mike Barton-Service Manager Highway Improvements  
x61977  
Sue Ritchie-Senior Engineer Highway Improvements  
x63823

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:** None

**APPENDICES:** Appendix 1 – Proposed Canning Road No entry drawing with pedal cycle by pass drawing  
Appendix 2 – Proposed Addiscombe Court Road No entry with pedal cycle by pass drawing  
Appendix 3 – Objections – correspondence  
Appendix 4 – Support – correspondence  
Appendix 5 – Plan – informal consultation boundary